The Centre for Language and Cognition Groningen (CLCG)

Assessment of research quality 2004 - 2009
Contents

1. General information ......................................................................................................................... 4
2. Review of the Centre for Language and Cognition Groningen .................................. 7
3. Assessment of the six research programmes of the institute ........................................ 14
Appendices ........................................................................................................................................... 25
According to national agreements the Board of the University of Groningen is responsible for organizing adequate, thorough, independent assessments of all research conducted at the University of Groningen. The evaluations follow the national Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009–2015 (SEP). The aim of the SEP is to provide common guidelines for the evaluation and improvement of research and research policy, based on expert assessment. Part of the protocol is that the research is evaluated externally every six years.

The Board of the University (College van Bestuur) has invited a Peer Review Committee of three to evaluate the research in the institute Centre for Language and Cognition Groningen (CLCG) in the period 2004 – 2009. The six programmes that are embedded in the institute are to be evaluated as well as the institute itself. Three main tasks of the research institute and its research programmes are to be assessed: the production of results relevant to the scientific community, the production of results relevant to society, and the training of PhD-students. The PRC based its evaluation on the SEP (www.knaw.nl/sep). There was no additional protocol or Terms of References supplied for this review (article 4.4).

The PRC consisted of
Prof. dr. W. Klein, Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics
Prof. dr. P. Muysken, Radboud University Centre for Language Studies (chair)
Prof. dr. A. Zaenen, Palo Alto Xerox Research Center and Stanford University.
Dr. S.F. Brouwer-Keij MBA from the Office of the University of Groningen was executive secretary of the PRC.

The PRC received a self evaluation report with a list of 30 key publications. The key publications were made available for review by the committee via a secluded internet page at http://www.let.rug.nl/alfa/CLCG/. Additionally a list of all publications was supplied. At the request of the PRC information was supplied on the teaching load, the student staff ratio and the age of the tenured staff.

The site visit took place from November 17 up till the 19th; the full programme is presented in Appendix 2. During the site visit the PRC met with the Rector Magnificus, the
faculty board, the institute’s director and the chairman of the CLCG advisory board. During the interviews with representatives of the six research groups a one or two page handout was presented by each of the group leaders. The handouts summarised the group information and recent developments.

In making recommendations, the PRC was aware of the high level of reflective discussion about the institute’s organisation. The PRC does not want to imply having all the answers.
Chapter 2 Evaluation of the institute

Description of the institute
The Centre for Language and Cognition Groningen (CLCG) is one of the three research institutes in the Faculty of Arts at the University of Groningen. It is the institutional home for all the linguistic research carried out within the faculty. Over the six-year reporting period 2004-2009 about 55 permanent faculty were CLCG members, roughly 8-10 postdocs and 30-40 graduate students. CLCG was founded in 1994 with Germen de Haan as its director. John Nerbonne succeeded him in 1999 and has been director since then except for one semester in which Kees de Bot was acting director (Fall, 2005).

CLCG has six research groups, reflecting linguistic subdisciplines, and constituting natural discussion fora for research issues.

Vision, mission and objective(s)
CLCG’s mission, as stated in the self evaluation report, is to promote linguistic research in the Faculty and CLCG recognizes special responsibilities in the following four areas:

- Linguistic research must work hand in hand with instructional needs of the faculty, particularly in the largest languages spoken in modern Europe (Germanic, Romance, Slavic and Finno-Ugric).
- CLCG has a special responsibility for Dutch languages and dialects, especially the minority languages spoken in the northern Netherlands, that is to say Frisian and Lower Saxon (including Grunnings, the dialects spoken in the northern part of the Dutch Low Saxon area, in which the university is located). The university recognizes this special responsibility.
- CLCG supports both pure and applied research. Opportunities for applied research are especially important for developmental linguistics (LANSPAN), aphasiology (NL), and computational linguistics (CL).
- CLCG is in a promising position to contribute to progress through cooperation with the cognitive neurosciences in Groningen. This opportunity is concentrated in neurolinguistics (NL) and LANSPAN, but theoretical (S&S) and computational linguistics (CL), as well as Discourse and Communications (D&C) also have research in this direction.

CLCG has the following six research groups:

| CL | Computational Linguistics | 6 |
| D&C | Discourse & Communication | 8 |
| LANSPAN | Language and Literacy Development across the Life Span | 10 |
| LVLC | Language Variation & Language Change | 15 |
| NL | Neurolinguistics | 5 |
| S&S | Syntax & Semantics | 11 |

With respect to evaluating the number of permanent staff members (in 2009), it should be mentioned in caution that nine members retired or left in 2009 and that three more worked at high-level administration posts with little research time.

Evaluation of the Institute CLCG
In accordance with the SEP, the quality, productivity, relevance and vitality and feasibility of the institute as a whole were assessed by the PRC. The numerical assessment can be summarized as follows.

| Quality | very good, 4 |
| Productivity | very good, 4 |
| Relevance | very good, 4 |
| Vitality | very good, 4 |

Quality
A number of groups in the institute have an excellent reputation. Particularly CL and NL occupy a strong position in the international research landscape. Since these are key areas in current linguistics research the CLCG is well equipped for new research ventures in the coming decade.
A very strong point here are the strong international ties of the institute, both in terms of visitors and exchange networks.

**Quality of the PhD-training**

The students are very happy with the amount of supervision they receive. Some follow courses in LOT and some in BCN. The current situation in which the faculty (Graduate School Humanities) GSH takes over responsibility for the PhD training has not settled yet and it is hard to say anything definite about it. A point of concern is that different types of PhD students (AIO vs. bursaal) have unequal access to research and training facilities, both financial and otherwise. However on the whole the institute has succeeded in achieving reasonable productivity in PhD training and research. About 60% of the students have more than one supervisor, which ensures stability in the supervision.

Most research groups have internal meetings in which the PhD students play an important role and in which they receive hands-on instruction. Also there are some intergroup reading sessions in which new developments are charted.

**Financial and human resources**

University research institutes such as CLCG are different from independent research institutes under the umbrella of the KNAW and NWO, or elsewhere CNRS or the Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, in that they do not control their own budget, for the most part. They have gained a voice, fortunately, over the last decades in helping decide who is appointed in a certain position, but what positions are opened is generally determined by the Faculty Boards of the institutions they are part of. Since at least 60% of each position is devoted to (mostly undergraduate) teaching, this cannot be otherwise. As noted in the self evaluation report, this also means that the overall size of the senior staff budget of an institute like CLCG directly depends on student interest and enrolments. Since the study of language(s) has lost popularity, in Groningen and elsewhere, over the years, there has been a slow but very steady decline in the senior research staff of CLCG. Can fewer people guarantee the same research output?

Another fact of life is that the profile of the senior staff of CLCG necessarily reflects the diversity of the departments that the researchers are appointed in. This is hinted at in the self evaluation report but hidden in the presentation of the staff figures. Diversity is in itself a good thing, but some of the granting bodies have wanted to push university research institutes towards more focus and mass in their research planning, and indeed in some areas this is becoming essential.

A third aspect to consider is that the average age of the senior research staff has been going up steadily, as fewer new appointments of young people are made. Can older existing staff ensure sufficient scientific innovation? Fortunately, there are some new appointments envisaged in the near future.

**Research facilities**

Facilities for the CLCG research appear to be sufficient for the current needs of the staff.

Much depends on the link between CLCG and the NIC (Neuro Imaging Centre). The PRC is happy to note that there will be increased attention to the systematic storage of research data from the various groups in digital form.

**Organisation and internal processes**

The self evaluation report shows evidence of considerable attention to organisation issues. The gender balance on the senior level has improved with a number of recent appointments, in part due to the RFF programme.

The PRC has noticed that sometimes there are as many as points of interaction among groups as interaction within groups. Coherence within the groups varies from group to group. Two of the current groups, namely CL and NL appear to play a pivotal role in collaborative projects.

Since there has been a substantial reduction in staff, the institute should seriously consider whether it should retain the six group structure in its present form. It is also important to look ahead at the new trends in language research. In our view these are:

- Systematic exploration of large data sets
- Modelling
- Experimental approaches to language behaviour and neurocognitive research
For these reasons it is possible perhaps to view the internal organisation of the institute in a different light with two scientific information, sources namely computational modelling/data processing and psycho- and neurolinguistic experimentation. A preliminary sketch is given below.

**Leadership**
The research director is very dedicated to his institute and has had a persistent impact over time on the CLCG. It is clear that for instance the recommendations of the previous evaluation report have been carefully discussed and implemented where possible.

**National and international positioning**
A very strong point here are the strong international ties of the Institute, both in terms of visitors and exchange networks.

**Productivity**
Although there are differences in productivity between the separate groups, the overall productivity is impressive. We have rated the average productivity for the six groups together at 4 (very good). The self evaluation report contains an attempt to compare the figures with national output figures but this is not easy since it involves different time periods and possibly also ways of counting the research staff. Even though this differs from group to group, there has been a marked increase in the number of publications in serious journals following the last evaluation. The idea of a bonus for awarded PhD degrees certainly will contribute to more rapid completion of doctorate projects.

**Relevance**
Four groups have some research with clear societal impact. Even though this is a new, separate criterion in the SEP, it is clear that the institute and its directorate are keen on enhancing the societal impact of its work. The committee recommends that the institute to select a few general themes with clear societal impact. A possible theme already under discussion is language and ageing. Other possibilities include understandability and comprehensibility, literacy and reading and language teaching.

**Vitality**
The appointment of a number of new, young research leaders bodes well for success in the coming period, as is already reflected in the high number of external grants acquired nationally and internationally. It is imperative to strengthen the research capacity in the crucial domain of D&C. Efforts are made to fill a number of important vacant senior positions in the CLCG, something which has caused difficulties in the recent past. The PRC strongly recommends an active role of the research director in these appointments and the recruitment strategy to maintain a well rounded profile in the CLCG staff. Care should be taken to create a sense of belonging to the institute as a whole, not just to the research group, especially in the junior staff.
There are at present six research groups in CLCG. These groups are defined by the linguistic sub-discipline the group focuses on, and the groups are the motors producing ongoing research. The groups are:

- Computational Linguistics (CL)
- Discourse & Communication (D&C)
- Language and Literacy Development across the Life Span (LanSpan)
- Language Variation & Language Change (LVLC)
- Neurolinguistics (NL)
- Syntax & Semantics (S&S)

In accordance with the SEP, the quality, productivity, relevance and vitality and feasibility of the six research programmes of the institute as a whole were assessed by the PRC. The numerical assessment can be summarized as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computational Linguistics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse &amp; Communication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Literacy Development across the Life Span</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Variation &amp; Language Change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurolinguistics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax &amp; Semantics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PRC has, to the best of its abilities used the criterion and scale as described in the SEP 2009-2015 and adheres to rounded numbers where possible. Since the last review the SEP has been further upgraded, as has the quality and performance in the international field of research. Hence one can not compare the score with the previous score on a one to one basis. Moreover, the above numbers reflect an overall summary of the evaluation and should not be used or interpreted on their own.

All groups have progressed or at least kept up their previous level of quality. We very much commend the members of the institute for their efforts in this respect.
Chapter 3.1 Computational Linguistics

Programme leader  dr. G.J van Noord
Tenured staff  2.10 fte (2009)
Total research staff  15.25 fte (2009)

The Computational Linguistics group focuses on language processing by computer, both from a theoretical, experimental and applied perspective. In the past the group has focused on syntactic analysis and the acquisition of lexical knowledge. It is now moving in the direction of more semantic analysis. This is a positive development showing that the group is in step with the overall developments in the field while keeping its specific orientation.

Evaluation

The numerical assessment of the programme Computational Linguistics (CL) can be summarized as follows.

| Quality   | excellent, 5 |
| Productivity | very good, 4 |
| Relevance   | excellent, 5 |
| Vitality    | excellent, 5 |

Quality

The CL group has a clear profile in computational linguistics and is as before among the best internationally recognized groups for the type of CL it does (combining symbolic and statistical methods). There is some danger that the necessity for outside funding might lead to lack of focus, but the senior researchers in the group are aware of this and for the time being they have the problem under control.

Productivity

The quantity of publications is excellent and they are of a very good quality. However, too few publications are in international top journals.

Relevance

CL is in general relevant to society. The work of the group on Dutch is essential for providing this language area with the necessary tools. Some other work, e.g. dialect studies, could have important policy implications. Given the importance of this work within the group, it would be good if these implications would be brought out more explicitly.

Vitality

With the appointment of a new endowed chair in computational semantics, the group has chosen a new promising direction and also acquired the necessary strength to pursue it. In the long term, the vitality of the group will also depend on the possibility to integrate its research agenda with other research groups in the institute, and to strengthen collaboration in teaching with other departments. It could achieve this by disseminating some of its research methods more broadly throughout the institute.

Chapter 3.2 Discourse & Communication

Programme leader  prof.dr. G. Redeker
dr. H. J. Mazeland (deputy)
Tenured staff  2.05 fte (2009)
Total research staff  5.80 fte (2009)

D&C research focuses on discourse as a communicative process. It examines discourse as the methodical use of linguistic and non-linguistic resources for communicative purposes in specific genres and settings. The group approaches this complex domain from different angles. Currently there are four focal areas for the research. Researchers in this group carry a particularly heavy teaching load.

Evaluation

The numerical assessment of the programme Discourse & Communication (D&) can be summarized as follows.

| Quality   | good, 3 |
| Productivity | good, 3 |
| Relevance   | very good, 4 |
| Vitality    | good, 3 |

Quality

In spite of setbacks, much has been achieved. D&C is currently not the strongest group in CLCG, but its success is essential to the future position of the institute as a viable
unit, because of Faculty teaching staff recruitment policies. Recruitment and training of good staff is vital. Some of the researchers have a strong national reputation. At the moment there appear to be too many subthemes and subgroups within the research group.

Productivity
The number of publications suffers under the teaching load and lack of senior staff. There are some good publications but the main challenge is to develop a coherent research programme. Cooperation with computational or experimental colleagues may help create a more competitive research output.

Relevance
Of course on the whole the research carried on is perceived as relevant but a more concerted effort could be made to adopt a specific societal focus, as sketched above. This may also create new job opportunities for graduates from the department.

Vitality
There is a strategy, not successful so far, to strengthen the leadership in the group. Lack of filled senior positions makes it difficult to guarantee leadership at the present moment. To create a pool of potential future staff members with a broad teaching and research profile, perhaps more combined five year PhD training/teaching appointments should be considered as an option.

Chapter 3.3 Language and Literacy Development across the Life Span (LANSPAN)

Programme leaders
prof.dr. C. de Glopper
prof.dr. C. de Bot

Tenured staff
3.1 fte (2009)

Total research staff
9.5 fte (2009)

LANSPAN focuses on research problems and areas that are attractive and challenging from a theoretical perspective and also, preferably but not necessarily, from a practical perspective. LANSPAN covers the following six domains: (i) language development in L1, (ii) development of language use in preschool and kindergarten, (iii) second language learning, bilingualism and dynamic systems theory, (iv) the development of bilingual education in the Netherlands, (v) language, literacy and learning, and (vi) language attrition.

Evaluation
The numerical assessment of the programme Language and Literacy Development across the Life Span (LANSPAN) can be summarized as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>good, 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>very good, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>excellent, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitality</td>
<td>very good, 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality
The group is one of the very few groups worldwide which look at language development over the whole lifespan. A few members of the group are internationally very well rooted. Intensity and quality of work vary a bit across the group. A certain decrease in work on L1 acquisition over the last years is more than compensated by increasing activities in the area of language attrition.

Productivity
There are a number of international publications; the focus has been, however, clearly on publications within the Netherlands. But this is well-justified by the fact that a great deal of the group’s activities is devoted to educational and societal issues in this country. The work in this group on L1 and L2 development and attrition has an international reputation. Perhaps the research in the Dynamic Systems Theory model, which provides an interesting overall descriptive framework for the group, could be strengthened by additional computational or experimental work.

Relevance
The work of group is of eminent societal importance. This should be continued and even strengthened. In all areas, the focus is more on functional than on purely structural aspects of language, the only major exception being the
work on the acquisition of tense and aspect. Some of the work of the group is a likely candidate for funding from European research programmes.

**Vitality**

On the average, this is a very-well functioning group. With the appointment of highly productive new researchers the quality of the group remains assured.

---

**Chapter 3.4 Language Variation & Language Change**

**Group Leader:** prof.dr. M. Norde  
**Tenured staff:** 3.75 fte (2009)  
**Total research staff:** 6.30 fte (2009)

In 2005, the Descriptive and Historical Linguistics research group changed its name into Language Variation and Language Change. The common denominator for members of this group is specialized knowledge of one language or language (sub)family, or dialects, covering the entire Finno-Ugric and a substantial part of the Indo-European area. Most of the research conducted by this group is empirically based rather than top down. In addition, LVLC members study the implications of their data for current theorizing in a number of fields, to wit socio-linguistics, variationist linguistics, lexicography, onomastics, discourse studies, (second) language acquisition, construction grammar.

**Evaluation**

The numerical assessment of the programme Language Variation and Language Change (LVLC) can be summarized as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Vitality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good, 3</td>
<td>good, 3</td>
<td>very good, 4</td>
<td>good, 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are many good researchers in the group, but the quality is somewhat uneven. The research in this group has

been, by perceived necessity perhaps, been geared towards individual subprojects. In several specialist areas members of the group are internationally recognized. Several international conferences have been organized. Researchers in this group are often members of teaching departments in which linguistics only plays a limited role.

---

**Chapter 3.5 Neurolinguistics**

**Programme Leader:** prof.dr. R. Bastiaanse  
**Tenured staff:** 1.65 fte (2009)  
**Total research staff:** 3.65 fte

In the Neurolinguistics group the wide spectrum of normal and impaired language processing and production in children and adults is studied such as normal and impaired language acquisition, dyslexia and aphasia. The focus is on several aspects of language processing: understanding and production of various characteristics of verbs), phonological processing (in aphasia and dyslexia), sentence processing, ambiguity resolution, word reading, and speech motor control.
**Chapter 3 Review of the six research groups**

**Evaluation**

The numerical assessment of the programme Neurolinguistics (NL) can be summarized as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>very good, 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>excellent, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>very good, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitality</td>
<td>very good, 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality**

Although quite small, this is a strong group with a clear international perceptibility. The focus, and also the main strength, is on various types of language disorders, in particular aphasia, but there is also interesting work on language acquisition, both first and second. The finding that aphasic problems may be due to the temporal meaning, rather than to the inflectional properties, of the verb and may hence have a semantic cause rather than to mirror difficulties with morphosyntactic processing is a really challenging one. It will be taken up in a new and very promising project on time reference, not yet mentioned in the report. In terms of publications, the project has always been and continues to be productive. Its participation in the development of diagnostic tools is of eminent practical importance.

**Productivity**

The group is, especially in view of its small size, very productive, as shown not only in the number and place of publications but also by its contribution to the development of diagnostic tools.

**Relevance**

The group’s work on diagnosis of aphasia and other types of language disorders is of eminent societal importance.

**Vitality**

The group is clearly vital as such, with a dynamic staff and a recent major appointment in developmental disorders. About one aspect the PRC has some concerns. Collaboration with the overall neurocognition community in Groningen is labelled ‘promising’, while this research line and potential collaboration has been there for many years now.

**Chapter 3.6 Syntax & Semantics (S&S)**

**Programme leader** dr. J-W Zwart

**Tenured staff** 2.3 fte (2009)

**Total research staff** 11.75 fte (2009)

The Syntax and Semantics group studies syntactic and semantic phenomena with a view to understanding the nature of the human language faculty. Research activities are mostly not conducted by individuals but by project groups. Examples of subjects are: complex syntactic structures, the foundations of syntactic structure and semantics and cognition of interpretive processes.

**Evaluation**

The numerical assessment of the programme Syntax & Semantics (S&S) can be summarized as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>very good, 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>excellent, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>good, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitality</td>
<td>very good, 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Quality**

The quality of the work of the members that remain in the group in 2010 is internationally recognized in their research communities. The group has added a new, more empirical direction in semantics to the existing research profile and the work in syntax seems to evolve in a more typological direction.

**Productivity**

The members of the group publish widely in internationally recognized journals of the sub-discipline they belong to.

**Relevance**

Some of the work on semantics has the potential of societal relevance through its communicative perspective and the researchers involved in it make an effort to highlight the societal value of their work but the work in the syntactic...
minimalist framework is not done in a context that stresses societal relevance and must stand on its intellectual merits alone.

**Vitality**

Senior staff is reasonably young. The members of the group are dynamic participants in their sub-disciplines but the group, although small, is very heterogeneous. The cognitive semantic direction could be strengthened by the addition of an experimental semanticist. The syntactic component could profit from a more explicit grounding in computational data analysis. In general, stronger links to other groups would enhance the group’s capacity for survival.
### Appendix 1  
Staff (research and other) CLCG in fte/year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and present title</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Language and Cognition Groningen (CLCG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenured staff</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>94.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-tenured staff</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>48.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. students</td>
<td>23.45</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>25.95</td>
<td>31.50</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>155.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total research staff</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>47.95</td>
<td>44.40</td>
<td>49.50</td>
<td>54.20</td>
<td>52.25</td>
<td>298.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supporting staff</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total staff</td>
<td>50.40</td>
<td>48.35</td>
<td>44.80</td>
<td>49.90</td>
<td>54.60</td>
<td>52.65</td>
<td>300.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and present title</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I  Computational Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenured staff</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>12.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-tenured staff</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. students</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>49.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sub)total research staff</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>15.35</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>82.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and present title</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II  Discourse and Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenured staff</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>13.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-tenured staff</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. students</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sub)total research staff</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>23.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and present title</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III  Language and Literacy Development across the Life Span</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenured staff</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>17.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-tenured staff</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. students</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>26.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sub)total research staff</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>52.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and present title</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV  Language Variation and Language Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenured staff</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>22.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. students</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sub)total research staff</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>30.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and present title</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V  Neurolinguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenured staff</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-tenured staff</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. students</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>33.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sub)total research staff</td>
<td>12.55</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>60.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and present title</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI  Syntax and Semantics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenured staff</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>18.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-tenured staff</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>11.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. students</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>28.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sub)total research staff</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>58.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix 2  
Programme of the site visit

#### 2010 Peer Review Site Visit  
Assessment of Research Quality 2004 - 2009  
Centre for Language and Cognition, University of Groningen

**Wednesday, 17 November**

Starting dinner CLCG research evaluation 2010  
Location: Bistro ’t Gerecht, Oude Boteringestraat 43, Groningen  
6:00 pm

**Peer Review Committee (PRC)**  
Pieter Muysken (chair), Wolfgang Klein, Annie Zaenen

#### Thursday, 18 November

Location during the entire duration of the visit: Board Room  
(1315.0331) Harmonie Building  
Oude Kijk in ’t Jatstraat 26, Groningen
Appendices

Opening, Discussion of Goals
Gerry Wakker
Kees de Bot
Egon Dietrich (Faculty Treasurer)
Rita Landeweerd (Faculty Secretary)
John Nerbonne
Fennegien Brouwer
Heidi van den Heuvel

Interviews with the six groups
The protocol was the same for each research group (below).
The director and the group members of the CLCG advisory council (professors and group leaders) will be present. The group presented for 5 min, incl. 2010 updates (new grants, promotions). Followed by 20 min. for questions by the Peer Review Committee. The director of the institute (Nerbonne) was present at all six interviews.

Discourse and Communication
Gisela Redeker (leader)
Harrie Mazeland (deputy)
John Hoeks

Computational Linguistics
Gertjan van Noord (leader)
Johan Bos
Charlotte Gooskens

Language and Literacy Development across the Life Span
Kees de Glopper (leader), apology due to illness
Kees de Bot
Monika Schmid

Language Variation & Language Change
Muriel Norde (leader)
Cornelius Hasselblatt
Siemon Reker

Neurolinguistics
Roelien Bastiaanse (leader)
Ben Maassen

Syntax and Semantics
Jan-Wouter Zwart (leader)
Petra Hendriks
Jack Hoeksema, apology due to teaching duties

End of interviews with the six groups
Graduate students
Dörte Hessler
(Grad. Student Representative on Advisory Board)
Ruggero Montalto
Nynke van der Vliet

Discussion with postdocs
Hartmut Fitz
Nanna Haug Hilton
Peter de Swart
Mark de Vries

Friday November 19

9:00 - 10:00  PRC discussion with director Nerbonne
10:00 - 11:00  PRC Consultation
11:00 - 12:00  PRC presentation of preliminary findings and discussion
Open to FB and CLCG members
Informal lunch
PRC committee meeting and preparation of the report.
15:00  End of PRC site visit

Appendix 3  Peer Review Committee

The board of the university is responsible for the selection of the chair and further configuration of the external evaluation committee. The faculty and the unit to be evaluated were invited to suggest committee members. The selection procedure for chair and members ensured the competence, expertise, impartiality and independence of the evaluation committee as a whole. At the start of the site visit the PRC members signed a standard ‘Competence and independence of peer review committee members form’. According to the University of Groningen protocol for research evaluations www.rug.nl/corporate/onderzoek/kwaliteitszorg

The PRC for the evaluation of CLCG in 2010 consisted of three members and a secretary, their c.v.’s are listed below.
Brief cv’s

Prof. dr. P. Muysken, chair
Muysken holds a chair of General Linguistics at the Centre for Language Studies (CLS) of Radboud University Nijmegen. Professor Pieter Muysken researches the effects of increasing multilingualism and growing contact between various languages on the languages themselves and their speakers. His research focuses on migrant groups in the Netherlands, the Caribbean and various Indian languages in Latin America. In 1998 Professor Muysken received the Spinoza Prize from the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research.
www.ru.nl/linc and www.ru.nl/cls

Prof. dr. W. Klein
Klein is director of the Language Acquisition Group at the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics in Nijmegen and the. He is visiting professor at UCLA, Université de Paris VIII (repeatedly) and University of Peking (Bei Da, repeatedly). His research is aimed at how we learn a first, second or third language.
www.mpi.nl and www.mpi.nl/people/klein-wolfgang

Prof. dr. A. Zaenen
Zaenen is a Principal Scientist at the Palo Alto Research Centre, a XEROX company. She works on natural language technology with a current focus on lexical semantics. She is also a consulting professor at Stanford and co-editor of the online eLanguage journal Linguistic Issues in Language Technology.
www.parc.com/about/people/223/annie-zaenen.html

Dr. S.F. Brouwer-Keij MBA, executive secretary
Brouwer is policy advisor for research and valorisation at University of Groningen central offices (Bureau).
www.rug.nl/staff/s.f.brouwer-keij