RESEARCH REVIEW
POLITICAL SCIENCE
2013-2019

De Onderzoekerij
Vondellaan 58
2332 AH Leiden

Phone: +31 6 24812176
Email: info@onderzoekerij.nl
Internet: www.onderzoekerij.nl

Preface

This report provides an evaluation of the Political Science research programmes of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Leiden University and the University of Amsterdam. It covers the period 2013-2019 and follows the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP).

It was a real pleasure to evaluate these research programmes. As the following pages make evident, Political Science in the Netherlands is at a very high level and belongs to the international top. Therefore, its prospects seem to be excellent. However, a major threat for the sustainability of this high level is the poor and decreasing funding of Political Science research from the Eerste Geldstroom. Although all three research groups are increasingly successful in compensating the decrease of base funding by acquiring grants from NWO and the ERC, it is our contention that the universities and faculties involved should make a better financial effort to enable Political Science to maintain its present high level.

As I know from experience, an evaluation like this is a demanding exercise for the departments and institutes involved. We were impressed by the high quality of the self-assessments and the professionalism of the whole process including the contributions to the site visits. Due to the Covid-19 pandemic the planned site visits had to be replaced by virtual 'visits'. This was anything but ideal and asked a lot of endurance and flexibility of all people involved in the process. I very much appreciate how easily they all adapted to these unusual circumstances.

On behalf of the committee I would like to thank all PhD candidates, researchers and officials for their cooperation during the whole process of this evaluation.

I also would like to thank my fellow members of the committee for their professionalism, their dedication and good humour. It was a pleasure to work with them. Last but not least I would like to thank Esther Poort. As secretary of the committee she skilfully coordinated this evaluation, led us through all the successive steps of the process and saved us a lot of work.

Jacques Thomassen
Chair of the committee

1. Introduction

1.1 Terms of reference for the assessment

The quality assessment of research in Political Science is carried out in the context of the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) for Public Research Organisations by the Association of Universities in The Netherlands (VSNU), the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO), and the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW). This research review is part of the six-year cycle of evaluation of research in all Dutch universities.

In accordance with the SEP the research in Political Science covering the period of 2013-2019, is being reviewed by an external peer review committee. The research review comprises three research programmes from three different universities:

- Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam: Multi-layered Governance in Europe and Beyond;
- Leiden University: The Institutions of Politics: Design, Workings, and Implications;
- University of Amsterdam: Transnational Governance, Political Economy and Democracy.

In accordance with the SEP, the committee's tasks were to assess the quality of the research conducted by the programmes and their relevance to society as well as their strategic targets and the extent to which they are equipped to achieve them. In addition, the committee provides qualitative feedback on the PhD programmes, research integrity and diversity aspects of the programmes. The committee was furthermore invited to write a review on the performance of Political Science in the Netherlands (to the extent that it is represented by these three groups) from an international perspective, to evaluate its major strengths and weaknesses and to identify possible threats and opportunities. This review is provided in Chapter 2 of this report.

The committee received detailed information consisting of the self-evaluation reports of the programmes under review, including all the information required by SEP (including appendices) and key publications for each research programme.

1.2 The Review committee

The Board of the three participating universities appointed the following members of the committee for the research review:

- Prof. dr. Jacques Thomassen, University of Twente, Emeritus Professor of Political Science in the Faculty of Behavioural, Management & Social Sciences. (chair of the committee)
- Dr. Fiona B. Adamson, University of London, Reader in International Relations Department of Politics and International Studies SOAS
- Prof. dr. Paul Dekker, Netherlands Institute for Social Research | SCP and Honorary Professor Tilburg University, TS Social and Behavioral Sciences
- Prof. dr. Lisa Herzog, University of Groningen, Faculty of Philosophy and Centre for Philosophy, Politics and Economics
- MSc Indra Römgens, PhD candidate at Radboud University and Roskilde University
- Prof. dr. Frank Schimmelfennig, ETH Zürich, Center for Comparative and International Studies

The Board of the participating universities appointed drs. Esther Poort from De Onderzoekerij as the committee secretary. All members of the committee signed a declaration and disclosure form to ensure

that the committee members made their judgements without bias, personal preference or personal interest, and that the judgement was made without undue influence from the programmes or stakeholders.

1.3 Procedures followed by the committee

Prior to the site visit, the committee reviewed detailed documentation comprising: The Self-assessment report of the institutes including appendices and the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) 2015-2021. In addition, the committee studied the previous assessment report.

The committee was invited by the three participating universities to assess the participating programmes during a site visit. Originally, the plan had been to spend a day at each university, but the coronavirus pandemic precluded travel and meeting up, so instead the panel "met" the various groups through online video conferencing. Prior to the site visit, all committee members were requested to read the self-evaluation reports of all three research programmes. Each committee member was furthermore requested to independently formulate a preliminary assessment concerning two research programmes under review, based on the written information that was provided. This way all research programmes were reviewed in-depth by a first and second reviewer. Nevertheless, all committee members are jointly responsible for the review, scoring and report of all the programmes.

The committee proceeded according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021. The assessment was based on the documentation provided by the programmes and the interviews with the management, a selection of researchers of the programme, and PhD candidates. The interviews took place on 30 November until 2 December 2020 (see Appendix A).

The committee discussed its assessment at its final session during the virtual site visit. Based on the preliminary assessments and notes taken during the interviews, the committee members wrote an assessment of the programme for which they had been appointed as first reviewer. The second reviewer verified and added to this assessment, after which the secretary used it for the report. The chair was requested to write the review on Political Science in the Netherlands. The total draft report was verified and added to by the committee before being presented to the programmes concerned for factual corrections and comments. The comments were reviewed by the secretary and incorporated in the final report in close consultation with the chair and other committee members. The final report was presented to the Boards of the Universities and to the management of the programmes.

5. Transnational Governance, Political Economy and Democracy, University of Amsterdam

5.1 Quantitative assessment

The committee assessed the research programme 'Transnational Governance, Political Economy and Democracy.' both quantitatively and qualitatively. For the quantitative assessment a four-point scale is used, according to the standard evaluation protocol 2015-2021. The explanation of the criteria underlying the scores can be found in appendix C.

According to the SEP scoring system, the committee has awarded the following scores to the research programme Transnational Governance, Political Economy and Democracy.

Research quality: 1
Relevance to society: 1
Viability: 1

The qualitative assessment of the programme can be found in the next sections.

5.2 Organisation, strategy and targets

The programme is very large (62 fte) and very broad in its thematic coverage. It successfully cultivates its goals of excellence, pluralism and societal engagement. It is organized into three programme groups: Challenges to Democratic Representation, Political Economy and Transnational Governance, and Transnational Configurations, Conflict and Governance. These serve as core structures (e.g., they hold monthly research seminars, have responsibilities in HR terms, and organize various flows of money), but they are supplemented by a number of cross-cutting themes and involvement in other research groups and centres (e.g., the Amsterdam Center for European Studies) and certain events series at the level of the faculty. Staff members also encounter each other in their teaching capacities, which are organized at a different level, not along the lines of the programme groups. Total staff numbers have almost doubled from 2013 to 2019 (from 34.26 fte to 62.16 fte) – mostly thanks to external grants. The complex network of programme groups, research centres, and contacts via teaching and other organizational levels nonetheless seems to ensure sufficient cohesion and numerous points of mutual contacts.

The conversations with the committee conveyed a sense of collegiality and mutual inspiration, also across different methodologies, approaches and research traditions. The staff convinced the committee that pluralism is seen as a value to be cherished and not as a threat to be avoided. The department seems highly successful in creating a vibrant research community, in which junior and senior scholars all feel that they can work independently, but also rely on the support of their colleagues and collaborate where desired. The management contributes to this research-oriented culture by making sure that the formal structures work well, that excellent support structures (e.g., for grant writing and administration) are in place, and that research time is protected. Based on university allocation alone, the programme would be able to offer 0.28 fte research time per person, but through external funding that is in part shared across the department, an allocation of 0.4 fte is possible (an indication that collegiality is really taken seriously). Moreover, each staff member is given a teaching-free period where possible, and efficiency is a criterion in teaching allocation (e.g., allowing combinations of research and teaching interests). The department thus clearly seems more than the mere sum of a number of (undoubtedly!) excellent individual researchers.

The department sets very reasonable targets in terms of publication expectations, focussing on quality over quantity. Although staff members have confirmed that the workload is high – partly due to external pressures – the overall work satisfaction seems very high, not least because expectations and promotion criteria (especially from assistant to associate) are clear and transparent.

5.3 Research quality

The research quality is very high, both in qualitative and in quantitative terms. The self-assessment offers a convincing picture of a high level of scientific production in accordance with the goals and criteria of the strategy (e.g., focusing on quality/impact and being clear about minimal quantities). The selection of the top five publications with a brief substantial explanation of their relevance demonstrates willingness and capacity to explain research to non-specialists. The pluralism of methods, fields and topics, which is one of the hallmarks of the department, is also visible in the outputs – it would be an impossible task to summarize the topics and approaches, which range from the history of ideas to questions of international humanitarian collaboration, from party politics to problems of international comparative measurement, and from transnational governance questions to the implications of ethnic diversity.

The numbers are impressive; for example, in the period under evaluation (2013-2019) the members of the department produced a total of 525 refereed articles, of which 391 were in ISI ranked journals, and of these 210 in the top 25% journals – in addition to books, chapters, and non-peer-reviewed outputs. The writing of peer-reviewed monographs with renowned university presses is encouraged, to allow for forms of research that could not easily be pressed into the form of articles. This strategy has certainly worked out. Many of the outputs have received best book / best article awards. Of the steady stream of PhD theses (between 5 and 10 per year in the period under consideration), almost every year at least one PhD thesis received some kind of prize. The many opportunities for feedback in the programme groups or other formats hosted at the department seems one of the key factors for these successes.

In terms of competitive research grants (from the NWO and the ERC) the department has also been outstandingly successful. Between 2013 and 2019, almost 30 million Euros of external funding have been raised, many grants coming from highly competitive and prestigious sources. This was one of the factors that allowed maintaining a 40% research time allocation for all staff members and has paid for positions of numerous PhD candidates and postdoctoral researchers, who have done their part to contribute to the research output. The research support structures for grant writing, but also the collegial support (brainstorming ideas, jointly writing of grant application, provision of feedback) seem to be excellent and have done their part to enable this huge success, in addition to the excellence of the individual grant recipients. The members of the department (especially the senior staff) also contribute to service to the scholarly community in their respective fields. For example, in addition to numerous editorial activities at various journals by individual staff members, one journal – the European Journal of International Relations – is hosted from within the department.[6]

All in all, the department can certainly be considered one of the leading political science departments in Europe, if not the world. Its reputation is also reflected in leading places in international rankings (although the methodologies of these raise their own issues). The focus on research excellence and the

---

[6] The strategy notes that staff members are encouraged to participate in, but not coordinate, larger grant proposals for research networks (e.g. from Horizon2020) – while this is understandably in terms of saving time, it seems not quite appropriate, nor necessary, as part of the strategy of such a large and successful department – it would mean free-riding on the efforts of others, who might in fact be less able to do so. In fact, the department has served as coordinator for two Horizon2020 cooperative projects.

collegial culture that supports it has been mentioned as a key factor for why staff members with outside offers chose to remain at the University of Amsterdam.

5.4 Societal relevance

The department distinguishes three kinds of engagement under the category of "societal relevance": policy and stakeholder engagement, dissemination of research to a broad audience, and research-based societal and stakeholder engagement. The examples provided in the report are very convincing: the pluralism of research topics, methods and approaches is also reflected in the various connections to the broader society. In addition to various memberships (especially of senior staff) in advisory boards and panels, one example that is particularly noteworthy is the blog StukRoodVlees, in which department members present their research findings to a broader audience (including journalists) in an accessible language. Although social scientists from outside the department and UvA contribute as well, staff members of the department play a key role to keep the blog alive. Feeding a blog on such a regular basis (including podcasts) is no small feat. As staff members have explained in the conversations with the committee, they also involve younger scholars, e.g., by encouraging PhD candidates to submit pieces. This is an excellent way not only of distributing the burden on more shoulders, but also of making outreach activities part of the academic socialization and training of PhD candidates.

It was made clear in the conversations that there is encouragement, but not pressure, for everyone to engage in societal relevance activities. It is taken into consideration in the annual review talks but does not seem to constitute a burden on staff members. In practice, almost everyone seems to find approaches that are interesting for him or her – again, the pluralism of the department shows itself.

5.5 Viability

Overall, the department seems to have a high degree of viability – it has excellent staff members and the internal structures seem to be set up very well to support them in fulfilling their tasks. The greatest risk is the heavy reliance on external funding (especially for PhD candidates and postdoc positions). Currently, about 2/3 of the research budget come from external sources, many of which are highly competitive (and increasingly so when researchers move from the junior to the mid-level and senior-level categories of grants). Even though some trust can be put into the capacity of staff members and support structures to acquire such grants also in the future (not least thanks to the Matthew effect), there might be some degree of vulnerability here (e.g., because of external developments such as the lowering of the EU budgets for research).

What is very positive – and speaks to the collegiality of the department – is the fact that external money is used partly for the group, in the sense that staff members buy out not only part of their teaching time but also part of their research time and cover it by external grant money. This helps to ensure that all staff members can have 40% research time (while the university only allocates 28%), instead of risking a bifurcation in "research stars" and other staff members who hardly have a chance to get their research going because they are too busy with teaching and administrative tasks (which would threaten the pluralism (if some staff members ended up not doing research any longer or certain lines of research found it easier to get external funding) and the collegial collaboration that seem to be one of the success factors of the department).

A strategy that has recently been adopted to ensure the financial viability of the department, apart and beyond the acquisition of external research funding, is to increase student numbers by offering a new dual-language bachelor. This seems a useful strategy for ensuring stable finances.

Involving junior staff and PhD candidates more into the management of the programme groups (a recent move) seems a good idea in order to make sure that bottom-up suggestions and ideas can be taken up. A good feedback culture and an open ear by senior staff and management should help to draw attention to problems early on and to understand what junior staff need to flourish in the department.

Workload and work-life-balance remain a challenge and need to be carefully monitored, especially for junior staff. It must be admitted, however, that many factors that influence workload are not in the hands of the department, but rather the university and/or the national science policy (e.g. length of the academic year; structural lack of funding for research time; availability of external funding). What is in the hands of the department is to carefully monitor the workload on administrative tasks and to make sure that it does not eat into the 60% teaching-40% research time division.

5.6 PhD programme

The PhD community is large, international, diverse and has a vibrant culture of mutual support and learning not only from more senior staff, but also from peers (e.g., through a PhD candidate club for mutual feedback). Both article-based and monograph-based based PhDs are possible; the decision is taken on an individual basis. There are many opportunities for PhD candidates to get involved in organizing events and to network (not least because of money for events from various projects, which senior staff members seem to generously share with junior colleagues and PhD candidates). Each PhD candidate has at least two supervisors, which can come from one or several programme groups (or, in the case of interdisciplinary projects, from other departments of the university).

PhD candidates expressed great satisfaction with the accessibility of their supervisors and the quality and rhythm of feedback. They felt well supported with regard to networking and career planning and seemed happy with the quality of the additional courses they can take. They knew where to turn in case of issues with their supervising team (e.g., PhD representatives or programme group leaders), but such problems seemed infrequent. A considerable part of the PhDs continued an academic career, which speaks to the quality of the programme.

PhDs are funded through different kinds of contracts, coming from different sources of funding. This had apparently led to some lack of clarity with regard to teaching obligations and to PhD candidates not being sure whether everyone was treated equally. However, no PhD candidate seemed to see the percentage of teaching time as a major obstacle to completing their PhD; there are plans for implementing a clearer rule in the future. The management is aware that the different sources of funding can sometimes lead to impressions of unequal treatment and takes steps to ensure fairness. One issue on which PhD candidates claimed improvements could be made is to support PhD candidates who come from abroad to find their way around the (formal and informal) structures and expectations of Dutch academia, but it was not perceived as a major issue. Another suggestion was to consider offering courses for skills that would be useful for the job market outside academia, which seems reasonable given the scarcity of permanent jobs in academia (but also the many job opportunities for PhDs with a solid political science training outside academia).

5.7 Research integrity

The research culture is focussed on excellence, with a clear priority given to quality over quantity – this is an important aspect of reducing incentives for fraudulent behaviour of any kind. There are clear structures in place for addressing all issues such as data management or ethical issues such as privacy, or best practices on issues such as open data storage etc. These structures are obviously also needed because many external funders (e.g., the European Research Council) request them.

There is an Ethics Advisory Board at the level of AISSR. As has been emphasized in conversations with the committee, its attitude is to let people reflect on ethical dilemmas, not just to tick boxes. A Research Integrity and Data Management Protocol is in place, in line with recent updates on the national level. It is noteworthy that all PhD projects also go to the Ethics Advisory Board; it is laudable that awareness for possible ethical issues is thus raised also in the next cohort of researchers. These support structures help researchers to stay up to date with the latest developments, e.g. in terms of open data policies, which are in constant flux and therefore difficult to monitor for individual researchers.

5.8 Diversity

Diversity has many dimensions, and the staff members and management are well aware of this. Gender diversity is very good at junior level; at the level of full professor there is room for improvement (73% male, 27% female). The strategy for working on this that has been proposed is to use internal promotions to improve the balance, which seems realistic. Plans to have clear criteria for the promotion to full professor and to make sure that enough positions are occupied by women in the future seem credible. Also, staff members pointed out that their family situation (e.g., lack of childcare during the Covid lockdown) is taken into account in their annual review talks and their overall evaluation. This should make sure that there are no hurdles for parents in making their way in the department (which is in practice often a problem especially for mothers).

Ethnic diversity is something to work on, but there is an awareness of this as well. The recent black-lives-matter-movement also led to discussions within the department and the formulation of clear strategies, for example the request, in hiring procedures, that candidates integrate their strategies for diversity in their teaching statement. Two recent hires at the level of assistant professor have been persons of colour. These concrete improvements are a signal that the department's commitment to diversity is genuine.

5.9 Recommendations

- In many ways, the key recommendation for the department seems to be: continue doing what you have been doing, it seems to work very well! What is particularly noteworthy is the collegial and egalitarian atmosphere and the genuine commitment to pluralism; moreover, the involvement of PhD candidates and junior staff in management tasks seems an excellent approach for generating bottom-up ideas and initiatives
- Although (or: precisely because!) the staff all seem highly committed and intrinsically motivated researchers, it seems vital to keep an eye on work-life-balance and to make sure that stress is reduced wherever possible. One aspect of this topic is to make sure that administrative tasks are carefully calculated in terms of hours and sufficiently taken into account when tasks are distributed within the department.
- Management and senior staff might want to see what more could be done to help PhD candidates and junior staff members who come from abroad to understand the ins and outs of Dutch academia.
- The department should continue to work on diversity at the level of full professor. Clear criteria for internal promotion seem an important step here.

Given that many department members have emphasized structural problems in Dutch academia as a whole (e.g., length of the academic year, insufficient core funding), it seems advisable to participate, where possible, in activities that bring this issue to the attention of the broader public and politicians. [7]

---

[7] The self-assessment mentions "advocacy for social sciences" already as one of the three additional objectives for coming years, and to "better understand and influence" politics of funding as one of the opportunities in the SWOT analysis. However, the department might give this combination of research and advocacy some further thoughts – combining research and advocacy here might lead to a problematic constellation that might raise questions about the objectivity of the research.

3. University of Amsterdam

Table 3.1 Number of staff and research fte – University of Amsterdam

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#
Scientific Staff[1]	19.97	51	21.90	53	24.09	52	28.83	58	29.25	60	29.10	58	28.95	57
Post-docs[2]	1.78	4	3.77	9	10.32	17	9.83	17	9.42	17	10.84	19	9.26	17
PhD candidates[3]	12.51	18	14.12	22	15.51	23	18.11	25	25.51	36	26.60	38	23.94	33
Total research staff	34.26	73	39.78	84	49.92	92	56.77	100	64.18	113	66.54	115	62.16	107

Note 1 Comparable with WOPI categories HGL, UHD and UD; tenured and non-tenured staff (research time allocated is 40% per FTE)

Note 2 Comparable with WOPI category Onderzoeker (research time allocated is 100% per FTE)

Note 3 For the purpose of this table, we only include Standard PhD (employed) and Contract PhDs (externally or internally funded but not employed) – according to the VSNU definitions – and only if they are allowed to spend at least 0.8 FTE on their research (research time allocated is 90% per FTE)

Table 3.2 Funding - University of Amsterdam

	2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
Funding	fte	%	fte	%	fte	%	fte	%	fte	%	fte	%	fte	%
Direct funding	20.82	61%	19.86	50%	17.41	35%	21.90	39%	22.18	35%	22.32	34%	21.05	34%
National research grants[1]	8.05	24%	9.58	24%	16.41	33%	16.89	30%	17.07	27%	17.12	26%	15.50	25%
International research grants [2]	4.03	12%	8.54	21%	13.25	27%	16.63	29%	21.31	33%	23.10	35%	22.72	37%
Contract research[3]	1.35	4%	1.80	5%	2.85	6%	1.35	2%	3.63	6%	4.01	6%	2.90	5%
Other[4]	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%	0.00	0%
Total funding	34.26	100%	39.78	100%	49.92	100%	56.77	100%	64.18	100%	66.54	100%	62,16	100%

Note 1: Research grants obtained in national scientific competition, specifically, grants obtained from the Dutch Science Foundation (NWO) and the Dutch Royal Academy (KNAW).

Note 2: International Research grants include research grants obtained in scientific competition organised by non-Dutch bodies like the European Research Council (ERC) and the European framework programme (Horizon 2020), as well as Non-Dutch national science foundations (like the ESRC in the UK).

Note 3: Research contracts for specific research projects obtained from external organizations, such as industry, governmental organizations and charitable organizations.

Note 4: Funds that do not fit in other categories

Table 3.3 Output - University of Amsterdam

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total
Refereed scientific articles[1]	72	62	72	85	75	91	68	525
ISI Ranked[2]	*46*	*43*	*61*	*68*	*51*	*74*	*48*	*391*
Top 25%[3]	*25*	*27*	*35*	*33*	*24*	*33*	*33*	*210*
Non-refereed scientific articles[4]	9	4	4	1	3	4	1	26
Scientific books	3	7	9	5	12	6	8	50
Scientific monographs	*1*	*2*	*2*	*0*	*4*	*4*	*3*	*16*
Editorship of scientific volumes	*2*	*5*	*7*	*5*	*8*	*2*	*5*	*34*
Scientific book chapters	18	33	36	30	46	27	35	225
Sub total scientific publications	**102**	**106**	**121**	**121**	**136**	**128**	**112**	**826**
Professional publications[4]	37	43	17	35	34	21	24	211
Publications aimed at the general public[5]	15	12	9	9	19	15	20	99
Other research output (esp published inaugural and farewell speeches)[6]	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	5
Total publications scientific staff	**155**	**161**	**147**	**165**	**193**	**164**	**156**	**1141**
PhD Thesis[7]	5	7	5	10	8	8	9	52

Note 1 Scientific articles will only be included for the year of their official publication. Articles that are only available as 'online first' are excluded and will then probably be included in the subsequent review period. We include a separate category for the editorship of Special Issues.

Note 2 This is a subsection of the broader category 'refereed articles. This subcategory should not be counted towards the total number of publications.

Note 3 The top 25% is defined based on the five-year impact factor, within disciplinary categories of Web of Science.

Note 4 Articles in journals that are non-refereed, yet deemed important for the field (vakpublicaties).

Note 5 Publications aimed at professionals in the public and private sector (professionele publicaties), including scientific reports.

Note 6 Also known as populariserende artikelen. Only including publications that have appeared in hard-copy (not online only) and have passed an external editorial board.

Note 7 PhD-theses defended at the institute and supervised by one of the 'staff members'.

Table 3.4a Standard PhD candidates - University of Amsterdam

Enrolment				Graduated after (≤) 4 years		Graduated after (≤) 5 years		Graduated after (≤) 6 years		Graduated after (≤) 7 years		Total graduated		Not yet finished		Discon-tinued	
Star-ting year																	
	M	F	M+F	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2010	0	1	1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
2011	2	5	7	0	0%	1	14%	5	71%	6	86%	6	86%	0	0%	1	14%
2012	1	1	2	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2013	1	1	2	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%			2	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2014	7	1	8	1	13%	6	75%	7	88%			7	88%	1	13%	0	0%
2015	3	2	5	0	0%	4	80%	4	80%			4	80%	1	20%	0	0%
Total	14	11	25	1	4%	15	60%	20	80%			21	84%	3	12%	1	4%

Table 3.4b Contract PhD candidates - University of Amsterdam

Enrolment Star-ting year	M	F	M+F	Graduated after (≤) 4 years #	%	Graduated after (≤) 5 years #	%	Graduated after (≤) 6 years #	%	Graduated after (≤) 7 years #	%	Total graduated	%	Not yet finished #	%	Discon-tinued #	%
2010	0	0	0														
2011	0	0	0														
2012	0	1	1	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%
2013	0	0	0														
2014	0	1	1	1	100%							1	100%	0	100%	0	0%
2015	1	0	1	0	0%							0	0%	1	100%	0	0%
Total	1	2	3	1	33%							1	33%	1	33%	1	33%

Data in tables 3.4a and 3.4b is cumulative

Appendix C – Meaning of the scores

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 recognised 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