Research Assessment 2019

Institute for Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies (PTR)

Radboud University Nijmegen

18 December 2019

Radboud Universiteit

Radboud University Nijmegen
Houtlaan 4
PO Box 9102
6500 HC Nijmegen
The Netherlands
Phone +31 24 361 5972
Telefax +31 24 356 4606
E-mail s.hampsink@soo.ru.nl
Internet www.ru.nl

Institute for Philosphy, Theology and Religious Studies
PO Box 9103
6500 HD Nijmegen
The Netherlands
Phone: +31 24 361 21 68
Telefax: +31 24 361 55 64
E-mail: m.slors@ftr.ru.nl
Internet: http://www.ru.nl/ptrs/research/about-our-research

Contents

7 Appendices

1 Introduction

1.1 The Netherlands System of Quality Assessment of Research

An external committee of peers evaluated the research quality of the Institute for Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies (PTR) of Radboud University during a site visit in October 2019, and reports its findings in this document.

This quality assessment (peer review) is part of the assessment system for all publicly funded Dutch research organizations, as organized by the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU), the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) and the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO).

The aims of this assessment system are: (1) improvement of research quality, and (2) accountability to the board of the research organization, and towards funding agencies, government and society at large. The assessment takes place at the level of research institutes and research programmes within the institutes. The site visit to each institute by an external committee, once every six years, is an essential part of the assessment system. A committee of peers is appointed and asked to review the research. Important elements of the site visit are the interviews the evaluation committee conducts with the management, the Institute's director and the group leaders, as well as with PhD students, postdoctoral researchers and junior staff members.

1.2 The Members of the Evaluation Committee

The Evaluation Committee consisted of:

Prof. Wiep van Bunge (Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands), Chair
Prof. Daniel Cohnitz (Utrecht University, The Netherlands)
Prof. Thomas Prügl (Universität Wien, Austria)
Prof. Auli Vähäkangas (University of Helsinki, Finland)
Prof. Antoon Vandevelde (KU Leuven, Belgium)
Sjoerd Mulder (Tilburg University, The Netherlands)

Dr. Jetje De Groof (Eduflow, Antwerp, Belgium) was appointed as secretary to the Committee.

A short bio of each of the members is included in Appendix 1.

All members of the Committee signed a statement of independence to ensure that they would judge without bias, personal preference or personal interest, and that their judgment is made

without undue influence from persons or parties committed to the institute or programmes under review, or from other stakeholders.

1.3 Scope of the Assessment

1.3.1 Research Institute for Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies

The Executive Board of Radboud University commissioned the assessment of the Research Institute for Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies (PTR). The PTR was founded in 2011 as the research institute of the Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies of Radboud University. The Institute is organized in five research Centers: Center for the History of Philosophy and Science (CHPS); Center for Catholic Studies (CCS); Center for Cognition, Culture and Language (CCL); Center for Religion and Contemporary Society (CRCS); and the Center for Contemporary European Philosophy (CCEP). A description of the Institute can be found in section 1.2. of this report.

The Executive Board of Radboud University provided Terms of Reference for the Committee (TOR). The Committee is asked to assess the quality and relevance to society of the research conducted by the Institute as a whole as well as by its five research Centers for the period 2013-2018. It is also requested to assess the strategic targets of the Institute and the Centers and the extent to which they are equipped to achieve them. The Committee is expected to do so by providing a written assessment of the Institute's and Centers' performance on the three SEP assessment criteria ('research quality', 'relevance to society' and 'viability'). At the Institute level, the Committee is asked to assign a score (1, 2, 3 or 4) to each of these criteria, in accordance with the SEP guidelines. Finally, the Committee is asked to reflect on three other aspects at the Institute level: (1) PhD supervision and training, (2) research integrity, and (3) diversity.

The Committee operates according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) for public scientific research in the Netherlands 2015-2021, which was drawn up by the KNAW, VSNU and NWO. The protocol specifies the information that must be provided to the Committee and the criteria for the research assessment.

1.3.2 National Research School NOSTER

National research schools are being assessed as part of a research unit at the host institution of the research school. PTR being the host institution for NOSTER, the Committee is also asked to include the assessment of NOSTER in the report. The TOR lists the main questions to be addressed by the Committee. They will be discussed in section 5 of this report.

1.4 Procedures followed by the Committee

Six weeks before the site visit, the Committee members received a self-evaluation report, containing the mission, vision, and ambition of the Institute and its research Centers as well as their academic results and societal impact in the period 2013-2018. Additional information was accessible on a secluded website. The Committee also received the TOR.

During the site visit (for the programme, see Appendix 2), the Committee members were welcomed by the Rector Magnificus of Radboud University. They met with the Dean, the director of the Institute and the coordinators of the research Centers. They interviewed the Faculty Board and the Institute director; representatives of the research Centers (who each gave a short presentation); post-docs and/or assistant professors; a group of PhD students; and the valorization coordinator. Additionally, the Committee interviewed the directors of Research School Noster and the Graduate School for the Humanities. Between the interviews, time was available to the Committee to discuss their findings. At the end of the visit, the Chair presented the main preliminary conclusions to the staff of PTR and the Faculty Board; the Rector Magnificus of Radboud University also attended this meeting.

After the site visit, the evaluation report was written, based on a template provided by Radboud University. When all Committee members had included their additions and comments, a final version was drawn up and sent to PTR for a check on factual errors. Finally, the report was delivered to the Executive Board of Radboud University.

1.5 Criteria and Assessment Scale

The Protocol requires the Evaluation Committee to assess the research on three main criteria of the Standard Evaluation Protocol:

- Research Quality (the level of the research conducted)
- Societal relevance (social, economic and cultural relevance of the research)
- Viability (strategy, governance and leadership)

The qualitative assessments are supplemented by assigning discrete categories (1-4): Excellent (1); Very good (2); Good (3); Unsatisfactory (4). The meaning of the categories in this four-point scale used in the assessment is described in the Standard Evaluation Protocol (see Appendix 4).

2 Assessment of the Institute for Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies

Director of the Institute:	Prof. dr. M. Slors (2012-2016) Prof. dr. B. Geurts (2016-2017) Prof. dr. C. van Nieuwkerk (2017-present)	
Tenured staff in 2018:	18.4 FTE	
Assessment:	Research Quality:	2
	Societal Relevance:	1
	Viability:	2

2.1 Mission, strategy, targets and research activities

Through the preparatory documents and the discussions during the site visit, the Committee obtained a clear view of the mission, strategy and research activities of the Institute for Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies (PTR). A summary is given below.

Radboud University's Faculty of Philosophy, Theology, and Religious Studies is unique in the Netherlands in combining the three disciplines of philosophy, theology, and religious studies. PTR's mission, as presented during the site visit, is to study the profound changes in the world and the ensuing challenges for individual and social institutions. The self-evaluation report explains that its multidisciplinary composition allows PTR to address crucial questions with a high relevance for society and quality of life. It provides many opportunities for interdisciplinary research in which empirical and normative research enrich each other. The Institute describes itself as being internationally oriented, while at the same time remaining closely engaged with Dutch audiences and professionals

During the review period the Institute's ambition has been to strengthen its organizational structure and effectiveness. In line with this ambition, it has created five research Centers in which researchers collaborate. Other ambitions in the review period were to create a positive and stimulating research environment by implementing a new career track system; to enhance PTR's societal impact by collaborating with societal partners; to improve the efficiency and quality of PhD projects, and to create an inclusive research environment, in which scientific integrity is self-evident. PTR's future goals include increasing the Centers' international visibility and reputation; strengthening the thematic connections between the

Centers so that they more strongly contribute to the overall research mission; and integrating societal issues in its research agenda.

2.2 Assessment of the Institute

In this section, the Committee evaluates the performance of PTR as a whole on the three criteria of research quality, relevance to society and viability. In addition, the Committee gives its evaluation of PhD supervision and education, research integrity, and diversity, as stipulated in the TOR (see also 1.3). For each of the sections, the report first provides an overview of the Committee's observations on the basis of the preparatory documents and the site visit. Next, the Committee gives its assessment for each of the topics, based on the observations made. An overview of the Committee's recommendations is given in section 3 of this report.

2.2.1 Research Quality

2.2.1.1 Output and academic reputation

Table 4 in Appendix 3 provides an overview of the Institute's research output in the review period. The most common form of publication is the single-author publication: academic articles in national and international journals, monographs, and contributions to edited volumes. PTR stresses the diverse and hybrid nature of many of its publications: output is based on thorough research yet reaches out to both academic and general audiences as it is written in an accessible style. Table 4 illustrates that after an initial increase in PTR's output in 2013-2014, there has been a small drop in all categories of publications. PTR explains this evolution is proportional to the decline in research capacity (see 2.2.1.3). The self-evaluation report mentions that 378 refereed articles, 57 books and 470 book chapters have been published in the review period. PTR staff was editor of 59 books. Also 91 PhD theses have been defended.

The Committee observed that although PTR aims to publish at the highest level, the number of papers published in truly first-class journals is limited. Against this background the Committee discussed PTR's publication strategy with different groups of interviewees. It learned that individual researchers' publication output is discussed during the yearly appraisals with the chairs. The Committee observed that good practices exist in some of the Centers, such as the use of lists of preferred publication channels; joint discussions of most suitable publication outlets for work in progress; and initiatives for Special Issues to which researchers are invited to contribute.

The Committee studied PTR's performance on indicators of scientific recognition, other than publications. It observed that PTR's researchers have significant impact as Chief Editors of Journals and Book Series, and learned that these editorships are nicely spread over the

different Centers. In the review period, PTR scholars have moreover gained various prestigious personal research grants, such as two NWO Veni and two ERC starting grants. The Committee learned during the site visit that PTR has been particularly successful in the last round of applications (in 2019), where its researchers have managed to obtain 2 ERC-grants (one Advanced), and one Vidi. Also, they are participating in an ITN Marie Curie consortium and a HERA (Humanities in European Research Area) project. Recognition by peers is furthermore evidenced by PTR researchers obtaining prizes and awards, such as the Radboud Science Award, which was awarded twice to a PTR researcher in the review period, and the Leibniz Society Essay award.

2.2.1.2 Structure, governance and organization

In the period between 2013-2016 the Institute and its ten chairs were clustered in three research programmes: 'Competing Worldviews', 'Cognitive Humanities', and 'Modernity Contested'. The aim was to stimulate a climate of interdisciplinary dialogue. However, the 2012 SEP assessment as well as the 2016 midterm review raised concerns about the organizational viability of the three large programmes and their ability to attract funds. This led to the re-arrangement of the research programmes into five thematic groups, the Centers. During the site visit, the Committee explored PTR's current organizational structure. It learned that the Centers have different logics of existence. Some of them group researchers that have been co-operating for a long time. One such example is CHPS, which was set up in a bottom-up way twenty years ago. Other Centers are the result of top-down initiatives, yet all five Centers mirror actual collaborations on the ground, and are closely associated with the expertise of the participating chairs. Because of the ever-changing nature of the fundable themes and in order to cope with present and future challenges, the research themes and strategies of both the Institute and its five Centers need to remain flexible. The management explained that the current structure allows space for both curiosity-driven research collaboration (bottom-up), and more top-down agenda setting based on funding strategies. Both Institute management and researchers expressed their appreciation of the non-hierarchical, friendly, and open atmosphere at the Institute. The Committee learned that PTR researchers meet in various constellations all the time due to the small size of the Faculty of PTR.

After having read the self-evaluation report, the Committee had questions regarding the unusual clustering of chairs and research topics in some of the Centers. One example of such a Center is CCL, with its combination of philosophy of mind and language with textual sources of Judaism and Christianity. Another example is CCEP, where the juxtaposition of psychoanalysis, phenomenology, hermeneutics and ethics raised questions. Researchers in these Centers were however very clear in pointing at the interesting research topics on which

they collaborate. Importantly, the Committee gathered that the representatives of the Centers do not consider the Centers to be a straitjacket, and that there is still ample room to do disciplinary research. However, the Committee also took note of the fact that collaboration varies between and within the Centers, and sometimes relies on personal affinities and contacts rather than structural collaborations (see also 2.2.3, 'Viability').

PTR is led by a Research Director (0.3 FTE). In the Institute's day-to-day management, the director is assisted by the research policy adviser, who also acts as the data steward and the administrator of output registration (0.6 FTE). The five Centers each have a coordinator (0.05 FTE) who together organize research and management meetings with the participating chairs and approve the Centers' content and direction. Additionally, the support staff was extended as the PTR appointed a valorization manager (0.2 FTE) and an acquisition coordinator (0.1 FTE). In the review period, the Research Director's management resources have increased. The Director now has an independent and increased budget for national and international conferences, valorization, and editing (€60,000). It supports the acquisition of project funding and allocate funds for teaching-free semesters, editing of publications, and organization of (international) conferences. It also awards funding for enhancing societal impact and building societal collaborations. Moreover, it subsidizes one-year appointments for external PhD candidates to complete their theses. In the review period, the Faculty has also paid for several PhD positions, based on projects with shared supervision between the Institute's chairs, a strategy PTR reports to be successful.

2.2.1.3 Resources

Staff

In 2018 the PTR was home to 18.4 FTE tenured staff (8.2 FTE Full professor, 4.0 FTE Associate professor, and 6.3 Assistant Professor), and 13.5 non-tenured staff (5.3 FTE post-doc and 8.1 FTE PhDs). Total support staff was 5.6 FTE. Appendix 3 (Table 1) shows that the total volume research capacity has decreased over the review period. It increased between 2013 and 2014 from 41.7 FTE to 50.6 FTE to decrease subsequently to 31.8 FTE in 2018. Although there was a slight increase in tenured staff over the review period (from 17.2 FTE in 2013 to 18.4 FTE in 2018), the drop was most clear for the category of post-docs and PhD students (from 11.2 FTE to 5.3 FTE and from 13.3 FTE to 8.1 FTE over the review period respectively). The self-evaluation report explains that the decline is on the one hand due to the problems PTR encounters to attract ear-marked funding, which is a challenge for all of the humanities in the Netherlands. It is on the other hand due to the fact that some of the Institute's larger externally funded projects have been completed. According to PTR, the recent acquisition of some large NWO and ERC grants will allow for the category of PhDs and postdocs to grow again (see also 2.2.1.1). Additionally, PTR has initiated a system of faculty

PhDs. Four funded positions at faculty level are available, and they are attributed to senior scientists who have applied for large grants but have not been successful. Another faculty PhD is appointed on a 50/50 research-teaching basis.

PTR's staff is unevenly distributed over the research Centers, with the CRCS being the biggest (11.23 FTE scientific staff) and CCS the smallest (2.9 FTE scientific staff) (see Appendix 3 Table 2). As regards the staff's age composition, PTR notes that its permanent staff has a broad age-range with 26% of research FTE under 44, but with a high percentage (53%) above 55. Table 7 in Appendix 3 also shows that staff above 55 year no longer increases (but is still above 50%), whereas staff under 44 year has increased from around 16% in 2013 to around 26% in 2018.

Staff working at PTR have a standard division of 60% teaching and 40% research. The Institute considers it a weakness that new staff is attracted primarily based on teaching needs, leaving less room to attract scholars on the basis of a chosen research focus. The Committee learned that currently there is no differentiation of research time based on staff performance, and that deviation from the 60/40-norm only happens occasionally. The Committee explored PTR's career development strategy and learned from the self-evaluation report that a new career track system has been implemented during the review period with clear criteria and conditions for promotion, with grant acquisition playing an important role to proceed to higher career scales. During the conversation with junior staff members it became apparent, however, that there is room for improvement in making the criteria more transparent. Also, the Committee observed that the acquisition of large grants plays a major role in order to proceed to a higher academic rank. The Committee moreover learned that another element of PTR's HR-strategy is that young talented researchers are given short-term appointments to write postdoc proposals, after completing their thesis. Finally, mid-career staff is given personalized career advice.

Funding and financial incentives

A detailed overview of PTR's funding sources can be found in Appendix 3, Table 3. PTR's main source of income is direct (state) funding (75.4% of its funding in 2018). 7.2% of its income comes from Dutch research grants from NWO or KNAW. 9.8% of its funding comes from the 'third flow of funds', i.e. European funds (like ERC or HERA), and other revenue, such as contract research.

The Committee learned from the self-evaluation report and during the site visit that PTR wants to improve the balance of the stream funds by improving the acquisition of second- and third-stream funding. In order to achieve this goal, PTR has deployed a few instruments. One such

instrument is to provide a teaching-free semester to junior or senior staff members who are in the process of writing a big grant proposal. During the conversations with representatives of the Centers, the Committee learned that this instrument is much appreciated and widely used. Also, an acquisition manager has been attracted, who provides hands-on support for PTR researchers wishing to apply. The Committee encountered other good practices in the Centers, such as coaching of applicants by experienced colleagues and mock interviews. The fact that PTR has been quite successful in obtaining grants in 2019 seems to indicate these measures are bearing fruit. The self-evaluation report also mentions that the Dutch National Research Agenda (NWO) offers opportunities to attract research funding for some of the Centers if PTR manages to create large consortia. The collaborations with societal partners are considered to be an important milestone for this (see also 2.2.2).

Assessment of 'research quality' by the Committee

PTR is, by all metrics and information the Committee consulted, a healthy Institute. Its Centers have contributed significantly to current debates in their chosen field of expertise, and the general quality of the output is high. Nevertheless, the number of papers published in truly first-class journals is limited. The same comment applies to the monographs published during the review period. Although they are of high quality, few of them were issued by the most prestigious publishing firms. The Committee is of the opinion that PTR's output could be aimed more at top outlets. Good publication practices already are in place in some of the Centers, and PTR should think of ways to share these practices within the Institute and develop them into a clear academic publication policy.

PTR has made great efforts to improve the research environment by facilitating research, and by re-arranging the configuration of the Centers. The Committee concludes that with its pragmatic, sensible attitude towards the organizational structure, PTR has been remarkably successful in making Centers that work, and that produce exciting research. Key elements in this strategy are, according to the Committee, the careful balancing of bottom-up initiatives with top-down steering, and the fact that individual quality and interests of PTR faculty are taken into account. Nevertheless, some of the individual Centers have matured quicker than others. The Committee encourages PTR to further support the coherency and collaboration within and between the five Centers. The partly unique combination of fields and disciplines in PTR offers many opportunities for joint research questions and projects. The Committee is of the opinion that across the Centers more attention could be paid to disciplinary coherence and collaboration in theology.

The Committee welcomes that PTR has developed a career track but finds that the requirements for promotion should be made more transparent. PTR does not differentiate in research time based on the performance of its researchers. The Committee encourages the Institute to think about additional incentive mechanisms, also in view of binding high-quality researchers to the Institute.

PTR has a convincing incentive strategy. In a time when faculty-funded PhD positions have all but ceased to exist in the Netherlands, the four faculty PhD positions are an excellent instrument for PTR to pursue its research agenda. The Committee values that researchers who have applied for, but have failed to obtain a large (personal) grant, can apply for the faculty PhDs. It believes that this strategy may contribute to PTR's ambition to acquire a more balanced division of the different fund streams in its total income. The opportunity to apply for a teaching-free semester is also a valuable tool, which seems to produce its first results. The Committee advises to develop it further.

2.2.2 Societal relevance

PTR explains in its self-evaluation report that Radboud Reflects on the one hand, and the Institute's societal collaborations, are its two main channels of valorisation. The Institute argues that these initiatives demonstrate the concerted efforts made by PTR to improve its societal visibility and impact in recent years. Radboud Reflects is an academic programme targeted towards a broad audience. Programmes, events, and debates organized by Radboud Reflects include current issues in philosophy, ethics, politics, religion, economy, and lifestyle. Numerous internationally renowned scholars have visited Nijmegen in the context of Radboud Reflects activities. Table 5 in Appendix 3 provides a list of the activities organized in the framework of Radboud Reflects in the period 2014-2018. It shows that in 2018 16.649 participants attended activities of Radboud Reflects. It welcomed 100.000 unique visitors on its website and has 10.100 subscribers to its newsletter. During the site visit the Committee learned that PTR considers Radboud Reflects also as an instrument to attract students, a strategy that seems to be paying off, as research master students often point at Radboud Reflects as the reason why they chose their current study. Importantly, Radboud Reflects also has an internal task at the university in that it reflects on academic life in general, and is seen as a key element in safeguarding the university's identity.

The self-evaluation report explains that the collaboration with societal partners initiative was launched in 2017 for PTR's researchers to better meet societal demands while improving valorization conditions for research funding. The Committee was pleased to learn during the site visit that PTR has the ambition to approach potential partnerships in a strategic way, which means that not all opportunities for collaboration are pursued. Only when PTR

researchers can provide an added value, will it invest in structural collaborations. PTR researchers explained to the Committee that establishing a structural network is a slow process of finding good contexts and audiences, and a good role for PTR researchers. The result is a two-tiered process. On the one hand, PTR communicates its research results and products to society. On the other hand, through the networks it builds, PTR gets insight in the real professional issues that play in certain contexts, which then influences PTR's research agenda. In this way, PTR becomes a preferred supplier of advice in its selected areas of impact.

The self-evaluation report describes how in the review period PTR has indeed invested in structural contacts with a range of societal organizations, both locally and nationally. Collaborations have been established in the fields of democracy, education, personalized care, and religious culture. In these collaborations, researchers and the societal partners jointly develop services that range from contract research, post-academic courses and training, to educational books and materials, as well as joint research projects. PTR explains that further developing and consolidating these consortia is a key element of its future funding strategy, as it will equip the Institute to make better use of national and international funding in the future.

During the site visit, the Committee learned that collaborations with societal partners are both the result of bottom-up initiatives and more top-down activities. While it is the ambition to always start from the research interests of PTR scholars, the valorization officer (see also 2.2.1) points at potential connections, both between researchers within PTR, and with potential partners outside PTR, also in view of potential funding sources. The Committee was pleased to hear that being engaged with societal partners is not a must for everyone, and that fundamental research is highly valued. PTR researchers confirmed during the site visit that they did not experience a tension between research and valorization.

Table 4 in Appendix 3 shows that the number of publications aimed at the general public has risen from 26 in 2013 to 42 in 2018. PTR notes that this growth reflects the increasing importance placed on the societal impact of PTR research. PTR moreover explains that through its media appearances, publications, and training courses, it contributes to debates in society and amongst policymakers. It concludes that this has enabled the Institute to not only reach audiences traditionally interested in its research, but also professionals less aware of the relevance of its research to their work.

Assessment of 'societal relevance' by the Committee

The Committee comes to the conclusion that PTR makes an outstanding contribution to society. The Committee is particularly impressed by the societal impact PTR has by means of Radboud Reflects. Making Radboud Reflects into an integral part of the Institute allows PTR to play a vital role in setting the university-wide outreach agenda.

Throughout the self-evaluation and during the site visit it became clear that having societal impact is paramount for PTR. It has developed a clear strategy and uses diverse but carefully selected channels to achieve societal impact. The Committee values that, as part of this strategy, a valorization officer was attracted, to support researchers in establishing structural collaborations that may serve as the basis for future funding. The Committee remarks that one way to put societal relevance even higher on the agenda, would be to make it a criterion for hiring or promotion.

All five Centers have identified areas in which they provide service or input for a large variety of players (media, politics, administration, health care, education, churches and religious communities, etc.). The Committee is impressed with the fact that PTR is not just communicating its results to society, but is engaging with different audiences in different manners, both locally and nationally.

2.2.3 Viability

On the basis of a SWOT-analysis, PTR identifies several points of improvement. First and foremost, PTR wishes to strategically approach its earning capacity. Although PTR sees that the strong competition for the second and third flow of funding will continue to be a problem in years to come, it sees opportunities for some Centers to address the themes and challenges identified by research agendas. The recently established policy of structural societal collaboration can according to PTR pave the way for building the large consortia required for funding acquisition. As explained above (see 2.2.1) PTR has furthermore deployed several strategies that encourage and support its researchers to apply for larger grants, such as the allocation of first flow money to fund five PhD candidates, and the teaching free semester to write grant applications.

Throughout the site visit, the Committee observed a clear emphasis on acquiring grants. This strategy seems to be paying off, as PTR has seen increased success in acquiring grants in the 2019 calls. PTR argues that earning capacity in years to come may further improve due to the fact that that several new developments, e.g., in the field of technological innovation, raise ethical issues for which expertise of PTR researchers is needed.

The Committee explored how PTR's organizational structure impacts its viability. Part of the Committee's observations on this issue can be found in section 2.2.1.2. It became clear that, generally speaking, the current structure seems to be working very well, but performance of, and collaboration between and within Centers, varies considerably. The Committee also noted that the current collaborations in some of the Centers rely heavily on personal links. This raises the question whether these fruitful collaborations will continue when key players retire or leave the Institute for other reasons. The Committee learned that although there is some flexibility in hiring, new permanent staff members are mainly recruited based on teaching needs, leaving limited room for PTR to strategically hire staff that may build bridges. Strategies that PTR does put forward to address this issue include identifying crosscutting themes, allocating PhD positions paid by the faculty for projects with shared supervision, and organizing increasing lunch seminars.

During the site visit, the Committee explored PTR's vision. On the question where the Institute would like to be in ten years' time, PTR responded that the fields its researchers work in evolve too quickly for the Institute to develop a vision with that time span. PTR's main strategy is to be versatile in order to quickly react to changing funding schemes and be available for potential collaborations.

Finally, the Committee also explored PTR's societal relevance and impact in view of its viability. The Committee's observations are described above (see 2.2.2).

Assessment of 'viability' by the Committee

The Committee comes to the conclusion that PTR is very well equipped for the future. The sound quality of its research and the outstanding contribution to society form a solid basis to further develop from. PTR's coordination of Radboud Reflects, a high-impact channel that caters to the identity of the university, bodes well on its viability. The Institute's structure seems to be robust and is offering an appropriate balance between bottom-up initiatives and top-down steering. PTR leadership is doing a good job in cultivating a climate of collegiality and creativity, and has a financial incentive strategy to support the implementation of its strategic goals. The Committee appreciates that the decision was made to invest in support staff as the resulting alleviation of workload has a positive impact on viability.

The Committee finds that PTR's pragmatism has been very useful in building the current structure. Nevertheless, the differences in performance between the Centers, the variation in collaboration in and between the Centers, and the fact that collaborations sometimes depend on individual affinities are issues that require follow-up in view of the Institute's viability. In

order to let PTR's structure and collaborations further evolve, PTR should develop a fundamental vision on its future research agenda and themes. This will not only make the Institute less susceptible for external developments, but will allow it to proactively create opportunities, rather than wait and be responsive to outside evolutions. The Committee is of the opinion that also regarding other policy issues, such as publications and human resources, there is room for PTR to be more forward-thinking.

One important element PTR has developed an active strategy in, is grant acquisition. The recent acquisition of several important grants shows this strategy is paying off, which according to the Committee reflects in a positive way on the Institute's viability. Nevertheless, the Committee was also struck by the emphasis put on grant applications. Recognizing the necessity of earning grants for financial viability, the Committee wishes to stress that the dynamics of scholarship is in publications. High-quality publications remain a necessity in order for grant applications to be awarded. Moreover, advanced-career scholars have less opportunities to apply for these big grant schemes. Considering PTR staff's age distribution (see 2.2.1.3), this implies grant acquisition falls on the back of the younger generation. In conclusion, the Committee recommends that PTR carefully monitors whether the current emphasis on grant acquisition does not lead to any undesired consequences.

2.3 PhD programmes, training and supervision

The self-evaluation report explains that all PhD projects have to match the profile of one of the themes of the research Centers. This applies for both PhD candidates that are part of research grant-funded projects and non-funded external PhD candidates. In 2018 there were 14 internal and 116 external PhD candidates. PTR explains that the number of external PhD students has dropped from 144 in 2014 to 116 in 2018. During the site visit, the Committee learned that the decline is a consequence of improved monitoring, which has allowed PTR to identify inactive candidates.

The Graduate School for the Humanities (GSH) is the meeting place for all PhD candidates of the Faculty of Arts and of the PTR Faculty. The Committee learned from the self-evaluation report that GSH invests in improving supervision. A 'Code of Supervision' has been drawn up, and there is an annual 'supervision day'. On admission to GSH, each candidate must have at least two supervisors - a promoter and a co-supervisor, to ensure that the 'four eyes' principle is implemented.

GSH also monitors the progress of PhD projects and the wellbeing of PhD candidates. At 14 months, a go-no go assessment takes place; if positive the contract is extended. Progress is monitored every twelve months based on the Training and Supervision Plan handed in by

PhD candidates at the start of their project, and on a progress report they hand in before every meeting. The Committee learned that during this meeting, PTR's research director goes in detail through the PhD student's planning. The quality and amount of supervision is also an important topic in every assessment. The Committee was pleased to learn that all new external PhD candidates have been monitored according to the GSH protocol since June 2017. The system has recently been extended to all external PhD candidates.

Table 6 in Appendix 3 shows the actual research time of PhD students, including contract extensions. The self-evaluation report mentions that since GSH monitoring started in 2012, efficiency has improved. The Committee observed that the number of PhDs who finish their trajectory has indeed improved. Nevertheless, the time to completion remains long. The Committee also learned that one of the reasons for PhD students needing a considerable timespan, is that it takes up to six months to proceed from submission of the thesis to defense.

An important part of the PhD process consists of additional training. Two mandatory GSH courses are scientific integrity and research data management. During the site visit the Committee learned from the students that they appreciate the freedom they get in choosing the courses that best suit their needs. In addition to the required courses, they choose from courses at the university level (e.g. methodology courses), summer and winter schools, and the courses offered at the national research schools. The Committee learned that the doctoral officer of the GSH keeps track of the activities PhD students do. All PhD candidates also participate in a writing support group in which they help each other in the process of researching and writing a thesis.

The GSH has an alumni policy. At the annual alumni event, alumni discuss their career paths both in- and outside academia. PTR keeps track of its alumni. Also, career planning is an important topic at the assessment meetings from 24 months onwards. The exit interviews show that most PhDs join the labour market after graduation, sometimes as self-employed, in some cases in non-academic sectors, but mostly as university lecturers or researchers.

The Committee explored during the site visit whether PhD students feel embedded at PTR. PhD students explained that, both on the level of research content and on the personal and informal level, they have opportunities to share their questions and findings with other researchers, and receive support when needed. The Committee learned that the PTR PhD students have a designated contact person within GSH.

Assessment of 'PhD education' by the Committee

The Committee comes to the conclusion that PTR has a vibrant, well-designed PhD programme. The GSH has introduced best practices that offer PhD candidates a safe research environment, in which the quality of supervision is monitored, and in which the candidates are taught skills necessary to pursue a career both inside and outside of academia. The Committee is pleased that PhD students feel embedded in PTR's research environment. It found that students are offered a broad range of both disciplinary and general courses, which are of good quality. The Committee found that the job placement of PTR's PhD students is strong and that adequate steps are taken to guide students in the process of finding a job after the PhD be it inside or outside academia.

The Committee finds that PTR has significantly improved its PhD trajectory over the review period. The procedures for admission are solid and the Committee values that all PhD students, also the external ones, are monitored. That students have to draw up a Training and Supervision Plan facilitates a well-structured planning and enables the necessary monitoring. The Committee highly appreciates that the Institute director or GSH coordinator has a yearly meeting with all PhD students to discuss their planning and the quality of supervision. Nevertheless, the Committee also feels that more steps could be taken to further improve time to completion. The Committee urges GSH to continue to look for elements in the process that can be improved so that the time to completion is gradually shortened. The current monitoring system should be further fine-tuned, so that any problems causing a delay are tracked as soon as possible.

With regard to external PhD candidates, the Committee welcomes that the regulations for internal PhD candidates are now also being set in place for this group. Yet, the Committee sees ample room for improvement in being stricter in the follow-up of external PhD students. It suggests considering a maximum duration of external PhD trajectories, such as six years. This would prevent both external PhD students and their supervisors from getting stuck in a fruitless cooperation.

2.4 Policy on research integrity

In its self-evaluation report, PTR explains that it follows university policy concerning research integrity, ethics and research data management. Regarding data management, this policy includes that by 2020, all data will be stored in a safe manner according to the FAIR principles, whereby the principles of 'findable' and 'accessible' have priority; the use of data by others is a long-term process. In order to be aligned with this policy, the PTR research Institute formulated a policy with regard to research data management (RDM), appointed a

data steward, organized a staff meeting on RDM, and organized an instruction meeting for PhDs in CRCS, the Center most involved in empirical research. All PhDs are required to take a course on RDM and academic integrity; this course will also be available online for external PhDs.

Scientific integrity is an integral part of the research culture of each Center and of the faculty as a whole. The 2018 'The Netherlands Code of Conduct for Scientific Practice' replaces a previous version of the code. The GSH Scientific Integrity course is obligatory for all PhD students. During the site visit, PhD students explained these courses had helped them to reflect critically on their positions as academic researchers. With regard to dissertations, the Committee learned that all manuscripts will be checked for plagiarism in the near future.

Radboud University has a central Committee for scientific integrity that deals with complaints based on 'The Netherlands Code of Conduct for Scientific Practice' and the ALLEA European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. It also has appointed confidential advisors for academic integrity at central (university) and local (faculty) level. At local level, the adviser is regularly consulted - about three times every year on matters like, e.g., plagiarism, confidentiality of research data and authorship. No measures or integrity issues have been reported since the adviser started on July 1, 2015.

PTR shares the Ethics Assessment Committee for the Humanities (EACH) with the Faculty of Arts. EACH assesses the ethics of the faculties' research in which humans are directly or indirectly involved. EACH has a protocol containing the standards for all criteria; the quality of the information procedure and burden for the test subjects are the main criteria. Assessing research projects involving humans requires a full (and not an abridged) procedure; this applies to a limited part of the faculty's research. The Committee learned from the PhD students that those who have to consider ethical issues in the set-up of their research, receive the necessary guidance.

Assessment of 'academic integrity' by the Committee

The Committee is of the opinion that the PTR has satisfactorily effectuated policies and protocols to ensure data safety and research integrity, with an emphasis on data safety in which human beings are involved. It has appointed various personnel as confidential advisors, tries to pressure its research staff to take responsibility in these matters, and offers PhD candidates obligatory trainings. The Committee would only like to remark that, in this digital age, it is strange that any policy to scan PhD theses on possible plagiarism has until now not

been put into place. Such a policy, according to the assessment report to be effectuated “in the near future”, seems long overdue.

2.5 Policy on Diversity

PTR follows the general Radboud University policies as an equal opportunities employer. The goal is to ensure that the Institute’s staff reflects the diversity of the international research field. PTR strives to create an atmosphere in which people from different cultural, socio-economic, religious, and political backgrounds can express themselves and work together. In 2018 it organized a workshop on ‘the Discomfort of Diversity’ to increase awareness about diversity. The plan is to repeat this workshop. Recently, a training course on ‘Recognizing Biases’ was designed for members of appointment committees. It will be offered on a regular base in the future.

Table 8 in Appendix 3 shows that in 2018 the permanent academic staff included 27% women and 73% men. PTR also has a balance of 28% (5.8 fte) female and 72% (15.2 fte) male at a professorial level. The temporary staff (PhDs and Postdocs) is more diverse, with a gender ratio of 42/58% respectively. The long-term aim is to have an overall 50/50% balance. Importantly, the Institute management clarified that of the ten chairs, 50% are women. Importantly, PTR’s research director is also female.

Table 9 in Appendix 3 shows the cultural diversity of PTR staff. 6% of its permanent staff is from outside Europe. Of its regular PhD candidates and postdocs, 77% have Dutch origins, 16% are from other European countries, and 7% from non-European countries. Of its external PhD candidates, 47% have Dutch origins, 15% are from other European countries, and 38% from areas outside Europe (Africa 21%, Asia 12%, North & South America 5%). PTR notes that diversity and gender balance are important in its recruitment policies. The Institute advertises internationally, vacancies are spread among networks of female academics, and gender balance is an important concern when composing selection committees.

Assessment of ‘diversity’ by the Committee

The Committee comes to the conclusion that PTR is aware of its gender imbalance, but that progress has been made in addressing the imbalance. The Committee is pleased to see that although at the professorial level the large majority is still male, half of the chairs and the Institute director is female.

The Committee applauds that PTR wants to create an environment that welcomes scholars from different backgrounds and welcomes the initiatives it has taken to address bias. It

welcomes that in particular its PhD population reflects a growing cultural diversity. Nevertheless, Committee would welcome more initiatives geared at attracting international staff. The Committee finds that there is clear room for improvement in attracting PhD students and staff from non-Dutch or minority backgrounds. The Committee urges PTR, the Faculty and Radboud University to provide incentives in order to increase staff diversity in nationality and minority status.

3 Recommendations

In this section the Committee lists its specific recommendations for PTR's future. These recommendations should be read against the background of the Committee's assessment of PTR in section 2.

3.1 The quality of the Research Institute

The Committee advises PTR to

1. continually reflect on its organizational structure. The Committee suggests to further support the coherence and collaboration within and between the five Centers. Also, more attention should be paid across the Centers to disciplinary coherence and collaboration. The possibility of a redefinition of the Centers at the occasion of the retirement of its main staff members should be kept in mind;
2. be more proactive in formulating its future strategy to cope with important challenges. This includes developing a fundamental vision on its future research agenda and themes. Also, a clear and deliberate publication strategy should be developed;
3. continue the current financial incentive strategy, yet to also monitor carefully whether the current emphasis on grant acquisition does not have any undesired consequences;
4. make the criteria for promotion in the career track more transparent;
5. make societal relevance a criterion for hiring and promotion;
6. think about additional incentive mechanisms such as diversification of research time according to performance of researchers;

3.2 The Institute's PhD programme

The Committee advises PTR to

1. implement strict deadlines regarding the completion of PhD theses, both for internal and external PhD students;
2. continue to look for elements in the PhD process that can be improved so that the time to completion is gradually shortened;
3. further fine-tune the current monitoring system so that any problems causing a delay are tracked as soon as possible.

3.3 The Institute's policy on research integrity

The Committee advises PTR to

1. loose no further time to implement the announced measure to scan all PhD theses on possible plagiarism;

2. expand the scope of policies beyond the regular courses offered to PhD students, for instance by inviting every year a prominent guest speaker on the subject, so that the issue becomes part of the conversation among staff.

3.4 The Institute's diversity policy

The Committee advises PTR to

1. continue working towards a more balanced gender distribution;
2. develop more initiatives geared at attracting international staff.

4 Assessments per programme

4.1 Center for the History of Philosophy and Science (CHPS)

Coordinator: prof. dr. P. Bakker

Tenured staff in 2018: 4.18 FTE research capacity

Research Quality

CHPS functions as an international hub bringing historians of both philosophy and science together in order to investigate the discipline of natural philosophy. It coincides with PTR's chair of the History of Philosophy. It is a small, but excellent Center, that builds on a strong tradition, and is very well-connected internationally. According to the Committee, its combination of History of Science with History of Philosophy makes perfect sense, especially in relation to its focus on late medieval and early modern thought, as the separation between science and philosophy was of a later date. The way in which the members of the Center concentrate on notions of place and time, matter and motion, chance and necessity, and mind and cognition has added considerably to the coherence of its output, which is essentially concerned with the (dis)continuities between the way in which medieval and early modern European philosophers and scientists thought about nature.

The Center's academic output over the review period is very impressive: 30 articles in peer reviewed journals, 69 book chapters (including conference papers), 12 edited volumes, 10 books and 3 special issues. 8 PhDs were awarded. The Center's output reflects a fine balance between text editions, papers and monographs, and edited volumes. The many titles produced jointly by members of the same Center appear to indicate a strong tendency towards internal cooperation, which reflects positively on the management of CHPS.

During the period under review the Center has moreover received four separate NWO projects, and its members serve on the boards of the journal *Early Science and Medicine* and of the book series *Medieval and Early Modern Philosophy and Science*. It hosted 16 international conferences. Palmerino won the 2016 *Leibniz Society Essay Competition*.

Now that several long running projects have been completed, a challenge will be to explore new grounds. The recent expansion of CHPS in the directions of Antiquity and the modern age will probably add to its wider appeal as will the new focus on traditions besides Aristotelianism. The main challenge facing CHPS in the future will be to raise funds with NWO and the ERC, but this holds true for all academic research centers in the Netherlands.

Societal relevance

In view of the predominantly academic nature of their professional expertise and the research involved, the members of CHPS have been remarkably active in their engagement with a wider audience. Bakker and Leijenhorst play a crucial part in Radboud Reflects and Thijssen has published a popular book on happiness, successfully addressing a large audience. Palmerino's 2015 Dijksterhuis lecture also added to the public profile of the Center. The Center's output fully matches the aims put forward by PTR in its self-evaluation.

Viability

One of the threats identified by CHPS in it self-evaluation concerns "the fact that the study of the history of philosophy is losing its appeal in various parts of the world, including the Netherlands." On the one hand, the Committee feels this may indeed hold true for the current student population. In particular the linguistic demands made by professional research in the history of philosophy has started to present a problem. As a consequence, an increasing number of PhD students in the history of philosophy is now recruited from abroad. On the other hand, early modern scholarship in particular is blossoming across the globe, so there appears to be every opportunity to consolidate and expand on the Center's present position.

The Center has recently expanded is aims. In the future it will also cover both Antiquity and the modern age and in order to achieve this ambition, it has embarked on several new collaborations, involving for instance the Dutch national Research School in Classical Studies (OIKOS). With Leuven a new NWO/FWO research program has been launched on the diffusion of Cartesianism in the Low Countries during the early Enlightenment.

In view of the relatively small number of researchers involved, the decision to aim beyond the Center's traditional field of expertise will clearly necessitate the acquisition of additional funds, preferably with NWO or the ERC. The mounting pressure on both institutions, however, renders any prediction about the Center's ability to raise subsidies hazardous. In view of the Center's past performance and the competent way in which it has always been directed, there is every reason for confidence.

Recommendations for the programme

The Committee advises CHPS to

- consider the possibility of drawing up a long-term, visionary document, outlining where it wants to be in ten years' time, and identifying the specific means enabling it to reach that goal;

- consider the challenge of also reaching out beyond the community of mediaevalists and early modernists, now that the Center is broadening its scope. More general top journals should now be targeted, such as the *Journal of the History of Philosophy* and the *Journal for the History of Ideas*.

4.2 Center for Contemporary European Philosophy (CCEP)

Coordinator: prof. dr. G.-J. van der Heiden
Tenured staff in 2018: 5.96 FTE research capacity

Research Quality

The CCEP is the Netherlands' main center for research in contemporary continental philosophy. It coincides with the chairs of Ethics and Political Philosophy and of Fundamental Philosophy of the Faculty of PTR. The Committee notes that it is the only place in the Netherlands where psychoanalysis is still studied in an academic context. Certainly psychoanalysis is an important source of inspiration for contemporary continental philosophy. Nevertheless, this emphasis is courageous in a time when Freud and his legacy have fallen into discredit among large groups of social scientists and philosophers. The Center hosts specialists in phenomenology, in fundamental philosophy, in political philosophy and in ethics. Some of them are absolutely excellent, also on the international forum. The thorough investigation of the concept of testimony, for example, is an original contribution to contemporary continental philosophy.

Post-Kantian philosophy is the common point of reference for the members of the Center. Joint research and publications on issues like gender, democracy and the influence of digitalization and datafication on personal and public life show that this works. However, to some extent the coherence of the Center remains problematic. The Committee is far from sure that there is much interaction between the specialists of fundamental philosophy at one hand, the political philosophers and ethicists at the other hand, as is evidenced by the absence of common research projects. According to the SWOT analysis the Center is aware of the danger that new initiatives could lead to a fragmentation of its research. As ethicists seem to move away from fundamental ethics in the direction of applied ethics, this danger looms even larger.

The number of publications by members of the Center in the past five years is impressive: 81 articles and 116 book chapters in peer reviewed journals and books, 18 edited volumes, 14 books and 8 special issues of journals. This has been realized by a staff with 5.96 FTE research capacity. In judging the publication record of the Center, one should be aware that in the field of contemporary continental philosophy books and book chapters are more important than in other subdisciplines of philosophy. Hence the publication of an excellent scholarly English translation and edition of Freud's *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* does perhaps not enter neatly into the standard categories of academic publications, but is nevertheless an outstanding result of a long standing research tradition at the Faculty. Also

the field of continental philosophy is rather differentiated and excellent publications stemming from this inspiration are not always welcome in journals that are acknowledged as top within the dominant Anglo-Saxon tradition.

However, even taking into consideration the peculiarities of the general pattern of publication within the field, the quality of these publications varies greatly. There seems to be no general publication strategy aiming at excellence at the Center. Also, although there have been some successes in attracting external funding, especially from NWO, probably more could have been expected in a field that attracts many very good students in philosophy. The recently awarded ERC-starting grant permits hope for more. Also, the international visibility of research by scholars from CCEP on Nietzsche, on Saint Paul, on psychoanalysis and on the ethics of health care is well assured.

Societal relevance

Societal relevance of the research conducted in the Center is excellent. The Committee mentions the research on democracy and modernization of society, especially the Democratic Laboratory. The ethicists in the Center offer service not just to the general public, but also to particular categories of professionals and to policy makers. Becker is well known for his seminars about integrity, mainly destined to public officials. Together with Sharon he studies the problems that digitalisation raises for privacy and in the field of health care. Wils has done important work on the ethics of health care and in particular on the formulation of the oath for physicians. Members of the Center are quite active in *Radboud Reflects*, a series of programmes targeted towards a larger public.

Viability

New initiatives taken by members of the Center are very promising. There is for example the research on digitalisation and datafication, that is connected to the interfaculty Hub on Security, Privacy and Data Governance, the new research line on race and religion funded with NWO-money and the newly started research on protest movements and direct democracy developed in the field of political philosophy. It is somewhat worrying that future research depends so heavily on funding opportunities by external instances. The danger is that this leads to a focus on fashionable subjects to the expense of the fundamental tradition that used to be the hallmark of Nijmegen philosophy. In this sense, the Committee is of the opinion that the Center should not neglect fundamental issues in favor of applied ethics. Applied ethics is all the more interesting as it is connected to fundamental ethics and philosophy. The Committee trusts that the tradition of virtue ethics, so typical of Nijmegen ethics, will survive in the work of Wils and Becker. Also funding has been raised for a new Nietzsche project, that would continue the research done by the group of Van Tongeren. However a clear and

offensive research programme that brings together researchers of fundamental ethics, political philosophy and applied ethics is highly desirable, also in view of the potential fragmentation of research that results from new initiatives. The fact that Nijmegen sticks to the continental tradition in philosophy should not be regarded as a weakness, but rather as a strength of the Faculty. Whether one should continue research within the psychoanalytic tradition in the future is less certain. On this point the challenge will be to integrate within one research programme philosophical anthropology, phenomenology and – beyond the boundaries of the Centers - philosophy of mind.

Recommendations for the programme

The Committee advises CCEP to

- continue its work on its traditional strongholds, such as fundamental ethics;
- consider the possibility of drawing up a long-term, visionary document, outlining where it wants to be in ten years' time, and identifying the specific means enabling it to reach that goal. This will entail formulating a research strategy that combines all the Center's research topics in order to avoid (further) fragmentation of research;
- devise a more ambitious publication strategy, aiming more explicitly at top publications.

4.3. Center for Cognition, Culture and Language (CCCL)

Coordinator: dr. L. de Bruin

Tenured staff in 2018: 7.86 FTE research capacity

Research Quality

The CCCL investigates fundamental as well as applied questions at the intersection of cognition, culture and language. It coincides with the chairs of Philosophy of Mind and Language and of Textual Sources of Judaism and Christianity of the Faculty of PTR. At first sight, the combination of the chairs of Philosophy of Mind and Language and that of Textual Sources of Judaism and Christianity in a common Center looks arbitrary. However, during the site visit, the presentation of the Center and its responses to questions convinced the Committee that this unusual combination is of great value for both of the groups. There appears to be mutual exchange of ideas as well as a good deal of mutual inspiration. What the two chairs ultimately have in common - in addition to their similarly high ambitions and output strategies - is a joint interest in the intersection of mind, language, cognition, and the influence of socio-historical factors on these. Thus, the current combination of these two chairs in the same Center seems to be an essential factor in the research performance of the individual chairs and has led to fruitful and successful interdisciplinary research. However, the Committee also got the impression that the connection between these two chairs is to a large extent due to lucky coincidences; researchers from different backgrounds that happen to share certain interests. This issue will need to be addressed in view of future viability of the Center (see below).

The Center explicitly aims at research excellence and high-quality output, which is evident from the performance of the Center in the reporting period. The Center produces a solid amount of publications in high impact journals or with high impact book publishers (e.g. OUP, Routledge, Springer, etc.). In detail, the Center published 98 articles in peer reviewed journals, the majority in good or excellent places, 67 book chapters, 7 edited volumes, 5 books and 7 special issues. For a group with 7-8 research fte, this is a very good output, especially given the high quality of the places in which this output is published.

The international visibility of both groups in the Center seems high and the success with national and international grants shows that this is also recognized by funding organizations. The visibility of the group is also recognized through membership in NWO, ERC and KNAW panels and commissions.

Societal relevance

For groups that work in the more 'esoteric' areas of the humanities, such as theoretical philosophy or biblical studies, developing a societal impact strategy is often a challenge. CCCL has found ways to meet that challenge in an exemplary way. It has identified three different target audiences for its societal impact strategy: students and teachers of secondary and tertiary education, professionals in areas that can apply the research results of CCCL and the wider, general public. With respect to all three groups, CCCL is doing an outstanding job.

Societal impact is not about just trying to tell interested audiences something about one's research for the sake of having done 'outreach'; ideally there should be a plan detailing why these research results should be communicated to this or that specific target audience. The Committee got the impression that CCCL has very clear ideas about these issues which should help for possible future NWA grant applications and with finding international collaboration partners for the many very interdisciplinary research topics that CCCL is pursuing.

Viability

In its SWOT analysis the Center mentions as a weakness that there is little structural collaboration between the different groups. During the site visit it also became clear that changing this is not currently seen as a priority. The Committee agrees that the current form of collaboration based on mutual inspiration and exchange of ideas in research seminar is working well and that it is unclear how any other structure could 'force' more intense collaboration. After all, both groups, to a substantial extent, do research in areas that simply falls outside the intersection of interests that is defined by mind, cognition and social-cultural influence. This is illustrated by the fact that most defended dissertations during the reporting period do not seem to fall neatly into this intersection.

Nevertheless, this situation leads according to the Committee to two problems in the longer run. First, as identified by the SWOT analysis, it is a weakness of CCCL that its visibility as a whole does not match the visibility of some of the other Centers despite its high-quality output. This certainly also has to do with the fact that the combination of disciplines looks arbitrary for outsiders, but is also due to the fact that substantial parts of the Center's research and valorisation activities are not aligned with the Center's research profile. The Committee agrees that the new initiatives that are planned, such as extending the collaboration with the Donders Institute, the new interdisciplinary BA programme, and NWO application in the track 'Mental health, prevention and treatment', will improve the Center's visibility. However, they seem to be primarily connected to the research done in Philosophy of Mind.

Secondly, since the current collaboration in the Center is mainly based on the personal research interests of some of the researchers, the Center's profile and existing collaborations are contingent upon current personnel and may cease to exist in case of personnel changes. The Committee wonders in this respect how the Center will guarantee the preservation of its profile when prof. van Wolde retires.

Recommendations for the Center

The Committee advises CCCL to

- continue the new initiatives mentioned in the self-report. It seems to the Committee that the Center is producing excellent work and that its current structure is in part responsible for this success;

- consider the possibility of drawing up a long-term, visionary document, outlining where it wants to be in ten years' time, and identifying the specific means enabling it to reach that goal.

- in the long run, not to treat the current Center structure to be set in stone. Changes in personnel might make it necessary to reconsider whether the current combination of chairs in the Center should be kept or whether new alliances should be sought.

4.4. Center for Catholic Studies (CCS)

Coordinator: dr. E. Hense

Tenured staff in 2018: 2.9 FTE research capacity

Research Quality

CCS combines the two disciplines of Systematic religious studies and History of Christianity. With two chairs and four assistant professors CCS is the smallest of the five centers within PTR. Both the self-report and the interview with members of the Center revealed that after the rearrangement of chairs and disciplines in the Institute some years ago, the Center has yet to find its identity and viable forms of fruitful cooperation toward common research activities.

The Center identifies 'Catholicity' as the primary research interest of its members, focusing on the self-articulation of the Catholic tradition, but also on the challenges for this tradition within the growing secularization in Europe and in the Netherlands in particular. Despite the significance of Radboud University as a traditionally Catholic institution, the Center would be well advised to allude in its self-description not only to the denominational identity of Roman catholicity ('Catholic'), but also to foster a broader and more ecumenical understanding of catholicity present also in other churches, denominations and theological traditions ('catholic'). Additionally, a wider co-operation with other theological disciplines, for example NT exegesis and patristics, would make the focus of the Center more coherent and contribute to its visibility and impact.

Despite changes in staff and composition, the Center has made big efforts to create a coherent and plausible research agenda and to be a resource for society. The research output in the review period has been very good. With 13 books and 12 edited volumes, along with 36 articles in peer reviewed journals and 77 book chapters, the output of CCS matches the numbers of publications in other, also bigger Centers of the Institute. Nevertheless, the overall quality of output is mixed. Some publications gained international recognition, others received less attention. The monographs and edited volumes address, on the one hand, models of Catholic identity in the past, on the other hand, they follow the processes of the transformation of Catholicism in the 20th century. Occasionally, the research on these topics was not only presented by monographs or collected volumes, but also well placed in known peer reviewed journals. In this effort, the systematic topics were generally more successful than the subjects related to church history.

Individual projects speak to international research communities (e.g. Cusanus studies; Centers for spirituality; Carmelite studies) and aim at greater theological discourses ('public

theology'; Vatican II; 'Catholic' 20th century), situating themselves within larger international research networks. The researchers deserve a lot of credit for contributing in this way to the visibility of the Center and the Institute. The importance and visibility of the Center could nevertheless be increased by concentrating existing research capacity on the core themes of the Center, by attracting more outside funded research projects and by better including MA and PhD students into the research agenda of the Center.

From 2013 to 2018, the Center awarded 19 dissertations, a remarkable achievement considering the small scale of the Center. However, only occasionally did the dissertation topics reflect the research foci of the Center. In order to develop a flourishing research area, a constant flow of talented PhD students seems of highest importance. The Committee is aware that especially the historical and biblical disciplines, with their high demands on linguistic and professional skills, suffer generally from a shortage of talented doctoral students nationwide. The Center may therefore look even more urgently for new ways and methods to make the field attractive. More efforts could also be made to recruit strong international doctoral candidates.

Societal relevance

Members of the Center generated important societal impact in various venues, covering a diversity of fields. Surprisingly, there has been little cooperation with local ecclesial institutions, be it in pastoral training or permanent formation for the laity. Due to the partnership with the Titus Brandsma Instituut (TBI), however, the Center fruitfully interacts with the programme of this Institute, which specializes in the study and promotion of Christian spirituality.

The Center certainly has the potential to play a significant role both within PTR and in the University, as the mission statement in the self-report correctly suggests. Oddly, however, the Committee observed during the site visit that the Center's representatives had trouble to identify apt fields and occasions to cater expertise to society. Also, the suggestion of the Committee to engage in more cooperation with other Centers in PTR met with some reluctance. In order to stand up to the claims and the vision expressed in the self-evaluation report, the Center may show more self-confidence and take a leading role in selected discourses.

Viability

In order to make the Catholic tradition accessible to a post-secular society, the Center's research topics should be chosen more deliberately. For example, compared to the main foci of the Center, research on medieval Catharism and heretical movements seem less connected with the Center's core profile. Despite the ambition of the Center "to be at the forefront of comparable centers", the research profile 'Catholic studies' needs to be shaped yet, also by developing a matching publication strategy. The focus on the transformation of Catholic theology in the 20th century, combined with the goals of the so-called resourcement movement in theology, proves to be a promising and important path. Also, efforts to retrieve the spiritual catholic tradition both historically and systematically should be continued and intensified. Given the small number of researchers, is it even more important to join forces within the Center and to seek cooperation from outside. While, for instance, the Center for Religion in Contemporary Society is also researching contemporary spiritualities, by collecting empirical data, CCS could contribute to analyzing this data theologically or adding hermeneutical criteria and critique.

In order to meet its targets, the Center should continuously look for first rate publications in peer reviewed journals and with internationally known publishers. Furthermore, it should look more vigorously for outside funding, in particular for NWO and EU grants or comparable fellowships.

The comparably young staff of the Center allows to follow a long-term research and publication strategy. Junior faculty (Furnal) should be encouraged to play an important role in this process.

Recommendations for the Center

The Committee advises CCS to

- consider the possibility of drawing up a long-term, visionary document, outlining where it wants to be in ten years' time, and identifying the specific means enabling it to reach that goal;

- engage more actively in forms of co-operation, since the historical and systematical expertise of the research staff has a lot to offer for other Centers within the Institute and beyond. This may not only broaden the impact of the Center, but also attract more interest for the genuine research topics defined within the Center. This would

also entail an openness for new methodologies, new discourses and adjustment of past research topics;

- join forces with outside institutions, such as the Titus Brandsma Instituut (TBI), which possesses a clear profile, and which reaches a wide specific audience. Not only could such co-operations increase the societal impact of the Center, but also could they generate new research on a larger scale;

- intensify the disciplinary and methodological cooperation among systematic and historical approaches. Making historical phenomena or historical texts relevant for contemporary discourses has been a long characteristic of theological method and teaching. What is the significance of ‘tradition’ in contemporary, post-modern theological discourses, and what is the significance of (church) history for the identity of the faith communities and for theological reflection? To strengthen such discourses on the transformation of tradition and identity, the Center could aspire to become a platform for research in historical theology within PTR, opening itself especially to scholarship in patristics and NT exegesis;

- look more vigorously for outside funding. Successful applications in other Centers could provide helpful feedback during the application process. Toward this end, the Center could also seek substantial support from and cooperation with partner institutes within and outside Radboud;

- devise a more ambitious publication strategy, aiming more explicitly at top publications.

4.5. Center for Religion and Contemporary Society (CRCS)

Coordinator: prof. dr. C. Sterkens

Tenured staff in 2018: 11.23 FTE research capacity

Research Quality

The Center for Religion and Contemporary Society is the largest of PTR´s five centers. CRCS aims to develop empirically informed theories on contemporary religion and spirituality, while taking into account the historical and scriptural origins of present-day religion. CRCS studies religion and spirituality with regard to three themes: social cohesion and conflict, contingency and meaning, and death and remembrance. All these themes are highly relevant for theology and religious studies. Empirical methodologies unite the CRCS and they have focused on the good quality usage and training of a wide variety of empirical methods. Three chairs participate in CRCS: Empirical and Practical Religious Studies, Comparative Religious Studies, and Islam Studies. In addition to the three chairs, CRCS has five full professors and several other senior scholars. Three of CRCS members are also involved in the administration of the PTR. This means that three active members of the CRCS contribute part of their working time for the benefit of the whole faculty.

CRCS actively co-operates with other Centers inside the PTR but also looks for opportunities for interfaculty research. International collaboration of CRCS is active; they are for example working with the Max Planck Institute. CRCS members are actively involved in central international associations; many of them also serve as editors of top journals in their field.

The Center's academic output over the review period is very impressive: 143 articles in peer reviewed journals, 145 book chapters, 20 edited volumes, 18 books and 7 special issues. 31 PhDs were awarded. The Committee concludes that CRCS has created a spirit of striving for excellence and even if not all publications appear with top publishers, the overall quality is very good. The top five publications presented in the self-evaluation report represent the broad research profile of CRCS. In addition, these publications show several examples of joint authorship between junior and senior scholars in the Center. The Center has a clear publication strategy including the circulation of a list of high impact journals and good publishers for monographs. CRCS also edits thematic issues. In addition, the Center aims to contribute to publications that serve a wider public. Both junior and senior scholars contribute equally to more popular publications.

Societal relevance

CRCS' societal impact is very impressive and includes a variety of activities. CRCS has important Catholic partnerships, but it has also established partnerships for example with Moslem organizations. The impact of CRCS appears to be growing as a result of both research and education.

Another interesting contribution to its societal relevance concerns a research project led by assistant professor Tam Ngo, which investigates the use of spiritual and DNA forensics to find and identify war dead in Vietnam and its implication for the country's reconciliation politics. This project aims for a practical outcome and standardization in working packets, allowing for the possibility of application in other societies as well.

Viability

After the assessment period, CRCS has attained new funding including an ERC Advanced Grant, Marie Curie Consortium, NWO Vidi, Hera, and Porticus funding. This indicates that the Center has learned to show their relevance to funders. In a context where the plausibility of religion vanishes, CRCS has managed to show the viability of its research topics.

CRCS seems to share mood of co-operation and energy. Additionally, the Center is well organized under the leadership of Dr. Sterkens. CRCS meets regularly which is very important for such a big unit.

CRCS´s recent recruitments (for example Ngo) shows that retiring staff can be an opportunity and not only a weakness, as was indicated in the Center´s SWOT. The new recruitments show that CRCS is moving outwards and that it considers diversity in its hiring of new staff. The large ERC funding of prof. Murre-van den Berg has additionally strengthened the Center.

Recommendations for the Center

The Committee advises CRCS to

- consider the possibility of drawing up a long-term, visionary document, outlining where it wants to be in ten years' time, and identifying the specific means enabling it to reach that goal;

- align its goals to the fact that it is becoming even larger with the new projects;

- further develop its publication policy. Although its current publication strategy is to be commended, it leaves room for further development, balancing the fine combination of honoring tradition and searching for current issues in contemporary society.

5 Assessment of the Research School NOSTER

Director:	Prof. dr. A.J.A.C.M. Korte, Utrecht University (2009-2016) Prof. dr. H.L. Murre-van den Berg, Radboud University (2017-June 2019) Prof. dr. F.J.S. Wijsen, Radboud University (July 2017-present)

5.1 Description of the Research School

The Netherlands School for Advanced Studies in Theology and Religion (NOSTER) is the primary platform for research and training in the fields of theology and religious studies in the Netherlands and Flanders. Twelve research institutes in these fields have joined forces and provided a national research context and training programme for currently 176 senior researchers, 90 PhD candidates and 30 Research Master students. Its academic mission is to offer a cutting-edge and challenging curriculum in theology and religious studies for junior researchers (Research Master students and PhD candidates) of the participating institutions. The self-evaluation report explains that NOSTER has three major objectives. First of all, it wants to familiarize junior researchers with a range of research forms and methodologies in the field of theology and religious studies. Secondly, the programme provides specific training in the skills and techniques of the disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches in theology and religious studies. Thirdly, NOSTER aims to contribute to the formation of a national academic community in the field of theology and religious studies. Finally, NOSTER stimulates new initiatives and explorations in research and provides a national platform to foster communication between the participating institutes with a view to both short and long-term research collaboration.

Until the end of 2016, NOSTER was hosted at the Faculty of Humanities, Utrecht University. As of 1 January 2017, the Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies of Radboud University (PTR) has functioned as NOSTER's host institution. The NOSTER School Board includes formal representatives from all participating institutions. The Board is responsible for strategic decision-making and annual budgets and report approval. NOSTER has two advisory bodies: the Junior Council consisting of four PhD candidates and, as of 2018, two ReMA students, which plays a key role in the evaluation processes of separate curriculum events and of the curriculum as a whole; and the Executive Board (EB) consisting of eight senior members from the participating institutions and two Junior Council members. NOSTER staff comprises 1.3 FTE in 2013-2016; 1.05 FTE in 2017-2018: a director (0.2 FTE in 2013-2016; 0.15 FTE in

2017-2018), an executive secretary (0.4 FTE), a curriculum coordinator (0.2 FTE) and a secretary (0.5 FTE in 2013-2016; 0.3 FTE in 2017-2018).

5.2 Evaluation of the Research School

In the TOR, the Committee is asked to address six questions in its assessment. The Committee addresses each one of these questions in the text below.

Regarding NOSTER's ambition, the self-assessment clearly reveals that NOSTER is not lacking ambition. The Committee appreciates the mission of NOSTER, and recommends that the research school continues to focus on influencing the national research agenda. The Committee also notes that this high ambition stands in stark contrast with the limited means that NOSTER has at its disposal. In terms of human resources, NOSTER's staff consists of only 1.05 FTE. This makes NOSTER vulnerable and highly dependent upon the cooperation of participating institutes and researchers. The major challenge for NOSTER, then, is related to the question of ownership: do the participating institutes, including the hosting institute, take the mission of NOSTER seriously, and are they willing to support NOSTER more?

The previous assessment (2014 ECOS report) identified three areas of concern: (1) its disciplinary and transdisciplinary positioning (both national and international); (2) its gender policies; (3) its long-term viability, especially with respect to PhD candidate numbers. With regard to the first area, the Committee was pleased to learn that NOSTER has taken several initiatives. It launched thematic seminars as well as Research Collaboration Groups, it attempted (with limited success) to contribute to the *Nationale Wetenschapsagenda,* and it contributed to the protocol for Research Assessment in the Humanities. Also it briefly addressed the KNAW-recommendation to start a Netherlands Academy of Religion, with a national research agenda and a common theme, but this initiative was discontinued. Members of the research school are working on a collaborative grant proposal for the next round of *Zwaartekracht* funding. Finally, NOSTER is in the process of creating an online theology and religious studies portal that actively and collectively showcases the diverse and complicated landscape of the study of religion, with as many cross-references and search options as possible.

With regard to the second issue that was addressed, the gender balance, NOSTER states in its self-evaluation report that it continues to be a cause for concern, with a (considerable) majority of men in higher positions.

Concerning NOSTER's long-term-viability NOSTER mentions in its self-evaluation report that while the total number of PhD candidates increased strongly in the first years of the period

2013-2018, it has decreased in recent years. This decline has had an effect on NOSTER's income, as institutions pay €1k for the whole membership period of a new PhD candidate. NOSTER identifies as a possible cause for the decline the closure of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) Programme 'Religion in Modern Society' (2013-2018), which yielded several PhD candidates. Additionally, the participating institutions have little funding available for full-time PhD candidates. NOSTER concludes that, against this background, the success of NOSTER's PhD programme, is largely dependent on the institutions' successes in acquiring grants in the field that enable them to hire new PhD candidates.

The committee is of the opinion that NOSTER has taken seriously the challenges identified by the ECOS 2014 report. Nevertheless, it seems that NOSTER has so far failed to meet these challenges. In fairness, the committee finds it difficult to pass judgement on NOSTER, in view of its essential dependence of the results achieved by the participating institutions and their researchers. The Committee is fully aware of the largely virtual nature of many joint research schools in the Netherlands, and in view of the limited investment the partners are prepared to make in NOSTER it would not be fair to hold its current staff responsible for the little progress made since 2014.

On the basis of the self-evaluation report and the discussions during the site visit, the Committee comes to the conclusion that the NOSTER curriculum offers a very valuable contribution to PhD education in the field of theology and religious studies. This is reflected in the relatively high number of participants in the various research seminars it offers. It is therefore essential that the quality of these seminars remains high, and it is good to see that the NOSTER staff including the Junior Council go at great lengths to evaluate the seminars that are offered. As such, it seems that NOSTER is sufficiently monitoring the quality of the courses and seminars, and that NOSTER itself has a good overview of possible challenges.

NOSTER noted during the interviews that some seminars don't attract enough students, for example in biblical studies and church history seminars. The Committee recommends that NOSTER tries to find other ways to help the remaining students in these fields to grow as a researcher. For example, church historians could be directed to seminars of e.g. the Huizinga Institute.

The Committee acknowledges that NOSTER's main contribution to the field of research in theology and religious studies presently lies in its bringing together and training of researchers, rather than in drawing up a national agenda. This is especially true for the training of junior researchers; activities aimed towards senior researchers in general seem to

suffer from a lack of funds. Yet, it seems to the Committee that NOSTER has constantly looked for ways to provide added value to the field as a whole.

The Committee regrets that the KNAW suggestion to establish a Netherlands Academy of Religion appears to have been abandoned. In a time where the topic of religion is often no longer assigned to specialized faculties of theology and religious studies, the Committee welcomes NOSTER's commitment to draw up a research agenda nationally. For such an agenda to succeed, the committee believes, NOSTER should be careful not to compete with the various agendas of the particular institutions, but rather seek to support collaborations where possible, and as such strengthen the otherwise fragmentized field of theology and religious studies. The Committee believes that, in order for a national research agenda to succeed, both the hosting organization, and all participating institutes must be enticed to cooperate. Also, the question of ownership is important: do the participating institutes take their involvement in NOSTER seriously?

The Committee concludes that NOSTER has a realistic view of its strengths, weaknesses, threats and opportunities. In terms of recommendations, the Committee would in general suggest that, in the light of the low amount of resources and staff, NOSTER more clearly prioritizes its ambitions. The core functions of NOSTER seem to be the training of junior - and to a lesser extent senior - researchers, and these tasks are highly appreciated.

Furthermore, the Committee welcomes the ambition of NOSTER to draw up a national research agenda. However, after the failure of the NAR, it is obvious that this poses many challenges. The Committee believes that such an ambition is feasible, but only when NOSTER succeeds in addressing the question of ownership: on the one hand, the participating institutes must be enticed to cooperate more structurally in NOSTER; on the other hand, the University Board of the hosting faculty must be approached and engaged in order to understand that the hosting of a Research school is a valuable opportunity for the university to visibly impact the field, and thus that it should offer more support for this challenge.

6 Response of the Institute

The Faculty Board, the Center coordinators and the director of the PTR Research Institute would like to express their gratitude to the evaluation Committee for the careful assessment of our Research Institute and the valuable feedback the Committee has provided in its report. The Committee consisted of five top-researchers from various disciplines and a PhD candidate, together covering a wide range of expertise and experience in research management. In their report the Committee highlights the Institute's strengths and constructively identifies opportunities for improvement.

We are obviously very pleased that the Institute's research quality as well as its viability are assessed as "very good", and its societal relevance as "excellent".

In this response we will focus on the Committee's major recommendations for the Institute as a whole and for the five Research Centers. Most of the recommendations can be implemented without further ado, strengthening the research of the Institute and the Centers. A few of them will require further thought and discussion with the Center coordinators and the chairs within the Centers.

The report contains the recommendation, at the level of the Institute as a whole and at the level of the Centers, to formulate a long-term vision, anticipating opportunities and challenges for the next decade. It also recommends to develop a more ambitious publication strategy. The Committee recognizes that the quality of publications is generally high, but articles do not appear frequently in "truly first-class journals", whereas books do not always appear in "the most prestigious publishing firms". In response to these suggestions the Institute and the Centers will develop a long-term vision and an enhanced publication strategy in the context of the performance agreements which the director of the PTR Research Institute will renew with the chairs and Center coordinators.

At the same time, in keeping with our current strategy, we will also try to remain flexible in order to attain our ability to quickly react to changing research agendas and funding schemes.

We are pleased to note that the Committee assesses PTR's societal impact as outstanding. The recommendation to put societal relevance even higher on the agenda by making it a criterion for hiring or promotion will be implemented.

The Institute is also pleased that the Committee appreciates the way our research is organized, such that bottom-up initiatives are carefully balanced by top-down steering. The encouragement to further support the coherency and collaboration within and between the five Centers will certainly be taken to heart. The Institute will reconsider the composition of some of the Centers in order to enhance their viability. Although grant acquisition will remain crucial for our financial viability, we will carefully monitor whether the current emphasis on grant acquisition does not lead to undesired consequences.

The Committee comes to the conclusion that PTR has a vibrant, well-designed PhD program and that it has significantly improved its PhD trajectory over the assessment period. Nevertheless, the Institute will see to it that the time to completion will be further shortened, in particular with respect to external PhD students. With regard to the monitoring of dissertations for plagiarism, the Institute will urge the university to make adequate arrangements. The theme of scientific integrity will be addressed in the coming years, and the Committee's suggestion to regularly invite speakers to address this theme will be taken to heart.

We are pleased to learn that, according to the Committee, NOSTER offers “a very valuable contribution to PhD education in the field of theology and religious studies” and that NOSTER is “sufficiently monitoring the quality of the courses and seminars”. NOSTER will follow the Committee’s recommendation by more clearly prioritising its ambitions and addressing the question of ownership towards the participating institutions.

In the upcoming years, PTR Research Institute will strive to further strengthen its research quality and societal impact. The constructive report of the Committee will be a valuable tool in achieving this aim.

7 Appendices

Appendix 1: Short Curricula Vitae of the Evaluation Committee members

Wiep van Bunge (**Chair**) took his BA and MA at Utrecht University, was drafted into the army, and next was awarded his PhD at Erasmus University Rotterdam, having submitted a thesis on the seventeenth-century amateur philosopher Johannes Bredenburg (1990). In 2000 he was appointed on the endowed chair of the Dutch Spinoza Society and two years later he was made a full professor. From 2004 to 2012 he served as dean of the Erasmus School of Philosophy. Among his books are *From Stevin to Spinoza* (2001), *Spinoza Past and Present* (2012), and *From Bayle to the Batavian Revolution* (2019). He also (co-)edited several titles, including *Disguised and Overt Spinozism* (1996), Balthasar Bekker's *Die bezauberte Welt* (1997),*The Early Enlightenment in the Dutch Republic* (2003), *The Dictionary of Seventeenth and Eighteenth-Century Dutch Philosophers* (2003), *Pierre Bayle, le philosophe de Rotterdam* (2008), and *The Bloomsbury Companion to Spinoza* (2014). In addition, he was a member of the team directed by Antony McKenna that edited Pierre Bayle's *Correspondance* (1999-2017). He is an elected member of both the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) and the Royal Holland Society of Sciences and Humanities (KHMW).

Daniel Cohnitz (**Member**) holds the chair for theoretical philosophy at Utrecht University. Cohnitz studied philosophy, German literature and language, and history at the Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf. After graduating with an M.A. degree in philosophy and medieval history, he worked at the Institute of Philosophy at Düsseldorf and at the Department of Philosophy of the University of Duisburg-Essen. In 2005 he defended his dissertation on *Thought Experiments in Philosophy* (*Gedankenexperimente in der Philosophie*) at Düsseldorf. From 2006 to 2015 he was professor of theoretical philosophy at the University of Tartu in Estonia. Since January 2016 he is professor of theoretical philosophy in Utrecht and since 2019 head of the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies of Utrecht University.

Thomas Prügl (**Member**) received a licentiate and a doctorate in Catholic Theology from Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, specializing in Church History and medieval theology. In 2001 he was appointed assistant professor and in 2004 promoted to associate professor and Tisch Family Chair of Medieval Theology at the University of Notre Dame (Indiana, USA). In 2005-2006 he served as Acting Director of the Medieval Institute at Notre Dame. In 2008, he was appointed on the chair of Church History at the University of Vienna (Austria). Among his books are *Die Ekklesiologie Heinrich Kalteisens OP in der Auseinandersetzung mit dem Basler Konziliarismus* (1995); *Antonio da Cannara: De potestate pape supra Concilium Generale contra errores Basiliensium. Einleitung, Kommentar und Edition* (1996) and, as co-author, *Handbuch der Bibelhermeneutik. Von Origenes bis zur*

Gegenwart (2016). He co-edited volumes on *Kirchenbild und Spiritualität. Dominikanische Beiträge zur Ekklesiologie und zum kirchlichen Leben im Mittelalter (2007)* and *Bibelstudium und Predigt im Dominikanerorden. Geschichte, Ideal, Praxis* (2019). He is editor in chief of *Archa Verbi. Yearbook for the Study of Medieval Theology* and co-editor of the journal *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum.*

Antoon Vandevelde (**Member**) studied economics and philosophy. He graduated in 1986 at KU Leuven with a PhD on *Exchange and Recognition*. He has been full professor at the Centre for Economics and Ethics of KU Leuven until his superannuation in 2017. He was Dean of the Institute of Philosophy of KU Leuven from 2008 until 2015. Formerly he has been teaching for a long time at the universities of Antwerp and Rotterdam. Currently he continues to teach courses in *Political Philosophy*, *Social Ethics* and *Social and Political Philosophy* at KU Leuven. He published many articles, mainly in the field of economic ethics and political philosophy, for instance about philosophy of social security, migration policy, responsibility for future generations, altruism and the logic of the gift, liberalism and communitarianism. Together with G. Erreygers, he edited a book on *Is Inheritance Legitimate? – Ethical and Economic Aspects of Wealth Transfers* (Springer, 1997). Other books are on *Gifts and Interests* (Peeters, 2000), on *Autonomy and Paternalism* (with Thomas Nijs en Yvonne Denier, Peeters, 2007) and on *Justice, Luck and Responsibility in Health Care* (with Yvonne Denier and Chris Gastmans, Springer, 2013). Recently he published in Dutch *Het geweld van geld* (Lannoo Campus, 2017).

Auli Vähäkangas (**Member**) completed her MTh in 1992 and ThD in 2004 both at the University of Helsinki, Finland. She was lecturer at the Makumira University College (MUCo), Tanzania 1998-2005. After returning to Finland, she was first lecturer at Diaconia University of Applied Sciences before joining University of Helsinki in 2009. She was a Vice dean, Faculty of Theology, University of Helsinki 2014-2017. Vähäkangas was appointed as a full professor in practical theology in 2015. She is the author of *Christian Couples Coping with Childlessness. Narratives from Machame, Kilimajaro*. Vahakangas' research has focused on those in vulnerable situations: sexual minorities, childless people and hiv-positives in their communities. She co-led the South-African-Nordic research project *Youth at the Margins. A comparative study of the contribution of faith-based organisations to social cohesion in South Africa and Nordic Europe (YOMA)* (2013-2017). At the moment she is leading a Finnish multidisciplinary project *Meaningful relations: Patient and family carer encountering death at home* (2017-2021).

Sjoerd Mulder (**Student-member**) studied Theology at Utrecht University, and currently is PhD student at the Tilburg School of Catholic Theology, Tilburg University (public defense in

May 2020). He teaches Systematic Theology and Ecumenism at the ‘Fontys Hogeschool Theologie en Levensbeschouwing’, is a regular contributor to the Religion section of daily newspaper *Trouw*, and member of the jury for the “Annual Award for the Best Dutch Theological Book”.

Appendix 2: Programme Site Visit PTR

Day 1: Wednesday, October 23
Location: Hotel Van der Valk, Lent

15.00:	Chair and secretary committee meet with Steffie Hampsink for programme logistics and procedures
15.30:	Closed committee meeting: site visit preparation
17.30:	Welcome reception and introduction with committee, Rector Magnificus of Radboud University, Dean and Vice Dean of the Faculty, Director of the Institute, Research Coordinators.
18.30:	Dinner at the hotel (committee only)
20.00:	Further preparation of the site visit (committee only)

Day 1: Thursday, October 24
Location: Elinor Ostrom Building EOS 00.240, Radboud University

9.00 – 10.00:	Meeting with the board of the Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies, the director of the Institute (15' presentation, 45' interview)
10.00 – 10.45:	Closed session committee
10.45 – 11.30:	CHEP, 5' presentation, 40' interview
11.30 – 12.00:	Closed session committee & break
12.00 – 12.45:	CCEP, 5' presentation, 40' interview
12.45 – 13.00:	Closed session committee
13.00 – 14.00:	Lunch (committee only)
14.00 – 14.45:	CCL, 5' presentation, 40' interview
14.45 – 15.00:	Closed session committee
15.00 – 15.45:	CCS, 5' presentation, 40' interview
15.45 – 16.15:	Closed session committee & break
16.15 – 17.00:	CRCS, 5' presentation, 40' interview

17.00 – 18.00:	Closed session committee
18.00 – 18.30:	Walk to Faculty Club Huize Heyendael
18.30 – 20.30:	Dinner at Huize Heyendael

Day 2: Friday, October 25

Location: Elinor Ostrom Building EOS 00.240, Radboud University

9.00 – 9.30:	Interview with PhD students
9.30 – 10.00:	Interview with postdocs
10.00 – 10.15:	Closed session committee
10.15 – 11.00:	Research school Noster and Graduate School for the Humanities (GSH)
11.00 – 11.15:	Closed session committee
11.15 – 11.30:	Break
11.15 – 12.00:	Interview with valorization coordinator and societal partners
12.00 – 12.30:	Interview with the Board of Faculty Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies
12.30 – 13.30:	Lunch (committee only)
13.30 – 15.00:	Committee meeting to discuss results and preparation of site visit report
15.00 – 15.30:	Presentation of preliminary findings
15.30 – 16.30:	Informal gathering and drinks

Appendix 3: Quantitative data on the Institute's composition and financing

1. PTR

Table 1: Research staff 2013-2018

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE
Tenured staff												
Full professor	*25*	*8.0*	*27*	*9.0*	*25*	*8.5*	*23*	*8.5*	*25*	*9.0*	*24*	8.2
Associate professor	*7*	*2.1*	*7*	*2.1*	*7*	*2.1*	*7*	*2.1*	*7*	*2.2*	*14*	4.0
Assistant professor	*23*	*7.1*	*20*	*6.5*	*19*	*6.3*	*23*	*6.9*	*21*	*6.4*	*21*	6.3
	55	*17.2*	*54*	*17.6*	*51*	*16.8*	*53*	*17.5*	*53*	*17.6*	*59*	18.4
Non-tenured staff												
Post-doc	*17*	*11.2*	*29*	*19.8*	*13*	*8.6*	*15*	*7.5*	*10*	*5.3*	*11*	5.3
PhD	*22*	*13.3*	*21*	*13.3*	*20*	*14.0*	*17*	*12.0*	*16*	*10.6*	*12*	8.1
	39	*24.5*	*50*	*33.0*	*33*	*22.6*	*32*	*19.5*	*26*	*15.9*	*23*	13.5
Total	**94**	**41.7**	**104**	**50.6**	**84**	**39.4**	**85**	**37.0**	**79**	**33.5**	**82**	**31.8**
Support staff												
Director research	1	0.3	1	0.3	1	0.3	1	0.3	1	0.3	1	0.3
Research Centre coordinators	3	0.3	3	0.3	3	0.3	3	0.3	5	0.3	5	0.3
Research policy + data steward	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.6	1	0.6
Graduate school. coordinator	1	0.4	1	0.4	1	0.4	1	0.4	1	0.4	1	0.4
Valorization coordinator							1	0.2	1	0.2	1	0.2
Acquisition coordinator									1	0.1	1	0.1
Allocated overhead*	11	3.6	11	3.6	12	3.7	12	3.7	12	3.7	12	3.7
Total support staff	**17**	**5.1**	**17**	**5.1**	**18**	**5.2**	**19**	**5.4**	**22**	**5.6**	**22**	**5.6**
Total research + support	**111**	**46.8**	**121**	**55.7**	**102**	**44.6**	**104**	**42.4**	**101**	**39.0**	**104**	**37.4**

Table 2: FTE research capacity in 2018 divided over the 5 Centers

Center	FTE
CCCL Center for Cognition, Culture and Language	7.67
CCEP Center for Contemporary European Philosophy	5.96
CCS Center for Catholic Studies	2.77
CHPS Center for the History of Philosophy and Science	4.18
CRCS Center for Religion and Contemporary Society	11.24

Table 3: Funding 2013-2019

(x 1.000 euro)	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Funding						
Direct Funding	7,846	8,171	8,099	8,402	8,628	8,964
Research grants	1,027	1,044	1,153	994	1,024	855
Contract grants	1,556	1,558	1,535	1,524	1,303	1,166
Other	1,017	1,114	1,236	1,296	1,056	906
Total funding	***11,446***	***11,887***	***12,024***	***12,216***	***12,011***	***11,891***
Expenditure						
Personel costs	8,057	8,609	8,951	8,970	9,125	9,329
Other costs	2,889	3,222	3,096	3,246	2,893	2,605
Total expenditure	***10,946***	***11,831***	***12,047***	***12,216***	***12,018***	***11,934***

Table 4: Research output 2013-2018

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Academic publications						
Refereed articles	66	75	69	65	53	50
Non-refereed articles	4	7	4	8	11	7
Books	7	7	16	14	4	9
Book editorships	6	9	10	12	11	11
Book chapters	70	85	87	73	76	79
PhD theses	12	14	9	17	21	18
Total	165	197	195	189	176	174
Professional publications						
Journal contributions	40	43	35	38	28	27
Books	3	12	1	2	3	1
Book editorships		1	1		5	
Book chapters	15	27	22	16	26	9
Book reviews	20	16	10	19	12	13
Reports	5	5	12	3	3	7
Total	83	104	81	78	77	57
Publications aimed at the general public						
Books	3	1	2	2	2	2
Book chapters	4	9	32	8	8	13
Journal contributions	19	21	23	19	23	27
Total	26	31	57	29	33	42

Table 5: Radboud Reflects

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Total number of programs per year	100	120	119	112	134
Total number of participants per year	10,084	13,908	20,597	15,718	16,649
Average number of participants per program	101	116	173	140	160
Total number of subscribers email newsletter	7,500	9,500	12,000	13,300	10,100
Total number of unique visitors on website	41,000	78,000	95,000	85,000	100,000

Table 6: Success rate of regular PhD Candidates

Enrolment				Success rates						
Starting year	Enrolment		Total	Graduated in year 4 or earlier	Graduated in year 5 or earlier	Graduated in year 6 or earlier	Graduated in year 7 or earlier	Graduated after year 7	Not yet finished	Discont.
	M	F	(M+F)							
2009	0	3	3					2	1	
2010	2	2	4		1	1	1	1	0	
2011	0	3	3		1	1		1	0	
2012	2	3	5		2	1		1	1	
2013	1	4	5	1	2				2	
2014	3	0	3						3	
2015	0	4	4						4	
2016	4	1	4						4	
2017	2	0	2						1	1
2018	1	1	2						2	

Table 7: Tenured staff composition by age:

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE
Tenured staff												
up to 34 year	6%	2.6	2%	1.0	7%	3.0	4%	2.0	2%	1.0	5%	2.6
35 - 44 year	10%	4.4	13%	5.6	13%	5.5	14%	6.3	15%	6.6	21%	9.9
45 - 54 year	41%	17.6	39%	17.2	27%	11.5	24%	10.6	23%	10.1	21%	9.9
55 - older	43%	18.5	46%	20.1	53%	22.2	57%	24.9	60%	26.2	53%	24.8
Total tenured staff	**100%**	**43.1**	**100%**	**43.9**	**100%**	**42.1**	**100%**	**43.8**	**100%**	**43.8**	**100%**	**47.2**

Table 8: Research staff gender balance

in %	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Full professor	17%	83%	22%	78%	24%	76%	24%	76%	28%	72%	28%	72%
Associated prof.	33%	67%	32%	68%	33%	67%	33%	67%	13%	88%	27%	73%
Assistant prof.	15%	85%	8%	92%	15%	85%	16%	84%	21%	79%	27%	73%
Total scientific staff	***18%***	***82%***	***18%***	***82%***	***21%***	***79%***	***22%***	***78%***	***23%***	***77%***	***27%***	***73%***
Post-doc	52%	48%	39%	61%	36%	64%	47%	53%	41%	59%	25%	75%
PhD	76%	24%	61%	39%	65%	35%	53%	48%	40%	60%	51%	49%
Tot. non-tenured staff	***66%***	***34%***	***49%***	***51%***	***55%***	***45%***	***51%***	***49%***	***41%***	***60%***	***42%***	***58%***

in fte	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Full professor	3.4	16.7	5.0	17.5	5.0	16.3	5.1	16.2	6.3	16.2	5.8	15.2
Associated prof.	1.7	3.5	1.7	3.5	1.7	3.5	1.7	3.5	0.7	4.9	2.7	7.4
Assistant prof.	2.7	15.1	1.3	14.9	2.3	13.4	2.8	14.5	3.3	12.6	4.3	11.8
Total scientific staff	***7.8***	***35.3***	***8.0***	***35.9***	***9.0***	***33.1***	***9.6***	***34.2***	***10.3***	***33.7***	***12.8***	***34.4***
Post-doc	6.5	6.0	8.5	13.5	3.5	6.1	3.9	4.4	2.4	3.5	1.6	4.7
PhD	12.7	4.0	10.9	6.8	12.0	6.6	8.4	7.6	5.7	8.4	5.8	5.5
Tot. non-tenured staff	***19.2***	***10.0***	***19.4***	***20.3***	***15.5***	***12.7***	***12.3***	***12.0***	***8.1***	***11.9***	***7.3***	***10.2***

Table 9: Research staff composition by origin, tenured and non-tenured

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018	
	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE
scientific staff												
NL	77%	33.4	79%	***34.7***	73%	30.8	72%	***31.4***	71%	31.2	71%	***33.5***
EU	19%	8.0	17%	***7.5***	20%	8.5	21%	***9.4***	22%	9.8	23%	***11.0***
Non-EU	4%	1.7	4%	***1.7***	7%	2.8	7%	***3.0***	7%	3.0	6%	***2.7***
	100%	***43.1***	***100%***	***43.9***	***100%***	***42.1***	***100%***	***43.8***	***100%***	***43.9***	***100%***	***47.2***
PhD + post docs												
NL	66%	20.1	70%	27.7	72%	20.2	69%	16.9	75%	15.0	77%	13.4
EU	34%	10.1	28%	11.0	28%	8.0	31%	7.5	25%	5.1	16%	2.8
Non-EU	0%	-	3%	1.0	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	7%	1.3
	100%	***30.2***	***100%***	***39.7***	***100%***	***28.2***	***100%***	***24.4***	***100%***	***20.0***	***100%***	***17.5***

Appendix 4: Explanation of the categories utilized

Extended description of the 4-point scale for categorizing the quality along three criteria

Category	Meaning	Research quality	Relevance to society	Viability
1	World leading/ excellent	The research unit has been shown to be one of the few most influential research groups in the world in its particular field.	The research unit makes an outstanding contribution to society.	The research unit is excellently equipped for the future.
2	Very good	The research unit conducts very good, internationally recognized research.	The research unit makes a very good contribution to society.	The research unit is very well equipped for the future.
3	Good	The research unit conducts good research.	The research unit makes a good contribution to society.	The research unit makes responsible strategic decisions and is therefore well equipped for the future.
4	Unsatisfactory	The research unit does not achieve satisfactory results in its field.	The research unit does not make a satisfactory contribution to society.	The research unit is not adequately equipped for the future.