

RESEARCH REVIEW
PHILOSOPHY
2012-2017

ONDERZOEKERIJ

De Onderzoekerij
Vondellaan 58
2332 AH Leiden

Phone: +31 6 24812176

Email: info@onderzoekerij.nl

Internet: www.onderzoekerij.nl



Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Preface..... | 6 |
| 1. Introduction | 7 |
| 1.1 Terms of reference for the assessment..... | 7 |
| 1.2 The Review Committee..... | 7 |
| 1.3 Procedures followed by the Committee..... | 7 |
| 1.4 Application of the SEP scores..... | 8 |
| 2. General observations and recommendations | 9 |
| 2.1 Introduction..... | 9 |
| 2.2 Research time..... | 9 |
| 2.3 External Funding..... | 10 |
| 2.4 PhD programme..... | 10 |
| 2.5 Diversity..... | 11 |
| 3. Assessment of the Tilburg Center for Logic, Ethics, and Philosophy of Science | 12 |
| 3.1 Quantitative assessment..... | 12 |
| 3.2 Research quality..... | 12 |
| 3.3 Societal relevance..... | 13 |
| 3.4 Viability..... | 13 |
| 3.5 PhD programme..... | 14 |
| 3.6 Research integrity..... | 14 |
| 3.7 Diversity..... | 14 |
| 3.8 Recommendations..... | 14 |
| 4. Assessment of the Institute of Philosophy, Leiden..... | 16 |
| 4.1 Quantitative assessment..... | 16 |
| 4.2 Research quality..... | 16 |
| 4.3 Societal relevance..... | 17 |
| 4.4 Viability..... | 17 |
| 4.5 PhD programme..... | 17 |
| 4.6 Research integrity..... | 18 |
| 4.7 Diversity..... | 18 |
| 4.8 Recommendations..... | 18 |
| 5. Assessment of the Groningen Research Institute for Philosophy (GRIPh)..... | 19 |
| 5.1 Quantitative assessment..... | 19 |
| 5.2 Research quality..... | 19 |



| | |
|---|-----------|
| 5.3 Societal relevance | 20 |
| 5.4 Viability..... | 20 |
| 5.5 PhD programme..... | 21 |
| 5.6 Research integrity..... | 22 |
| 5.7 Diversity..... | 22 |
| 5.8 Recommendations..... | 22 |
| 6. Assessment of the Utrecht Research Institute for Philosophy and Religious Studies | 23 |
| 6.1 The organisation of the Institute..... | 23 |
| 6.2 Ethics Institute..... | 24 |
| 6.3 History of Philosophy | 26 |
| 6.4 Theoretical Philosophy..... | 28 |
| 6.5 PhD programme..... | 30 |
| 6.6 Research integrity..... | 30 |
| 6.7 Diversity | 31 |
| 6.8 Recommendations..... | 31 |
| 7. Assessment of the Department of Philosophy of Erasmus University Rotterdam | 32 |
| 7.1 Quantitative assessment | 32 |
| 7.2 Research quality | 32 |
| 7.3 Societal relevance..... | 33 |
| 7.4 Viability..... | 34 |
| 7.5 PhD programme..... | 34 |
| 7.6 Research integrity | 34 |
| 7.7 Diversity | 35 |
| 7.8 Recommendations..... | 35 |
| 8. Assessment of the Department of Philosophy of VU Amsterdam..... | 37 |
| 8.1 Quantitative assessment..... | 37 |
| 8.2 Research quality..... | 37 |
| 8.3 Societal relevance..... | 38 |
| 8.4 Viability..... | 38 |
| 8.5 PhD programme..... | 39 |
| 8.6 Research integrity..... | 39 |
| 8.7 Diversity | 40 |
| 8.8 Recommendations..... | 40 |
| 9. The Dutch Research School of Philosophy (OZSW) | 41 |
| 9.1 Quality of the PhD and ReMa programme | 41 |
| 9.2 OZSW as a national forum for academic engagement in philosophy..... | 42 |



9.3 Recommendations 42

Appendix A – Curricula Vitae 43

Appendix B - Programme of the site visit..... 44

Appendix C.1 - Quantitative data TiLPS 48

Appendix C.2 – Quantitative data Leiden 49

Appendix C.3 – Quantitative data GRIPh 50

Appendix C.4 – Quantitative data Utrecht 51

Appendix C.5 – Quantitative data ESPhil 54

Appendix C.6 – Quantitative data VU 55

Appendix D – Meaning of the scores 56



Preface

This report contains the outcome of the evaluation of the research in philosophy at six Dutch universities over the period 2012–2017 as well as the assessment of the quality of the Dutch Research School for Philosophy.

As chairman of the Review Committee, I think I speak for all committee members when I say that we were impressed not only by the quality of the research we had to evaluate, but also by the efforts made by all institutes to show the relevance of philosophy to other disciplines and to society as a whole. Dutch philosophy is blooming, both inside and outside academia.

The Committee's work was greatly aided by the excellent set of materials that were provided. The self-assessments were all very well written, transparent, and informative. I also want to acknowledge how much we appreciated the very cooperative atmosphere we encountered during the interviews we had with the management teams, with the delegations of the researchers and with the PhD students. The first question we used to ask in our meetings with the management teams was what they were most proud of, and without exception the answer was "the collegial working atmosphere at our institute". The truth of this answer was confirmed in the interviews with the researchers and PhD students. Clearly, this working atmosphere has had a positive influence on the quality of the work delivered.

As chairman of the committee, I am very grateful that I could rely on five eminent colleagues with complementary philosophical expertise, and on the secretary of our Committee, Annemarie Venemans, who did much more than her official title of "secretary" suggests. "Coach" would be a better characterisation of her role, because she guided us through all the interviews, making sure that all relevant questions were asked, and keeping an eye on the rules set by the Standard Evaluation Protocol and the Terms of Reference. She also took care of us in other respects – making our week-long stay in Leiden a most pleasant experience. In this connection I also want to thank the staff of the Academy Building in Leiden for their hospitality and care.

Speaking for myself, I found it great to see the many ways in which philosophy manifests itself in the Netherlands. Serving as a member of a Review Committee is a most instructive experience, one that every professional philosopher should have. It's a pity this experience comes at the end of one's career and not at the beginning.

Frank Veltman, Chair of the Evaluation Committee



1. Introduction

1.1 Terms of reference for the assessment

The quality assessment of research in Philosophy is carried out in the context of the Standard Evaluation Protocol 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).

The Committee was asked to assess the scientific quality and the relevance and utility to society of the research conducted by six universities in the reference period 2012–2017, as well as its strategic targets and the extent to which it is equipped to achieve them.

Accordingly, three main criteria are considered in the assessment: research quality, relevance to society, and viability. In addition, the assessment considers three further aspects: the PhD training programme, research integrity and diversity.

The Committee was also asked to assess the quality of the PhD programme provided by the research school of the Dutch Research School of Philosophy OZSW.

This report describes findings, conclusions and recommendations of this external assessment of the research in Philosophy.

1.2 The Review Committee

The Board of the six participating universities appointed the following members of the Committee for the research review:

- Prof. Dr. Frank Veltman, Theoretical Philosophy, Emeritus Professor University of Amsterdam, Netherlands (chair of the Committee);
- Prof. Dr. Dieter Birnbacher, Ethics, Emeritus Professor, University of Düsseldorf, Germany;
- Prof. Dr. Maria Carla Galavotti, Theoretical Philosophy, Department of Philosophy and Communication Studies, University of Bologna, Italy;
- Prof. Dr. Susan James, History of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy, Birkbeck University of London, United Kingdom;
- Prof. Dr. Geoffrey Sayre McCord, Meta-ethics, Department of Philosophy, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, USA;
- Prof. Dr. Ruth Sonderegger, Philosophy of Art and Culture, Academy of Fine Arts Vienna, Austria.

More detailed information about the members of the Committee can be found in Appendix A. The Board of the participating universities appointed dr. Annemarie Venemans of 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 judgment was made without undue influence from the institutes 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, the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) 2015–2021 and the document “Quality indicators for Philosophy”. In addition, the Committee studied previous assessment reports.

The Committee proceeded according to the SEP. The assessment was based on the documentation provided by the institutes and the interviews with the management, a selection of researchers of the institute, and PhD students. The interviews took place on January 15–19 2019 (see Appendix B).



The Committee discussed its assessment at its final session during the site visit. The members of the Committee commented by email on the draft report. The draft version was then presented to the Institutes for factual corrections and comments. Subsequently, the text was finalised and presented to the Board of the universities.

1.4 Application of the SEP scores

The Committee used the criteria and categories of the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015–2021 (SEP). The meaning of the SEP scores is explained in Appendix D. The Committee would like to make a number of remarks with respect to using these scores.

Concerning research quality: All research units evaluated by the Committee are pretty successful in gaining external funding from NWO and ERC. They all conduct very good, internationally recognised, research. Therefore, according to the SEP, they all deserve at least a score of 2, “very good” for research quality.

In terms of research quality, some research units stand out from the rest. According to the SEP, the research quality of a research group is excellent (score 1) if that group is “one of the few most influential research groups in the world in its particular field”. The Committee discussed how to interpret “few” here. If it means “about 10”, then probably no research unit would qualify as “excellent”. If the idea is “top 100” then maybe all would. Since the SEP is not clear on this point, the Committee used the newly developed Quality Indicators for Philosophy as a supplement to SEP to grade the research quality. In the relevant cases the conclusive factor has been the impact of the work: Is it at the forefront of the developments in the field? Is the unit’s work agenda setting for the research in the field?

It is important to note that the criteria and scores used in this assessment are different from the criteria used in the previous assessment. What counted as ‘very good’ or ‘excellent’ back then, may not be very good or excellent anymore.

Concerning societal relevance: All research units make a ‘very good’ contribution to society. They put a lot of energy in informing a wider public about new developments in their field, they play an active role in public debates about all kinds of ethical and social issues, writing articles in newspapers, blogging, and giving interviews. In addition, most units spend part of their time doing research on topics of direct societal interest. This is of course quite natural for practical philosophers, but not so for theoreticians. Still, from the work they have done it appears that many societal issues can benefit from their analyses.

Also in this case some research units stand out from the rest. Their engagement with societal matters goes far beyond the things mentioned so far. The originality and impact of the initiatives they employed is so high that the qualification ‘excellent’ is appropriate.

Concerning viability: In Dutch universities, the number of students taught determine the amount of direct funding, and with this the size of the academic staff. In addition to this, a unit’s viability largely depends on the plausibility of success in gaining external funding.

In judging these factors, the Committee considered a number of features:

- Research strategy developed for the near future;
- Ability to retain staff members;
- Leadership;
- Inventiveness in response to threats.



2. General observations and recommendations

2.1 Introduction

Academic philosophy in the Netherlands is truly international in at least three ways: (1) Dutch philosophers present their work at an international level. (2) Roughly 25% of the philosophers working at Dutch universities come from abroad. (3) In the Netherlands one can find specialists in every major school of thought, from the Greek Presocratics to the French Postmodernists.

Not so long ago, the presence of various schools of thought could easily lead to polarisation and friction, in particular between "continental" and "analytic" philosophers. Nowadays there is a growing awareness that this so-called Continental-Analytic divide is an historical artefact. Many philosophers seek to solve their problems wherever these problems lead them, regardless of philosophical tradition, school or style. In epistemology, philosophy of mind, philosophy of language, and even logic there has been a movement towards cross-fertilisation, in particular between analytic philosophy and phenomenology. Given their broad education, Dutch philosophers can play a leading role here.

Perhaps the most profound development during the last twenty years within academic philosophy in the Netherlands is its growing "scientification". This research assessment may serve as an illustration of what this amounts to: what this Committee is doing is evaluating "research projects" carried out by "a team of researchers", often funded by the "national science foundation" or the "European research council" on the basis of a critical review by "a number of experts in the field". Twenty years ago, nobody would have guessed that this last sentence was about philosophy. There are styles of doing philosophy – and good philosophy, for that matter -- that do not fit well within such a regime, which does not leave much room for solitary thinkers.

Another development – also caused by the current funding regime – is the increasing importance of knowledge valorisation. To get funding for research one has to be able to say what it is good for. How can its results help to build a better society?

The Committee was impressed by the ways that all philosophy institutes exploited the societal relevance of their research. It was particularly interesting to see that every institute has developed its own strategy for doing so. Clearly, in philosophy, knowledge valorisation can be more than writing about your discipline for a general audience; it can be more than playing an active role in public debates about ethical and social issues. Nowadays philosophers themselves initiate such debates, or do research on topics of direct societal interest. For Dutch philosophers, paying attention to societal relevance is no longer something one does on the side. In many research programmes it is at the centre of their activities.

2.2 Research time

A general complaint among academics working in the humanities departments of Dutch universities is that their teaching load is so heavy that there is too little time left for research. One of the goals this Committee set itself was to find out to what extent this holds for philosophy but it turned out impossible to get a clear picture of the situation.

The main unclarity is connected with what in the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) is called the "research time allocated by direct funding". Officially, all staff members are allotted a certain percentage of their time for research. This percentage differs widely, not only from one university to another, but often also between UD, UHD and full professor. However, these percentages do not tell much, because not only the amount of time available for research but also the activities that count as research differ from one university to another. In some universities people get extra time to write grant applications, in other they are supposed to do so in their regular research time. Some departments have a sabbatical scheme,



which also affects the time available for research, some give a bonus to supervisors when a PhD project is successfully completed¹.

The amount of time available for research not only depends on direct funding. Staff members can buy themselves out of teaching time in order to devote more time to research by bringing in money from an external grant. Perhaps it is for this reason that the only complaints about teaching load the Committee got in its interviews came from staff members without an external grant. Among them, young UD's are most in need of some extra research time because they have to establish themselves in their field before they can take a shot at winning a major grant. The Committee recommends that the teaching load for this vulnerable group should be reduced.

2.3 External Funding

Philosophy has learnt to live with the funding schemes of NWO and ERC. Compared to other disciplines in the humanities, it is doing quite well in these programmes. Still, the kind of projects funded by NWO is not ideal. They are just too large. Philosophy would be served by grants for small or even individual projects, not only for PhD students (as in the NWO programme PhD's in the Humanities), but also for staff members who want to buy themselves out of teaching for one or two years (to write a book, for example).

2.4 PhD programme

The Committee interviewed a representative selection of PhD students from all programmes about their supervision, their independence, their possibility of getting some teaching experience, and the role of national graduate school. Here are some observations concerning these points.

Supervision: In all programmes PhD students now have at least two supervisors, and all programmes have rather rigorous regulations about the frequency of meetings, milestones, and evaluations. In most, but not all local graduate schools there is an independent person to whom students can turn if they are not satisfied with their supervisor. It is important that there is such a person, even if (s)he is only called on occasionally.

Independence: Most PhD students are employed in some NWO or ERC project obtained by one of their supervisors. This means they do not have much say in determining the topic of their dissertation. This is far from ideal, even though the students the Committee talked to felt they had enough freedom to find their own way in their project. There are talented students whose interests and ambitions don't fit in with the projects of their teachers. However, only a very few institutes possess enough funds to appoint one or two PhD students working on projects that they themselves define. This issue is worth pursuing within the other institutes as well. Even one such PhD position per year would already be an enormous improvement. (There is of course the possibility of applying for a grant in NWO's "PhD's in Humanities" programme, but unfortunately this amounts to 20 grants per year for all of the Humanities, in all of the Netherlands.)

Teaching opportunities: To be competitive on the academic market, one needs teaching experience, but not all programmes offer their PhD students the opportunity to build up their teaching experience, or the opportunity to attend teaching courses. There are also institutes that offer these opportunities only to students who are paid from direct funds. The Committee understands that within the Dutch academic bureaucracy with its diversity in funding resources, it is not so easy to treat all PhD students equally, independently of the way they are funded. But this is a case where one really has to apply one rule for all. A PhD programme has to prepare its students for the job market, and they all need the opportunity to get some teaching experience.

Some universities, in particular the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, have been experimenting with a new kind of PhD student. These students have a contract for 5 years and their position involves 50% teaching and

¹ In the Standard Evaluation Protocol the measure of success of a research unit in obtaining external grants is given by the percentage of research time that is paid for by external grants. More precisely, success = (external time/(external+direct time))x100%. Given that all Institutes deal with the research time that is directly funded in a different way, this measure gives a distorted picture of reality.



50% research time. It is too early to judge, but so far this construction seems quite satisfactory for all parties involved.

National graduate school: In principle, all PhD students have the opportunity to participate in the activities organised by the National Research School for Philosophy (OZSW)². Those who do so are happy with the quality of the courses and seminars offered. But not all PhD students attend these activities. There are several reasons for this, all discussed in Chapter 8 of this report. Here the Committee only wants to recommend that supervisors encourage their students to take advantage of the opportunities offered by the OZSW. It might be particularly fruitful for students to present their work at the yearly graduate conference.

Completion time: Based upon numbers in the self-evaluation reports the time it takes to complete a PhD thesis appears to be too long. The Committee was pleased to note that during the review period all institutes have taken measures to improve the submission rates. The Committee commends these initiatives, but recommends the Institutes to keep monitoring these rates and, if necessary, to take further measures to increase the numbers of postgraduates completing their PhD within four years.

2.5 Diversity

In all programmes, gender diversity remains a problem and ethnic diversity does so even more. All institutes are aware of this and all institutes have taken steps to adapt their hiring strategies.

The issue of diversity does not only rise when new staff members or PhD students are to be hired. It should also affect an institute's policy for selecting visitors and invited speakers, and it is also worth looking at the gender and ethnic bias in the curriculum to see how this can be diversified. Several philosophy programmes have been working on this. The Committee hopes the others will follow their example.

² Some PhDs in philosophy also join other national research schools (e.g. OIKOS for PhDs in ancient philosophy). It is not for this Committee to assess how well these other schools function.



3. Assessment of the Tilburg Center for Logic, Ethics, and Philosophy of Science

3.1 Quantitative assessment

The Tilburg Center for Logic, Ethics, and Philosophy of Science (TiLPS) sets itself the mission of being internationally renowned for research on foundational issues in philosophy of science and practical philosophy, in order to pursue a better understanding of how people reason and act.

The Committee assessed the quality, societal relevance and viability of the Center both quantitatively and qualitatively. Its PhD programme, research integrity and diversity are assessed 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 D and section 1.4. The qualitative assessment of the Center can be found in the next sections.

Given the standards laid down in the SEP, the Committee has awarded the following scores to the Institute:

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Research quality: | 2 |
| Relevance to society: | 2 |
| Viability: | 3 |

3.2 Research quality

During the period 2012–2016, TiLPS earned a reputation as an internationally renowned center for philosophy of science and practical philosophy. In an attempt to pursue a better understanding of how people reason and act, special focus of TiLPS research has been on knowledge acquisition and decision making. The Center has been particularly strong in the application of formal methods in these fields.

TiLPS members produced a great amount of publications, including over one hundred articles in refereed top-quality journals, five books, and an impressive number of chapters in edited volumes and conference proceedings. In comparison to the previous period evaluated, its overall productivity increased.

The Center considers the interdisciplinary nature of its research an important strength. The Committee agrees. A significant number of publications produced between 2012 and 2016 are co-authored with researchers operating in other fields, which is evidence of a successful interdisciplinary cooperation.

In the same period several grants were acquired, creating substantial external funding for the Center, and the possibility of hiring two PhD students and two post-docs. Moreover, the Center had a robust fellowship programme that brought in strong scholars from around the world, and significantly benefitted its faculty and PhD students.

A challenge facing the Center is the relatively high (compared to its peers) teaching load. The last review noted this and recommended a differential change in the allocation of research time. The Center followed that recommendation by diminishing the teaching load of some members of staff at the expense of other less well publishing members of staff. Unfortunately, as the self-assessment report states, this policy was met with a lot of resentment and therefore had to be abandoned. The Committee's sense is that serious progress has been made in alleviating that resentment and building a collegial community of scholars. Yet the original goal of diminishing the teaching load has not been achieved.

In view of the above, particularly the Center's record of publications and grants, the Committee has awarded the score "very good" to the Center's quality of research.



3.3 Societal relevance

TiLPS does a substantial amount of service teaching, and in line with this a number of introductory monographs for a wider public were written. The Committee considers the service teaching as well as the monographs written for a wider public as a valuable contribution not just to the university but to society.

In addition to this, TiLPS has been involved in a broad spectrum of outreach activities— taking part in the public debates on all kinds of topics with a popular blog, with publications in newspapers, and with interviews both in national and international media.

Moreover, a significant part of TiLPS research is concerned with topics directly relevant to society. This holds not only for the work done on practical and moral philosophy (PMP), but also for the work done on epistemology and philosophy of science (EPS). Highlights are the experimental work on the question whether moral value can bias explanatory judgement, and the work on the impact of inequality on wellbeing, but there are many more research projects aiming at a better understanding of issues that are relevant to society. TiLPS research programme is clearly committed to producing societal relevant work.

3.4 Viability

TiLPS is at a crossroads. For a variety of reasons, it has lost a large proportion of the faculty who were responsible for its strength and reputation in the use of formal methods. The strategic plan of TiLPS includes strengthening interdisciplinary research and establishing stronger links between Epistemology and Philosophy of Science (EPS) and Practical and Moral Philosophy (PMP). The basis for this has been laid by hiring some researchers working on ethics, political philosophy and philosophy of action. There was a plan for hiring one full professor in philosophy of science, but no suitable candidate has so far been found. Presently the situation is strongly unbalanced in favour of PMP, while the EPS component is much too weak to offer a solid prospect of maintaining the reputation achieved in the past, or even justifying the name of a Center for logic and philosophy of science. This is not a problem in itself, since change is inevitable, including change in the balance of strengths in a philosophy department. But it is a problem that the Center has not yet decided how to move forward.

Discussion with the leadership and the staff of the Center made clear that there is as of yet no settled plan. On the one hand, the aim of reviving its old strength and reputation is attractive. Yet the difficulty the Center has had in doing that, along with the fact that recent additions to the staff bring a different suite of strengths, might recommend going in a different direction with an eye to building a new signal strength.

An important bright spot, when it comes to long-term viability, is the healthy demand for the Tilburg Philosophy master's programme. However, matters are complicated by the Center's role in providing service courses to programmes outside of philosophy. The basic funding that comes from that teaching is essential for the survival of the Center. That means that, whatever direction the Center takes, it needs to hire people who can teach those courses. This has been its strategy since 2015 and a substantial amount of people have by now been employed with an eye to this service teaching, as well as in order to build a more sustainable research-profile. This strategy has made the Center less dependent on external funds.

The Committee was also concerned about two funding-related matters: The first is the noticeable decrease in acquiring research grants from 2014 onwards. The current funding model in the Netherlands means that securing external funding is key to the health of academic units, in philosophy as elsewhere. The Center's growing strength in PMP might help on this front, as might the interdisciplinary nature of much of its research. But given the heavy teaching load and the lack of a unifying character, it is unclear whether those resources will pay the dividends they would otherwise have. The University needs to invest in research time for their staff, if only to allow them the time to write applications that will win external funding. To their credit, the Center does provide some research time for younger faculty who are working on funding applications. In addition, TiLPS has managed to compensate for the decrease in funding by NWO and ERC by increasing their contract research substantially from 2016 onwards.

The second issue related to funding is that, instead of increasing the funding for the Visiting Fellows Programme, as the last external Committee recommended, that funding decreased by 40%. This is a pity and the Committee hopes more funds can be freed up for this programme in the future. The fellows the



programme brought in over the years were impressive and played an important role both in contributing to the vitality of the Center and in extending its international reputation.

Given the considerations above, the Committee could not give a score higher than 3 for viability. TiLPS has had, and continues to have remarkable strengths promising a bright future. But this promise can only be fulfilled with careful planning, effective leadership, new investments by the University, and a quick decision on what strategy to pursue for the near future.

3.5 PhD programme

The Tilburg School of Humanities and Digital Sciences (TSHD) Graduate School is responsible for the PhD programme. At the beginning of their trajectories, PhD candidates are registered at the Graduate School in order to monitor their progress and facilitate their participation in research education activities. When a PhD student is appointed a tailor-made training and supervision plan (TSP) is drawn up, which contains details on the composition of the supervision team, an outline of the research project, and a list of training activities to be undertaken by the PhD candidate.

The Committee concludes that the internal organisation of the TSHD Graduate School is sound and constructive. Students are not only closely monitored and tutored, but also well integrated into the Center's research environment. The participation of the Center in the national research school OZSW provides PhD students with a valuable national networking environment outside their own alma mater, as well as further resource opportunities that they exploit effectively.

The Committee interviewed current PhD students at various stages of development of their PhD research about their supervision, research facilities and possible constraints on their research. The Committee was pleased with the quality of the students they met. PhD students receive good supervision on a regular basis, are well integrated into the academic life of the Center, have access to travel money and are given the possibility of visiting other research centres.

There is only one concern: The teaching policy for PhD students is too strict. PhD students are allowed to spend 10% of their time teaching on subjects related to their PhD project. The Committee fears that this limitation to 10% may be disadvantageous to the students, given the current academic market in which having teaching experience can play a significant role in securing permanent positions.

3.6 Research integrity

Research integrity is part of all the activities of TiLPS, including research and teaching. Several staff members are engaged in committees on Research Ethics and Scientific Integrity.

3.7 Diversity

Within TiLPS, 23% of the staff and 60% of the PhD students are women. The Center is well aware that this is not yet the sort of gender balance that might be expected.

At the level of the School of Humanities and Digital Sciences several measures have been implemented to increase the diversity of the research population, but there is still a long way to go. The Committee is of the opinion that it would be good to also develop a more concrete plan at the Center level, tailored to the specifics of TiLPS.

The issue of diversity also arises in connection with the policy for selecting visitors and invited speakers, and in connection with the design of the teaching curriculum. The Committee applauds the efforts made by TiLPS to diminish the gender bias in these areas.

3.8 Recommendations

- TiLPS should quickly decide on a profile for the Center that will reflect and build upon current strengths of the Institute. In this connection, the priority is to establish the research profile of the professor who has to fill the vacant chair;



- With regard to the vacant chair, TiLPS should not let the needs of service course teaching drive hiring policy;
- If TiLPS is to live up to its current name, achieving a better balance between the EPS and PMP is crucial, and requires strengthening the EPS component. If in the new research profile, the focus is no longer on formal methods, the Institute should get a different name;
- TiLPS should devise a clearer policy for combining research and teaching for PhD students.



4. Assessment of the Institute of Philosophy, Leiden

4.1 Quantitative assessment

The Committee assessed the quality, societal relevance and viability of the Institute both quantitatively and qualitatively. Its PhD programme, research integrity and diversity are assessed 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 D and section 1.4. The qualitative assessment of the institute can be found in the next sections.

Given the standards laid down in the SEP, the Committee has awarded the following scores to the Institute:

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Research quality: | 2 |
| Relevance to society: | 2 |
| Viability: | 1 |

4.2 Research quality

With 5 full professors and a total scientific staff of 16.3 full-time equivalents, the Philosophy Institute can be classified as medium-sized. Given its size, its research output is remarkable both in quantitative terms (ten refereed articles, eight book chapters and two books per year on average) and in qualitative terms (to judge from the key publications referred to and provided by the self-assessment report). The Institute remarks that its output might be even more impressive if its researchers had a less heavy teaching load, which includes service teaching for other courses, among them a number of courses in The Hague. The amount of time left over from teaching duties for original research seem to be substandard in comparison with other institutes in the Netherlands, where at least 30% of the time budget is reserved for research. PhD supervision at Leiden is included in research time, though some allowance is properly made for designing and writing grant proposals. The situation is partly remedied by a sabbatical system; it is possible to collect hours towards a research semester over a five-year period.

The specific profile of the Institute can be characterised by its expressively stated “core value”, diversity. The Institute shows a remarkable determination in pursuing its own specific trajectory of working in a broad spectrum of fields, thus covering substantial parts of the whole of philosophy instead of concentrating on particular subfields. It took steps to develop its strengths in several diverse areas, including disciplines sometimes marginalised by other institutes such as Ancient and Medieval philosophy and Continental philosophy.

While the Institute used to be divided into separate programmes, it has now decided to integrate its programmes into one, partly because the individual programmes were too small to be viable, partly to encourage additional interaction between members and facilitate communication and co-operation between different areas of the subject. Judging from the interviews with the Committee, this aim has been successfully achieved, with the proviso that hardly any co-authorships are visible in its list of publications. The Committee was impressed by the closeness of the interaction between different areas of philosophy within the Institute, and the friendly overall climate. A problem that seems as yet unsolved is a certain imbalance in BA and MA supervision duties against the background of a greater demand for supervision in Practical philosophy and Continental philosophy.

Credit is due to the Institute for taking the courageous step of introducing the field of Comparative Philosophy in its research programme. This promises to open up new vistas within philosophy as an academic discipline, and allows some existing areas of research to be integrated into a new framework. It complements existing programmes within the University’s departments of History and Religion, and stabilises the Institute’s position within the Faculty. It is to be expected that this topic will in due course become a centre of gravity that attracts other able researchers.



4.3 Societal relevance

An important aspect of the societal relevance of philosophy is the role philosophy plays in courses and disciplines outside the philosophical curriculum, both on the elementary and the research level. Against this background, the Institute's contribution to the compulsory philosophy of science modules for all humanities bachelor programmes is to be welcomed. Some of the Institute's funded research programmes are interdisciplinary and clearly have the potential to be socially relevant; they include, for example, the ERC project on Secrecy and the project "Rethinking conflict and its relation to law in political philosophy". It is also clear from the five "societal publications" listed in the self-assessment report that the Institute makes its work available to the general public through articles in popular journals and other media, and through lectures to general audiences (for instance on existential problems and feminism). It has contacts with political officials and professional groups and is engaged in consultancy work. While the Institute sensibly does not demand that all its members should undertake socially relevant research, a significant proportion do in fact make their work available to audiences beyond academia. In line with its interest in comparative philosophy, the Institute regularly offers public talks on themes within extra-European philosophy, has contributed to a summer school on political philosophy in Cameroon, and has exchange programmes with universities in Chile and China.

4.4 Viability

The Institute's strategy of cross-financing research by introducing attractive bachelor and master courses to generate direct state funding has proved to be successful. Both the master track "Philosophy, Politics and Economics (PPE)", introduced in 2015, and the English-taught bachelor track, "Philosophy: Global and Comparative Perspectives" launched in 2017 have pushed student admissions to impressive heights. Leiden University with its comprehensive Humanities Faculty is particularly well equipped to host a teaching programme on Comparative Philosophy given its resources to provide students with appropriate language skills and a broad background in Non-Western cultures.

At the moment, the Institute has a number of staff vacancies, among them a professorship in Practical philosophy. The Committee was assured that they will be filled as soon as possible. If research in the Institute is to develop as it desires, it will need more research funding and more staff to fill the gaps, especially in its ambitious Comparative Philosophy programme. Fortunately, since its newly introduced courses have attracted many additional students, there is a solid financial footing.

The Committee is highly impressed by the inventiveness of the Institute in introducing the new research direction on Comparative Philosophy along with a BA course in this field. Even in its present shape the programme provides the Institute with a specific profile that makes it singular among Dutch philosophical institutes. The Committee shares the expectation of the Institute that this programme will be successful in the years to come and will considerably sharpen its research profile.

4.5 PhD programme

The inherent diversity of the research done at the Institute enables PhD students to choose from a wide range of topics, and they are largely free to choose any theme that the staff are capable of supervising. To judge from the interviews, PhD students are generally happy to be in Leiden, partly because of the very good working climate and relative lack of hierarchy, and partly because of the support they receive. For example, reading groups set up on the initiative of the students can expect help from the staff. The groups offer students an opportunity to get feedback on work in progress from other PhD students as well as from supervisors.

The supervision system, again, is elaborate and seems to keep a proper balance between freedom, encouragement and control. Each PhD student has two supervisors (an official promotor whom they see occasionally and a day-to-day supervisor whom they consult roughly once a month). Supervisors are often drawn from different areas of philosophy, and there is a lot of co-supervision. The supervision system is generally judged to be helpful, though some of the students think that there is still room for more regular quality control of supervisors. The fact that everyone who supervises a PhD student for the first time has to take a course about how to supervise shows that the management of the Institute is not only



aware of the problem, but has already taken active steps to remedy it. The writing of grant proposals is supported on both Institute and Faculty level, and PhD students can apply for funds to attend national and international conference attendance.

All these factors are important assets and seem to have contributed to an increase in the number of PhD students during the last assessment period. Interest is so high that the Institute has to decline applications. Admissions are limited, above all, by funding strictures. One consequence is that external and self-funded PhD students are not allowed to teach (they would have to be paid to do so), despite the fact that they need teaching experience in order to raise their prospects in a rather tight job market.

4.6 Research integrity

Integrity is less a problem in the humanities than in the natural sciences, and even less in philosophy than in other disciplines because philosophy seems inseparable from the individuality of whoever is doing it. However, philosophy has an important role to play in educating university staff and others in the standards of professional integrity, and in staffing ethics committees on professional integrity. The Committee welcomed the information that, while an ethics committee is being founded at Faculty level, members of the Institute already offer courses in integrity in other domains, including the natural sciences.

4.7 Diversity

The Institute is keenly aware that the gender distribution is still unsatisfactory and has not changed much since the last assessment. Though the gender distribution has become more equal on the PhD level, philosophy lags behind other humanities departments. The situation at Leiden does not differ significantly from that at other Philosophy Institutes, but the Committee was convinced by the leading staff that the Institute has undertaken active steps to adapt its hiring strategies. Selection committees increasingly take gender issues into account, without, however, compromising academic quality.

The proportion of international PhD students is increasing, partly due to the exchange programmes with several universities in China. The collaboration with Chile is currently being reviewed to solve organisational problems and a lack of suitable supervisors.

4.8 Recommendations

- The Institute has made an energetic and successful effort to stabilise itself within the Humanities Faculty and to build up a distinctive profile, in teaching as well as in research. It is already heavily involved with neighbouring disciplines in the Faculty. It might further stabilise its position by contributing to other degree programmes in the faculty, and by co-operative research. Its research strengths in Nietzsche studies, phenomenology and existentialist philosophy might provide a basis for this change;
- Though the public outreach of the Institute's work is admirable, it might be further strengthened by systematic monitoring, encouragement (e. g. in the hiring process) and integration into the Institute's general strategy;
- The Institute is clearly addressing its lack of diversity. However, there may be room for a more systematic approach to the problem that encompasses the need to introduce diversity into the curriculum, mentoring of minority staff and students, training in dealing with gender bias, as well as appointment processes at all levels.



5. Assessment of the Groningen Research Institute for Philosophy (GRIPh)

5.1 Quantitative assessment

The Committee assessed the quality, societal relevance and viability of the Institute both quantitatively and qualitatively. Its PhD programme, research integrity and diversity are assessed 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 D and section 1.4. The qualitative assessment of the institute can be found in the next sections.

Given the standards laid down in the SEP, the Committee has awarded the following scores to the Institute:

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

5.2 Research quality

Within the University of Groningen, Philosophy is an independent Faculty with a lively teaching programme. Research in the subject is guided, monitored and encouraged by the Groningen Research Institute of Philosophy (GRIPh). GRIPh contains three strands of research (Theoretical Philosophy; Ethics, Social and Political Philosophy; and History of Philosophy). However, despite their formal separation, individuals working in these areas constitute a single philosophical community. They collaborate with each other and with researchers in other disciplines.

During the assessment period, the Institute has maintained its well-established and justified reputation for research excellence. The Committee noted that its members have consistently published with leading university presses and in front rank international journals; some of their publications have been discussed at workshops and conferences around the world. Several members of staff and students have received prestigious awards. In addition, the Institute has won an impressive number of research grants, ranging from VENI grants to large-scale ERC awards. These have significantly increased the research time of its members.

The Committee was impressed by the Institute's co-operative ethos. The Institute prides itself on its open and non-hierarchical atmosphere, reflected, for example, in the fact that all staff, from Assistant to Full Professors, are allotted 40% of their time for research. (This includes supervising PhD students though not master students, and writing grant proposals.) The Institute also emphasises its internationalism. A third of its members come from outside the Netherlands and all its researchers look outwards when deciding where to publish and what networks to join. Many international visitors contribute to an active programme of talks, summer schools and conferences.

GRIPh acted on the recommendations of the 2011 assessment by maintaining its status as a Faculty, merging its Ethics and Practical Philosophy programmes, and extending the list of specified A+ journals, (but later abandoning the idea of attaching extra weight to A+ publications). After experimenting with various ways of monitoring its research output, it now encourages staff to publish in the venues they consider the best in their fields and most appropriate for their work. It also recognizes that it takes longer to produce a book than an article, and is prepared to sacrifice sheer quantity of outputs in the name of quality. Judging from its list of recent publications, this is working well.

The Institute's current aspiration is to work hard to maintain the level and kinds of excellence it has achieved. As far as the quality of its research is concerned, it aims to continue to attract the best researchers, expand its philosophical repertoire by making appointments in growing areas of the subject (climate ethics and philosophy of race were mentioned), and consolidate its areas of strength.



To achieve these goals, GRIPh needs to develop its strategy for winning research grants and adapt it to changing times. While it recognizes the advantages of large ERC grants, particularly for interdisciplinary projects, it emphasizes the value, for philosophers, of the smaller grants awarded by NWO. It has put a lot of effort into winning VENI grants and has become increasingly successful at doing so. (Between 2015 and 2017 it won 8 out of a total of 19 awards.) In the opinion of the Committee, more attention could perhaps be given to winning VIDI and VICI awards, in order to ensure that the overall level of grant income is maintained. The Institute's Management also suggested that it would be helpful if the NWO were to run a competition for small grants, for example to enable a researcher to finish a book.

The Institute works with several other faculties and departments within the University. It has, for example, set up a Philosophy, Politics, and Economics (PPE) programme, made a joint appointment in philosophy of physics, and formed links with economics. These interdisciplinary ventures are clearly important, but the Institute's primary goal is nevertheless to continue to produce outstanding research in the traditional heartlands of Philosophy.

The Committee was impressed by the Institute's philosophical achievements, which seem to have been helped along by its determination to sustain a non-hierarchical culture and its continuing status as an independent Faculty. In these respects, the Institute should indeed work to stay the same. At the same time, it needs to remain open to opportunities for change. The main challenge it faces is to sustain a fruitful balance between disciplinary and interdisciplinary research, between different areas of philosophical research, and – within each programme – between the research made possible by individual grants and the research of the programme as a whole.

5.3 Societal relevance

As a relatively large group of researchers, GRIPh has been well placed to respond to the demand that philosophy should be socially relevant. Some of the strategies it has adopted are familiar; its members contribute to newspapers and popular journals, give public lectures, and so on. In addition, anyone who applies for a grant has to say how their project will be socially relevant. But GRIPh has also taken a larger step. In 2010 the Faculty set up a Centre for Philosophy and Public Affairs, since renamed as the Knowledge Centre Philosophy (KCF). Its goal is to promote applied philosophical research within GRIPh, organise collaborations with external partners and make the Institute's research accessible to a wider public.

The Committee believes that this innovation has been extremely fruitful. KCF invites all the Institutes' researchers to regular meetings. Those who choose to attend are given the opportunity to explore ways of putting their work to socially relevant use. KCF then selects projects and works with the relevant researchers to put them into practice. Some of its most successful projects have been closely related to the local community, thus strengthening links between the University and other institutions in the region, while others have been national in scope. Projects of both types have influenced social policy and increased the visibility of GRIPh's research.

This approach has the benefit of allowing individual researchers to decide whether they want to develop the practical implications of their research. It also has the effect of institutionalising a boundary between the research carried on in the Institute and its application. There seems no reason why KCF should not continue to work in this way, as the Institute currently intends, and no reason why it should not continue to be successful. However, this approach is not the only one available. Where GRIPh separates doing philosophical research from applying it, other philosophy departments in the Netherlands are more inclined to elide the two activities. As they see it, philosophical research is an inherently social and practical enterprise – so much so that there is in effect no gap between examining a problem and putting to work in everyday life. In the coming years the Institute may wish to reflect on its relationship to this ancient, but also contemporary conception of the subject.

5.4 Viability

The Institute recognises that, if it is to remain successful, it must do more than bask in its current achievements. Internally and externally it must be ready to adapt to change.



However, the Institute is confident that it is internally resilient and that its ethos strengthens its capacity to retain staff and attract the people it wants. This confidence seems justified. The staff the Committee met all described the Institute as a friendly, easy-going place, where talented individuals give each other intellectual encouragement and support. At a practical level, for example, colleagues read drafts of one another's grant applications and run mock interviews. Less tangibly, they continually exchange ideas, whether in seminars or the corridor. (This is, the Committee believes, one of the important benefits of their non-hierarchical culture.) These conditions make GRIPh an exceptionally attractive place to work.

It was also striking that the staff the Committee spoke to did not seem to feel unduly burdened by administrative duties – a further advantage of working at GRIPh. This benefit is partly due to the fact that Philosophy is an independent Faculty within the University. As the previous research assessment noted, this status gives it a welcome measure of autonomy, particularly in relation to appointments, promotions, and the division of labour. The Institute can decide how to distribute the administrative load and make sure that none of its members are overloaded.

The Committee believes that to maintain the forms of resilience described above, the Institute clearly needs to retain its existing position within the University. However, like the University as a whole, it is also subject to external pressures, particularly from government. The Institute notes that NWO grants for research in the humanities may become more scarce. It is aware of the need to prepare for this eventuality, perhaps by applying for more ERC funding, as well as by strengthening its ability to compete within the NWO. Here the societal relevance of its research may be an important factor.

5.5 PhD programme

At present, the Institute is fortunate to have independent funding for four research students, two of whom are chosen from Groningen's Research MA programme in Philosophy and two from outside. (Over the assessment period various modes of selection have been tried and this one has been settled on.) Impending financial changes mean that in future only three students will receive this type of funding, but three is better than none. The Institute also has externally-funded Ph.D. students, usually attached to individual grants, and self-funded students. It aims to provide a friendly environment in which students of all types can internalize professional standards and pursue independent research. Thirty dissertations have been defended since 2012, though we were not given information about the career trajectories of the successful students.

Over the assessment period, GRIPh has tightened its supervision arrangements, partly with an eye to improving the training it provides, and partly with an eye to improving completion rates as far as possible. Each student now has two supervisors (often one more senior and one more junior). Although there seems to be no formal rule about how often a student and supervisor should meet, the students we talked to said they received enough help, from their supervisors, from other staff, and from each other. Once a year, student and supervisor meet with an independent staff member to assess the student's progress. In the first year, this meeting also determines whether the student can continue. These meetings were felt to be helpful, with one reservation described below. Students also have the opportunity to present their work at a fortnightly seminar and to organise conferences for research students at the Institute. Some organise and attend courses sponsored by the OZSW.

For broader training, students are able to attend courses, including teaching courses, within the University. Those funded by the University as a PhD student rather than as an employee are not eligible to take the Basis Kwalificatie Onderwijs (BKO) teaching qualification, and the Management would not recommend it. But students do gain teaching experience. They give regular classes attached to lecture courses, and occasionally give lectures themselves. Both students and staff were confident that this adequately prepares candidates for the job market. The Committee learned that the Institute helps students to write job applications and prepare for interviews, though the details of these arrangements were not clear.

The Committee formed the impression that there are three ways in which the PhD programme might be strengthened. First, there should be an independent person to whom students can turn if they are not satisfied with their supervisor(s). (This has implications for the design of the form that supervisor and student are required to fill in at the end of each annual assessment.) Relatedly, staff may need to be more



attentive to the insecurities and personal difficulties of their PhD students. Thirdly, it might help the Institute to assemble a placement record and use it to assess and advertise the strengths of its programme.

5.6 Research integrity

In addition to the Netherlands Code of Conduct for Scientific Practice, there are University specific rules and regulations and also an "Ethical Review Committee" for the three humanities faculties at Groningen. Nothing in the self-assessment suggests grounds for any notable problems or concerns.

5.7 Diversity

The Committee is of the opinion that the Institute urgently needs to increase the gender, ethnic and racial diversity of its staff and students. Of these imbalances, the easiest to correct is probably gender diversity; at present, women at all professional levels remain in a significant minority. The gender ratio is particularly poor in the case of professors, and rectifying it should be a top priority.

The Committee is convinced that the Institute is aware of this problem and is taking steps to bring about change. In its most recent round of appointments, for example, it began by considering all women applicants. There may nevertheless be room for a more comprehensive approach to gender diversity, and indeed to ethnic and racial diversity as well. Such an approach might aim to improve diversity within the curriculum, teach staff and students about gender bias, provide mentoring and other support for minority groups of staff and students, as well as address appointments and promotions. A great deal of knowledge about these issues is available, and it would be nice to see it more systematically applied.

5.8 Recommendations

- The Institute should remain open to opportunities for philosophical development and change;
- The Institute should take further steps to monitor and, where appropriate, document the strengths and weaknesses of its PhD programme, and where possible use the results to improve it;
- The Institute should develop a more systematic policy for increasing diversity;
- The Institute should keep its successful approach to demonstrating the societal relevance of its research under review;
- Philosophy should remain an independent Faculty within the University.



6. Assessment of the Utrecht Research Institute for Philosophy and Religious Studies

6.1 The organisation of the Institute

The Utrecht Research Institute for Philosophy and Religious Studies (henceforth OFR) is one of the four research institutes hosted by the Faculty of Humanities of Utrecht University.

Here, OFR's research programmes in philosophy are assessed: History of Philosophy, Theoretical Philosophy, Practical Philosophy/Ethics Institute. Together these programmes cover a large part of philosophy, while each programme individually seeks interdisciplinary collaboration with the disciplines that are most relevant to its research agenda. Utrecht University offers ample opportunities for such collaborations via the interdisciplinary and cross-faculty Strategic Themes and Focus Areas. Theoretical Philosophy and the Ethics Institute play an important role in the strategic theme "Institutions for open societies", while the focus area "History and Philosophy of the Sciences and the Humanities" has been very important for both Theoretical Philosophy and History of Philosophy.

Apart from a strong interdisciplinary orientation, these three programmes share solid methodological standards and a tendency to concentrate on "key notions" – fundamental concepts governing science and/or society, like "human dignity" (studied in the Ethics Institute), "information" (studied in History of Philosophy), and "reasoning" (studied in Theoretical Philosophy).

The Institute facilitates the work within the three research programmes in various ways. It publishes a regular newsletter, it organises colloquia and lunch lectures for the Institute as a whole, it employs coaching activities supporting the writing of grant proposals and oversees the graduate programme and the supervision of PhD students – all this to the satisfaction of all concerned.

The Committee assessed the three research programmes of the Institute both quantitatively and qualitatively. Its PhD programme, research integrity and diversity are qualitatively assessed on Institute level.

One more topic to be discussed at the Institute level is the topic of research time. OFR differs from all other research institutes taking part in this assessment procedure in that the default (in the entire Faculty of Humanities) is to assign more research time to UHD's and full professors than to UD's. This seems unwise. Even though it is a default rule with many exceptions, the default should be the other way around. As the Committee already noted in Chapter 2, the junior staff are most in need of some extra research time because they have to establish themselves in their field before they can take a shot at a major grant (and buy themselves into more research time that way).

In the next three sections the qualitative assessment of the research programmes, discussed separately, can be found. Based on this, the Committee concluded that according to the criteria laid down in the SEP the following (quantitative) scores should be assigned.

| | Ethics Institute | History of Philosophy | Theoretical Philosophy |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Research quality | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Relevance to society | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Viability | 1 | 2 | 2 |

The fact that these three research programmes are separately assessed might suggest that the three groups work in isolation. There is, however, quite a lot of cross fertilisation and cooperation, which resulted in a number of high-quality publications. OFR has asked for scores both on the level of the three research programmes and on the Institute's level. The Committee saw no reason why the general score would



deviate a lot from the mean of the individual scores, and therefore assigns the following scores to OFR as a whole:

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Research quality: | 2 |
| Relevance to society: | 1 |
| Viability: | 2 |

6.2 Ethics Institute

Quality

With seventeen staff members, the Ethics Institute is one of the largest of its kind in Europe. Given its size and the diversity of its members' competences and interests, research at the Institute covers a broad spectrum of research topics. These are held together, however, by a common strategy and a common methodology.

Its strategy and at the same time its distinctive profile are bringing together the detailed ethical analysis of concrete issues from individual, social and political life with reflection on fundamental categories of moral discourse. The concrete topics the Institute has been working on are, for the most part, topics of current public and political debate, among them problems in climate ethics, energy ethics, animal ethics and other topics in bioethics as well as the various social justice dimensions of economic policies. Work on concrete issues is given a properly philosophical dimension by being linked to fundamental ethical notions like human dignity, social justice and sustainability. These notions are not only of interest because they underlie the debate on concrete moral issues, but also because they are notorious for openness of meaning and the danger of being interpreted in partial, manipulative and interest-driven ways.

The methodology is characterised by three elements: what might be called robust interdisciplinarity, seeking contact and cooperation with researchers in relevant practical fields; analytically rigorous thinking; and a straightforward philosophical style that makes the academic output accessible to the general reader. Methodological issues are regularly discussed in a colloquium to which all researchers of the Institute are invited.

The Institute scores high in all dimensions of quality. The articles issuing from its work are published in journals with a high reputation in the ethics community such as the *Journal of Medical Ethics*, the *American Journal of Bioethics*, *Environmental Ethics* and the *Jahrbuch für Wissenschaft und Ethik*. The average of refereed articles is fourteen per year. There is a slightly higher average in chapters of edited volumes on specific issues and a high rate of editorship of books published by internationally leading publishers such as Routledge and Springer.

The work of the Institute is widely known internationally, and there have been regular invitations to editorships, guest editorships, contributions to anthologies, among them one of the more recent Cambridge Handbooks, dedicated to the concept of human dignity. A textbook on bioethics authored by one of the Institute's leading researchers was recently translated into Chinese and published in 2017. A further credit of the Institute is that it initiated and has been editing a journal that makes an explicit attempt to provide a bridge between academic ethics and social morality, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, published by Springer. A number of articles and edited volumes issuing from the Institute has had a seminal function for innovative topics of applied ethics, opening up new fields of discussion, such as the work on animal end of life (a project together with Wageningen University, publication 2016), including the long-neglected moral problem of killing fish (article publication 2013) and on environmental human rights (edited volume Routledge 2018).

The Institute's research is highly visible and widely recognised by peers. Within Utrecht University, the Institute collaborates (and thereby gains substantial additional funding) with four interdisciplinary and cross-faculty "strategic themes": 'Institutions for open societies' (IOS), "Pathways to Sustainability", "Life Sciences", and "Dynamics of Youth". Outside the University, the leading researchers of the Institute enjoy a high academic reputation. One of its leading researchers was recently elected member of the Royal Academy (KNAW). Another researcher has been elected head of the central institution for ethics of animal use in the Netherlands.



The strategy of cross financing graduate research by introducing attractive undergraduate courses to generate state funding has proved to be worth the effort. This applies, for example, to the Artificial Intelligence (AI) course, which is under consideration, but has not been approved yet. EI's involvement with this focus area is also under consideration. Beyond funding, it offers new perspectives and new forms of co-operation among the theoretical and the ethical programmes. Another case in point is the recently introduced Philosophy, Politics and Economics (PPE) programme at the Bachelor level, which has paved the way to hiring a new assistant professor contributing to the research output of the Institute in 2018.

Societal relevance

Applied ethics is inherently societally relevant. The Institute does much more than publish articles and monographs with the expectation that they will gain the attention of social and political stakeholders. It aims at a more direct impact on public bodies and audiences, and pursues this aim with unusual consistency. The judgement made in the last assessment that "the total portfolio of activities amounts to exemplary policy and public engagement" continues to hold without qualification for the period under assessment. Societally relevant work has ranged from lectures to students in other faculties to public lectures to international, national and institutional audiences and to advisory work on diverse levels. Several members of the group regularly give lectures to physicians and health care professionals. As was already mentioned, one member of the Institute has been elected head of the central institution for ethics of animal use in the Netherlands, an increasingly sensitive topic of public discourse. Contacts reach as far as politicians on a national level, e.g., concerning future ethics and the option of appointing an ombudsman for future generations on the model of countries such as Hungary and Israel.

The Institute consistently aims at dissemination of ethical competence to the general public. The self-assessment report mentions a considerable number of publications in Dutch designed to further ethical reflection and education on matters of general societal interest, such as economic institutions, professional ethics, environmental and climate issues, and sports. In some areas of research, the Institute has made an explicit attempt to publish the results of a more academic discussion in a form attractive to the general public. A case in point is the open-access book "Towards the Ethics of a Green Future" (Routledge 2018), a sequel to the European Science Foundation Network "Rights to a Green Future" organised by members of the Institute. Moreover, members of the Institute regularly give public talks on live issues, which is, ultimately, a favour not only for the public but also for philosophy, since it exemplifies the potential of philosophy to clarify societal concerns and to encourage reflection on central values. Especially noteworthy is the series "Ethical Annotations", a regular online publication forum where the group presents ethical arguments on important topics in a format aimed at a wider audience. Titles of public talks such as "Ethiek voor Apotheker" not only signal the preparedness of the Institute to bring applied ethics to bear on those whose job it is to put it into concrete action, but demonstrates a significant innovative potential.

Viability

The prospects for the Ethics Institute to thrive in the future are, on the whole, bright. The general direction of its current research promises to serve as a solid foundation for the future. Given that several of its themes are not only sustainable but almost certain to become more prominent, e. g. in biomedical ethics, animal ethics, and energy ethics, the Institute is well prepared for the next period. The Institute's announcement that it will further pursue research topics such as human rights and social-economic ethics is to be welcomed, as are its plans to intensify the strategic alliance with Eindhoven University of Technology on issues concerning the social and ethical questions of sustainability and energy ethics. The new focus area AI with its future potential implies the prospect of a fertile and innovative agenda for applied ethics on topics such as privacy, participation, discrimination and democratic legitimacy. The same can be assumed to hold for the public outreach aspect of the Institute's work. There is growing public interest in contributions by philosophers to debates where the increasing complexity of social decisions calls for reliable and sober judgments.

The Institute has a well-established position within the University, which is confirmed by its many and various co-operations with other faculties and departments. There is no reason to assume that its past



success in attracting able researchers will diminish. On the contrary, the issues addressed by the leading researchers of the Institute, on the one hand human rights and on the other social justice, seem to have a considerable potential for the time to come and are broad enough to be relevant to a large variety of more special topics. The fear expressed in the last assessment, that the work of the Institute might be fragmented by taking on too many commitments within applied ethics, seems, as far as the last six years are concerned, unfounded.

Recommendations

- The Institute is encouraged to continue and to further develop its strategy of interweaving the ethical analysis of concrete present-day social problems and the systematic reflection on fundamental ethical concepts and orientations. The fear of an imbalance in the Institute's work towards socially relevant topics and a corresponding weakening of its efforts to contribute to fundamental ethical issues is not borne out by the record of its publications in the period under review. On the contrary, this list confirms the integrative strategy of the Institute and demonstrates its fruitfulness. Nevertheless, since attracting public controversy may sometimes be seductive, it is important not to be overly distracted from work on the foundations of ethics, metaethics and ethical anthropology. In practice, however, this warning may be unnecessary since it is already addressed as a threat in the Institute's own SWOT list;
- Given the stature of the Institute, and the extensive infrastructure for PhD students provided on department level, the current number of PhD students seems moderate. It might be increased in the coming period.

6.3 History of Philosophy

Quality

History of Philosophy is subdivided into two sections covering the history of ancient and medieval philosophy and the history of early modern and modern philosophy. It has a research staff of three full-time professors (one recently appointed), one special professor, two assistant professors (both recently appointed), and two postdocs.

The programme has recently gone through a period of major change and has acquired new staff (both senior and junior) with new specialisations. One consequence of the change is a slight reduction in the programme's total research time (which includes time spent supervising PhD students and writing grant proposals). Junior staff, who are allocated 30% of their time for research, are under pressure to publish and apply for grants, while senior staff feel the burden of their administrative responsibilities. Nevertheless, the group has extended the range of areas in which it has expertise. It includes specialists in ancient philosophy including the philosophy of medicine, neoplatonism, early-modern philosophy, and philosophy from the eighteenth to the twentieth centuries. These distinct areas gain overall coherence from two shared methodological commitments: to a contextual approach informed by historical and philological learning, and to the project of tracing the emergence of major philosophical concepts. The results are both historical and systematic, as is evident, for example, in the group's work on realism and its new project on the idea of Europe.

The programme's members and their associates have published extensively (their publication list includes 38 refereed articles, 5 books and 66 book chapters), and several of them are involved in major editing projects. A good proportion of their research has appeared in leading journals or with major publishers, and the work of the group's senior members is internationally known and greatly respected.

The group has been successful in gaining external funding. During the assessment period three members of staff won substantial grants for ongoing projects, and the programme also became home to two VENI projects. The dip in grant funding at the end of the assessment period has been offset by further successes, so that the overall level of grant income remains stable.

The group emphasises that it co-operates extensively with the other philosophy programmes and with other institutions within the University, including the Descartes Centre. The extent of these collaborations was not entirely clear to the Committee, perhaps because of the University's decision to assess each of its



philosophy programmes separately, but they are clearly an important element of the groups' research. The group also has an impressive range of European connections. Here its links with other philosophers, and with researchers in related disciplines, are widening. Through these links, the group is consolidating its international reputation in new areas, while maintaining most of its established strengths.

While the number of PhD students in the History of Philosophy group is relatively small, the group's reputation attracts high quality candidates from the Netherlands and other parts of Europe. During the assessment period, the number of funded PhD students rose, and three degrees were awarded in early modern or modern philosophy. The programme is content with its PhD numbers, and the students we met praised its open and co-operative atmosphere.

Societal relevance

Since the previous assessment, the programme has taken great strides in making its research more visible and more obviously socially relevant. Several of its members "go public" in the literal sense of disseminating philosophical knowledge, inspiration and reflection outside the walls of academia. A concern to show how the history of philosophy is relevant to our lives is reflected in some of the group's publications, where historical debates are brought to bear on contemporary ones. The group has also won grants to contribute to broad interdisciplinary initiatives involving events for the general public. These include contributions to the "Anchoring Innovation" project, and to the University's strategic theme "Institutions for Open Societies". The group has also set up a series of interdisciplinary workshops and conferences on the future of the sciences and humanities. These events, which are a work in progress, involve policy makers and university administrators as well as academics.

The group's research has had a significant effect on formal education in the Netherlands. One of its members has created and tried out a new course for school students (soon to be rolled out nationally). He also organises a regular conference for school teachers, and has founded a society open to members of the public. Other members of the programme give regular philosophy courses to older citizens, and give talks in schools.

A further major initiative is the Spinozaweb. This online resource provides scholars, students and members of the general public with easy access to documents relating to Spinoza's life and work, thus helping to maintain Spinoza's heritage in the Netherlands.

In its self-assessment, the group notes that, while its social impact has so far largely been via events, it is now starting to produce more socially relevant publications. While this is admirable, the Committee wonders if it is necessary. The group currently makes creative pedagogic use of its knowledge and expertise, and has developed a repertoire of valuable activities. Perhaps it should put its energy into strengthening them. For example, there are plans to broaden the history of philosophy teaching curriculum to cover some of the relationships between western and non-western philosophies. As these come to fruition, they will reveal new areas of social relevance and new possibilities for pedagogical social impact.

Viability

The viability of the History of Philosophy programme is not in doubt, though it faces some potentially serious obstacles. Over the last few years it has demonstrated its resilience by attracting new staff (including an internationally respected scholar) and broadened its research profile. It has maintained a healthy publication record, won prestigious grants, come to play a more active role in the university, extended its interdisciplinary initiatives, and developed a lively programme of academic and public events.

These achievements also offer a range of opportunities. As the group points out, it is well placed to extend its international networks and increase its involvement in interdisciplinary activities within the University and beyond. To this list one might add the opportunity to consolidate its achievements in making its research relevant to the general public, and the opportunity to extend its reputation for excellent research into new areas.



At present, the programme's philosophical reputation centres on its senior staff, and in the longer run this is a threat to its viability. If junior staff are to establish themselves in their fields, they will almost certainly need some relief from heavy teaching loads and other duties. Since the usual way to gain relief is to win a grant, and the struggle for grants is becoming increasingly competitive, the programme needs to support them in this endeavour. Currently, the University provides research support and seed money for developing grant proposals, while the programme helps its members draft proposals and stages mock interviews. In a relatively small group like History of Philosophy it seems particularly important to provide each individual with the right kind of support. While the programme has weathered a difficult period, its success over the next few years will depend on the success of its junior staff.

The self-assessment document also mentions another difficulty – that relatively few students take courses in the history of philosophy. The need to attract bachelor and master students to the programme (and thus increase the supply of PhD applicants) by offering more enticing courses is to some extent in tension with the need to publish cutting edge research. However, the programme has many promising ideas about how to reconcile the two. Its work in the philosophy of medicine, in the philosophy of gender, and in the relations between European and other philosophical traditions could surely form the basis for a range of popular courses. In addition, the group is considering how it might increase its student numbers by contributing to a wider range of interdisciplinary courses. As these proposals indicate, it is thinking creatively about ways of dealing with the difficulties it faces and is poised to put its plans into practice.

Recommendations

- The programme should ensure that it continues to support the Spinozaweb as a cultural resource;
- The programme should continue to try to increase its student numbers by adapting its history of philosophy curriculum and pursuing interdisciplinary teaching projects;
- Given that programme's research in ancient philosophy includes the history of ancient medicine and falls into the field of Medical Humanities, it might think of intensifying contacts with the Utrecht Medical Centre.

6.4 Theoretical Philosophy

Quality

Between 2012 and 2018, the profile of the Theoretical Philosophy (TP) group considerably changed. Whereas back in 2012 research centred on mathematical logic and its applications in the foundations of mathematics and in philosophy of language, the field covered by TP has considerably broadened. Firstly, in addition to logic and philosophy of language, other branches of theoretical philosophy, notably epistemology, metaphysics and the philosophy of mind become fields of investigation. Secondly, logical methods are still important, but now they are also applied in the field Artificial Intelligence, metaphysics and epistemology. And thirdly, the TP group has invested a lot of time working on topics of fundamental concern to society, thereby showing that highly theoretical considerations can help solve some of the problems today's society is facing.

Perhaps the above suggests that the research programme of TP has become a receptacle of widely different projects. Yet, this is not the case. The projects pursued by the group are linked together by a central theme: the philosophical analysis of reasoning.

TP's research is well embedded in the university. Important for the mathematical logicians in TP is the link with the Mathematics Institute. One of the joint activities is the organisation of the Colloquium on Mathematical Logic, in which also the mathematical logicians at the University of Amsterdam participate. Important for TP members with an interest in the philosophy of science is the link with the Descartes Centre, in particular the Philosophy of Science Seminar organised there. Hopefully History and Philosophy of the Sciences and the Humanities will remain a focus area within the university, so that this platform for interdisciplinary research can keep flourishing. There is a fair chance that Artificial Intelligence will become one of the new focus areas of the university. If so, this could give an enormous boost to TP's research in this field, because it would mean that the existing co-operation in teaching between TP and other groups



in the university can be extended to research. TP also participates in the interdisciplinary strategic theme "Institutions for Open Societies", where TP brings in its work on conspiracy theories.

Within TP, the work done by the "old" logic group on mathematical logic, and particularly in proof theory and provability logic, can still compete with the best work worldwide in this area. The academic reputation of the leaders of this team is excellent. This is not only clear from the number of publications in top journals, but also from other quality indicators as, for instance, membership of the Royal Dutch Academy of Arts and Sciences, (chief) editorship of a top journal like the *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, and grants acquired, witness the recent VICI grant for the project *Optimal Proofs*.

The research done by the other teams in TP deserves the predicate "very good". They publish less frequently in top journals (or proceedings of top conferences) than the mathematical logicians, but their work certainly plays a significant role in the international community. Other indicators (ERC consolidator grant, NWO free competition) are in line with this qualification.

Societal Relevance

The TP group has always been very good at informing a wider public about new developments in analytic philosophy. The list of publications written with this aim during the period 2012–2017 in national newspapers is again impressive.

In addition to this, the TP group played an active role in several public debates. Climate change, religion vs. science, free will vs neuroscience are some of the issues addressed and the communication channels used to reach a wider audience included not only articles in newspapers, but also public lectures, interviews, short courses, and blogs.

As already noted, a new development within TP is that nowadays some of the research itself is concerned with topics of societal interest, witness the work on conspiracy theories, and the REINS project on responsible intelligent systems. The work on conspiracy theories is part of a larger interdisciplinary enterprise, the COST Action network COMPACT (Comparative Analysis of Conspiracy Theories). The REINS project does not only purport to raise public awareness of the ethical issues connected with Artificial Intelligence, but also seeks to build intelligent systems with reasoning capacities that can help them to act responsibly.

The self-evaluation report mentions the following as one of the topics which constitute the basis for activities related to societal relevance: "To what extent, and in which way can our scientific knowledge (about the neuro physiological functions of the brain, about behavioural dispositions shaped by evolution, about the nature of biological processes, etc.) be of relevance to our self-understanding?" This is an important question, which could provide a firm basis for cooperation with other departments at UU, such as the Psychology and Biology departments, not just in connection with societal relevant initiatives, but also for the sake of interdisciplinary research.

Viability

The TP group owes its size largely to the number of AI-students. Since this number keeps growing in the short term the viability of TP is not in danger. In the long term this might change. As the self-assessment states: "We need to ensure that logic-based methods for AI remain a key aspect of the AI teaching and of the AI research profile in Utrecht." The Committee agrees that this is certainly important. However, in addition to this, the TP group might seek to strengthen its expertise in the area of "learnability" and closely related areas like "abduction" or "Bayesian statistics". There is a lot of foundational work to do in these areas, and since the role of pure logic in AI is decreasing, it might be fruitful to invest in this.

Another quote from the self-assessment is: "Our proximity to the ILLC in Amsterdam poses a threat to our ability to recruit graduate students who want to pursue studies in logic. We need to ensure that our research profile in logic is sufficiently different from the ILLC, and that it is appealing and easy to communicate." The Committee agrees with this. Actually, given the way TP's profile has developed over the past few years, it is already safe to say that TP now has its own, appealing profile. Still, it would be not very wise to look at the ILLC as a competing institute and not seek more co-operation. There has already



been fruitful research co-operation in the field of provability logic. In the opinion of the committee this can be extended to other fields. Also, it would be good, for both TP and ILLC, if research master students and PhD students in Utrecht could standardly take courses in ILLC's master of Logic track and vice versa. The proper way to formalize this would be via the Nederlandse Onderzoekschool Wijsbegeerte (Dutch Research School of Philosophy).

Recommendations:

- The TP group might seek to strengthen its expertise in areas like formal learning theory, and (Bayesian) statistics, which could give new impetus to foundational work in (explainable) AI;
- The TP group should extend research and educational collaborations with ILLC;
- The TP group should seek collaboration with psychologists and biologists to investigate how recent developments in these fields can be relevant to our self-understanding;
- It is hoped that the TP group will keep contributing to the good reputation of UU as a centre for research in philosophy of science, through an effective collaboration with the philosophers of science working in the Freudenthal Institute and elsewhere in UU.

6.5 PhD programme

The Research Institute for Philosophy has no independent funds for supporting PhD students. So, most PhD students are employed in externally funded projects, which means they do not have much say in choosing the topic of their project. Still, the PhD students we interviewed felt quite happy with the freedom their supervisors gave them to find their own way within their project.

Since the previous assessment, the OFR has tightened up its arrangements for training and assessing its students. There are faculty guidelines for supervision. Within the setup, a special, much appreciated role is played by the Research Co-ordinator, to whom students can turn for assistance and advice, also in case there are problems with the supervision.

Students gain teaching experience by giving exercise classes and leading seminars. Sometimes they can move on to giving lectures. The University offers general seminars on how to teach. Although students are not able to gain the BKO teaching qualification, it is generally felt that the available training adequately prepares them for the job market.

In its self-assessment, OFR expresses its concern about the rate at which its students complete their degrees. Despite the measures taken to improve the quality of supervision, the rate of completion remains difficult to control. It looks like many individual factors have to be taken into account.

The programme clearly manages to place students. About 75% of the PhD students go on to work in academia. The remaining 25% get to work for a non-profit organisation or a commercial company.

6.6 Research integrity

As in all Dutch research institutes, the principal framework of regulations on research integrity is The Netherlands Code of Conduct for Scientific Practice, formulated by the Association of Universities in the Netherlands. In Utrecht research integrity is further embedded in Utrecht University's Code of Conduct for Scrupulous Academic Practice and Integrity.

Several philosophers working in the Ethics Institute play an important role in designing teaching activities in the field of research integrity, and in implementing them throughout the university. The Graduate School of Humanities offers annual seminars for PhD candidates on the theme of research integrity. All PhD candidates are supposed to attend this seminar and upon graduation every PhD candidate declares to uphold the standards of academic research integrity.



6.7 Diversity

During the assessment period the Faculty of Humanities made much progress in increasing gender diversity, but the Department of Philosophy and Religious studies lags far behind the other departments in this faculty. Within the History of Philosophy programme, for example, all senior professors are male and only one assistant professor is a woman. This is not to say that no attempts have been made to achieve greater diversity. Unfortunately, so far these had limited success.

The Department has made some efforts to increase diversity within the curriculum. There is now some attention to philosophy and gender, and to non-European philosophies. But work remains to be done. The Committee got the impression, for example, that most invited speakers are male, though OFR reports that its students value female role models. It seems that there is room for a more informed and systematic approach to increasing diversity of all kinds within the programme.

6.8 Recommendations

- The Institute should do all it can to support its junior staff in building up their career;
- The Institute should develop a more systematic set of policies for increasing diversity.



7. Assessment of the Department of Philosophy of Erasmus University Rotterdam

7.1 Quantitative assessment

The Committee assessed the quality, societal relevance and viability of the Institute both quantitatively and qualitatively. Its PhD programme, research integrity and diversity are assessed 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 D and section 1.4. The qualitative assessment of the Institute can be found in the next sections.

Given the standards laid down in the SEP, the Committee has awarded the following scores to the Institute:

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Research quality: | 2 |
| Relevance to society: | 1 |
| Viability: | 1 |

7.2 Research quality

The four research groups of the Erasmus University of Rotterdam's (EUR) Erasmus School of Philosophy (ESPhil) are united by the School's twofold policy: (1) to produce scholarly knowledge and (2) to be of societal relevance.

Until recently, ESPhil consisted of four rather independent research groups that were all led by different chairs. However, such division was given up in 2015 in favour of a programme that is simply called "Philosophy". It branches into four projects, namely (1) Philosophy and Economics, (2) The Structure of Reality, (3) The Making of Modernity, and (4) The Constitution of Subjectivity.

(1) The first project is closely related to but not identical with the Erasmus Institute for Philosophy and Economics (EIPE) because some of EIPE's members who mainly research and teach abroad are rather associated with EIPE than with ESPhil. The research done by EIPE members spans over a wide range of topics including the methodology of economics, especially behavioural economics and neuro-economics, the relationships between economics and ethics, the foundations of decision theory, game theory and social choice theory. The group is very active in networking with other institutions in Holland and abroad. It stands out because of its organisation of frequent research and PhD seminars and international workshops and conferences. Moreover, EIPE runs a research master programme and the Erasmus Journal for Philosophy and Economics. EIPE researchers have also been active in acquiring various grants from e.g. NWO, the Marie Curie programme, the ERC as well as from the Leverhulme Trust.

(2) The project called Structure of Reality is carried out by only two researchers. Their main topics are metaphysics, epistemology, and thought experiments as well as philosophy of physics. They have been awarded several grants from NWO, one of these researchers is one of NWO's few Caesar Fellows in philosophy. Additionally, he is the president of the Dutch Society for the Philosophy of Science, leads five study groups of the Dutch Research School for Philosophy, organises a seminar on the philosophy of physics at Utrecht University and runs an NWO project entitled "The digital turn in epistemology" in collaboration with Utrecht University (2017–2022).

(3) The group called "The Making of Modernity" emphasises on the history of philosophy. Its special focus is on the early 16th century, 17th and early 18th century rationalism; and the modern philosophy of war. This group is particularly renowned because of its special focus on Dutch philosophy. The profile of the group is predominantly academic; however, a great deal of its activities is also devoted to reach an audience outside the academy. Members of the group took part in international conferences and are members of prestigious academic institutions in Holland (e.g. KNAW and KHMW) and abroad; and they serve as editors or series editors of e.g. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History. Four major NWO projects have been acquired from 2000 onwards.



(4) The group “The Constitution of Subjectivity” investigates the notion of subjectivity through the subjects’ enactment of moral, cultural, socio-political and technological practices and the way in which such practices are shaped by social values and norms. The group includes experts in continental philosophy, anthropology, aesthetics, as well as political and practical philosophy. Several researchers of the group have been invited speakers at international conferences and institutions. Moreover, they have been awarded an impressive number of NWO grants, collaborated with international research projects (based in Porto, Lausanne and Milan) and supervised numerous PhD students.

In the eyes of the Committee, all four groups are successful in their own way. Whereas the first group has established an extremely prestigious international network and, likewise, recognition of its members and research output by peers, the second and rather small group stands out as far as grant applications are concerned. The third is renowned for its editorial work and famous for its focus on the history of Dutch philosophy and the fourth branch of ESPhil is extremely successful as far as the pioneering establishment and promotion of the field of public philosophy is concerned.

The Committee felt that the amount of publications produced by ESPhil members (382 articles, 229 of which on academic refereed journals; 98 books of which 85 are academic) is indeed impressive and of very good, in some cases even excellent, quality. Moreover, the Committee acknowledges the self-acclaimed world-leading role of EIPE. However, as long as the research of EIPE is not more tightly knit into the structure of the whole department, that has the status of an independent faculty, there is a certain unevenness as far as the overall quality of research is concerned.

On a similar note, the Committee felt that more collaborations between the four groups of ESPhil, on the one hand, and between ESPhil and other faculties of Rotterdam’s Erasmus University, on the other, might contribute not only to increase the number of research grants (the number of which decreased significantly in 2017). Moreover, such collaborations and the cross-fertilisations that come with collaborations might also contribute to a clearer signature as far as ESPhil’s overall research topics are concerned. In light of this, the Committee was glad to hear that ESPhil’s Faculty Colloquia and Lunch Seminars are attended by a large amount of staff members and that they will enable more and new collaborations.

7.3 Societal relevance

The Committee is of the opinion that ESPhil is doing particularly well as far as societal relevance is concerned, most of all in relation to the relevance and visibility of philosophy in the Netherlands. To be more specific, ESPhil contributes significantly to education in (secondary) schools, to timely public debates in various old and new media; it supports and advises different ministries as well as municipalities and organizes exhibitions and media projects; its members publish in national newspapers and popular magazines and participate in radio and TV programmes.

The list of activities meant for the general public is very long. Among them are: the annual Philosophy Olympiad (an essay competition in philosophy); the annual Month of Philosophy with philosophical activities all over the Netherlands; the contribution to a movie entitled “Spinoza: a free thinker” that was shown in thirteen cinemas in Holland and on the National Dutch TV; an eight weeks online course on “The politics of scepticism”; collaborations with various art institutions in order to organize lectures and events aimed at a wide audience. Additional activities were organized on, amongst others, the issues of immigration, the politics of austerity, philosophy for children (including an illustrated philosophy booklet) and philosophy for everybody. Last but not least, one of the department’s professors was appointed “Denker des Vaderlands” in 2015 which lead to numerous invitations and many TV appearances (on ARTE amongst others).

The Committee was particularly positive about the fact that ESPhil does not only organise/host occasional public events but puts the emphasis on long-lasting societal relevance, especially as far as (school) education and the quality of public debates (in the Netherlands) are concerned.

Moreover, the Committee was of the opinion that ESPhil might want to make its twofold policy – (1) to produce scholarly knowledge and (2) to be of societal relevance – more explicit if not its common denominator in order to strengthen collaboration across its four groups and also in order to secure what one might call the “signature” of philosophy at Rotterdam’s Erasmus University.



7.4 Viability

After a period of turmoil mainly due to severe financial problems, ESPhil underwent a process of fundamental but so far very successful restructuring. Since 2015, the formerly rather autonomous Chair Groups are now seen as four projects of one single programme that secures collaborations and cross-fertilisations.

The current strength of ESPhil is due to the fact that it embodies diverse philosophical traditions (analytic and continental) and a broad range of topics, (philosophy of economics, philosophy of physics, metaphysics, ethics, aesthetics, etc.). This has the potential of attracting many students from other faculties and meet a wide range of interests which is all the more important given the fact the ESPhil is the only representative of the humanities at Rotterdam's Erasmus University.

A major opportunity for the viability of ESPhil is the Double-Degree (DD) programme, namely the possibility given to EUR students to obtain a second bachelor's degree in philosophy in addition to their main subjects, for 90 EC. When DD was launched in 2015, the Deans of the other faculties accepted to substantially finance the programme which led to a remarkable increase in ESPhil's funding via so-called contract research. So far, the DD has been successful in attracting more than one hundred additional students per year. The discussion with staff members made it very clear that the faculties that are funding the DD committed themselves to do so on a long-term basis. Moreover, the conversation with staff members brought to the Committee's attention that, by now, it is primarily those other faculties that advertise the DD in philosophy which is seen as a surplus value for EUR's students of law, management, economics, or medicine. After the discussion with staff members the Committee was very impressed by ESPhil's ability to find innovative ways to financially secure its future and full of trust in the success of ESPhil's DD programme.

The Committee felt that ESPhil's strict rules concerning 40% research time were very laudable; not least because such amount of research time is needed in order to keep the success rate of project applications high which in its turn is essential to secure the faculty of philosophy's future.

7.5 PhD programme

ESPhil's current admission policies and supervision procedures appear as both rigorously structured and successful; especially after the implementation of a PhD Office and a PhD Committee in 2018 that takes care of all applications.

The admission procedure requires that applicants for PhD positions (funded by ESPhil as opposed to external funding) send a CV, a writing sample and a research project. On the basis of these documents, 3 or 4 candidates per year are selected and invited for an interview. The final decision is up to the Dean of ESPhil and the Faculty board, both of which try to follow the advice from the PhD Committee.

The success of the new admission procedures shows in the following numbers: Between 2012 and 2017, 18 PhD-students successfully defended their PhD-theses, of which ten were in the (old) area of "Subjectivity", five in "Economics", and three in "Modernity". Five more students obtained their PhD certificate not in ESPhil but were partly supervised by ESPhil members. In 2018, however, there were 36 PhD-students, 3 of which have already finalised their theses.

The Committee was particularly positive about the conversation with ESPhil's PhD students who stressed both their (thematic) independence as well as all the possibility of collaborating with colleagues from all four research groups. Moreover, the Committee was pleased to hear that PhD students emphasized the possibility to have weekly talks with their supervisors as well as the general "open door policy" that invites PhD students to talk to their supervisors whenever necessary. In addition, the Committee felt that ESPhil's Lunch Seminars as well as several reading groups organized by PhD students ensured a lively philosophical community in which PhD students participate from day one.

7.6 Research integrity

Signing an employment contract at EUR implies that one observes the Code of Conduct for Scientists (written by the Union of Collaborating Dutch Universities, VSNU). Moreover, the EUR has developed a



scientific integrity-dilemma game that all employees are recommended to play. Said game is played by philosophy students as part of their lecture course on ethics. Additionally, in the course on philosophy of science various issues related to values in science are discussed. All PhD dissertations are checked for plagiarism.

ESPhil has an integrity officer who writes an annual report to the Faculty Board. However, so far, no problems have been reported.

The Committee felt that the integrity game might be valuable for other universities as well and therefore recommended to make it publicly available. Moreover, the Committee recommended that ESPhil reflects more on the problems of integrity as far as Big Data Management and co-authorship are concerned.

7.7 Diversity

ESPhil's diversity measures are particularly laudable. As far as gender issues are concerned, the Program is confident that 25% of its academic personnel will be female by 2020 (and thus in accordance with a rule issued by the Executive Board of Rotterdam's Erasmus University). Of the twenty persons forming the current academic staff of ESPhil four are female, and only one of the four full professors is female. However, two female members have been hired on tenure track positions in the last few years. This improved the balance a bit, but there is still matter for concern, especially since the Executive Board of EUR requires that by 2020 at least 25% of the academic staff is female.

Moreover, and in contrast to most Philosophy Departments, ESPhil puts a strong emphasis on the dimension of diversity that it addresses as "having a migration background". Not for nothing the Erasmus University is said to be the most popular university in the Netherlands among students with a Moroccan and Turkish background. Ethnic diversity, therefore, is not understood by ESPhil as meaning being open for international (elite) students. Rather, ESPhil aims to represent all ethnicities living at present in The Netherlands. However, hiring staff members from under-represented (ethnic) groups turns out to be extremely difficult because they do not apply when new positions are advertised.

Like every Faculty at EUR, ESPhil has a diversity officer, who is in charge of keeping an eye on possible actions that could contribute to achieve a better a balance regarding gender, provenance and age.

The Committee's conversation with staff members made it very clear that ESPhil is currently also engaging with changes in its (gender and ethnicity wise) biased curricula and with the necessity of changes within the staff.

The Committee was very positive about further measures that were mentioned in the meeting with staff members, e.g. a new course on Philosophy and Racism as well as a course on female (but not necessarily feminist) philosophers taught by all former chairs.

7.8 Recommendations

The Committee's overall impression is of an excellent institute with a strong research agenda and a particularly laudable policy as far as societal relevance is concerned.

As far as the quality of ESPhil's research is concerned, the Committee noted that there were even signs of "T"; particularly in relation to EIPE and its world-leading role that was substantiated in the discussions with senior staff members.

Although the Committee was rather concerned about ESPhil's viability before the site visit, conversations with staff members made it more than clear that ESPhil has developed strong relationships with other faculties that, apparently, need philosophers even more urgently for big(ger) grant applications. After the site visit the Committee was confident that such inter-faculty networks will secure ESPhil's future that depends, to a large degree, on the success of the faculty's DD-programme.

In order to improve these strategies, the Committee wants to highlight the following recommendations that should be read as suggestions:



- Re-think the research strategy as far as the signature of the Institute is concerned: Should ESPhil be perceived as an association of four rather autonomous research groups or rather as the department that is famous because of its emphasis on societal relevance? If the latter were the case ESPhil might want to highlight such signature more explicitly and consider to e.g. establish a journal in the field of public philosophy;
- Maintain and expand the DD programme; not only because it is vital for ESPhil's funding but also because it will contribute to the diversity of the student population and, in the long run, hopefully also a more diverse composition of ESPhil's staff;
- Intensify collaborations with other faculties on the level of research in order to secure the network that is vital for your promising DD programme;
- Join forces with VU to consider the possibility of a research master in Philosophy and Economics;
- Keep the possibility of internally funded PhD positions because this is one of the very few ways to support individual projects that are vital for philosophy;
- Be proud of the research time that is allocated to staff members and cultivate the blocks free of teaching especially for junior staff members that need to build up a career.



8. Assessment of the Department of Philosophy of VU Amsterdam

8.1 Quantitative assessment

The Committee assessed the quality, societal relevance and viability of the Institute both quantitatively and qualitatively. Its PhD programme, research integrity and diversity are assessed 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 D and section 1.4. The qualitative assessment of the institute can be found in the next sections.

Given the standards laid down in the SEP, the Committee has awarded the following scores to the Institute:

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Research quality: | 2 |
| Relevance to society: | 1 |
| Viability: | 1 |

8.2 Research quality

VU's philosophy programme is impressive. They have a strong community of philosophers who work well together. The evidence shows that they have leveraged their individual strengths to great effect. The quality of their efforts is reflected in the department's recognition by peers in the form of national and international research grants, publications in top journals and with top presses, as well as extensive professional talks, and significant positions on scientific committees.

In response to their last quality review, in 2012, the Institute sets itself some seriously ambitious targets with respect to quality, international reputation, teaching at both the undergraduate and the postgraduate levels, and societal relevance. They have worked effectively to meet those targets. Important to their success has been a strategy of "internal differentiation" combined with "focused clustering". Not all departments would thrive using this strategy (in no small part because effective clustering that generates real synergy is rare and to be cherished). But here the strategy is clearly working well.

The strategy of internal differentiation likely works well for the Institute because of its history. Up until 2014, it had three distinct sections (Practical Philosophy, Theoretical Philosophy and History of Philosophy) with distinct research programmes. In 2014 the three sections were merged into one. Vestiges of that history remain in the new structure, which supports a suite of distinct strengths. Yet the merger and other organisational and staffing changes seem to have induced a culture that seriously supports collaboration both within the various areas of strength and between them. The collaborative spirit, and the willingness to try new things and embrace promising ideas, was evident in all the interviews, both with the leadership and the staff.

The faculty, thanks to this strategy, end up falling into groups, most with impressive international profiles in philosophy, others making clearly significant contributions at the intersection of several disciplines (perhaps most notably PPE, which has an impressive international profile), and still others doing work of direct relevance to society. The variety of publications, the quality of the venues in which the publications appear, and the wide participation of the faculty in producing them, are each individually and then also jointly impressive.

VU Philosophy's reputation for research is rising fast. They are right to note in their report that they have significant strengths in the following long list of subspecialties within philosophy: "ethics and political philosophy, epistemology, metaphysics, logic, philosophy of science, German idealism, and history of Platonism."

The Institute's success in acquiring external funding is impressive: nearly 50 % of its total funding comes from external sources. The downside of this success is that half of the Institute's funding is temporary and to that extent unstable.



8.3 Societal relevance

The VU report rightly highlights three major ways in which the work done in Philosophy at VU is relevant to – and is having a notable impact on – society beyond philosophy. They have a strong record of producing books, articles, blog posts and presentations for non-philosophy audiences, whether audiences of scholars in other fields or non-scholarly audiences. The impact of such work is a bit hard to measure, partly because it often starts as a gentle ripple in another pond that takes time to develop. But looking back it is often easy to see how such ripples have grown. There is a lot of reason to think VU is generating a lot of ripples that are likely to make for more than a few waves. Much, but by no means all, of this work is under the auspices of two groups:

1. Centrum Ethos, which is having a remarkable impact across a very wide audience in the Netherlands;
2. The Abraham Kuyper Center, which has two main projects at this time, one concerning the epistemic responsibilities of universities, the other concerning forging an understanding of science that goes beyond scientism. The character, quality, and impact of the Center is well-supported.

Another aspect of Philosophy that figures less in their report but that, going forward, is well placed to have a broad impact is their PPE programme (established in 2016), which, as it develops, may have a notable impact on how people in places of influence think about public policy.

In addition, the nature and quality of the VU Philosophy Institute's fundamental research is, as they rightly put it, "an important contribution to society," as is their undergraduate and graduate teaching. Though the Committee realises that the nature and quality of their teaching is beyond the scope of the remit, there is no doubt that it is of serious relevance to society and, in that capacity, within the scope of what the Committee should be taking into account. A society in which the citizens understand and appreciate the importance of the fundamental questions (concerning, for example, knowledge, value, justice...) is much richer.

The Philosophy Institute's strengths in theoretical and practical philosophy, especially in the theory of knowledge and the understanding of social and political values, has the faculty wrestling with ideas that fundamentally shape society and that are ignored at the peril of all. It is this fundamental research that informs the Centrum Ethos and the Abraham Kuyper Center and makes it possible for them to have the valuable impact that they do.

8.4 Viability

In thinking about the viability of VU, looking forward -- which seems the only way to look when it comes to questions of viability -- there are two things to be concerned about:

1. their basic funding, per FTE, has declined, while the work load has increased;
2. the quality of VU's research and its impressive projects that are of broad societal importance, depend crucially on external funding.

In light of these concerns, it is easy to imagine different circumstances in which they would be even more secure, and so more viable, than they are. Yet the Committee has been impressed by how intelligently and successfully Philosophy has organised itself in the face of the current circumstances.

With regard to 1, the Committee learned that much of the decline was due to student numbers, and those have been coming up. The benefits of that (the Committee gathers) take two years to show up, but once the increased numbers have their budgetary impact the understanding is that the balance between basic funding, per FTE, and workload will be significantly better. This is crucial to the long-term viability of philosophy.

With regard to 2, the Philosophy department's culture of collaboration and interdisciplinary work means, the Committee thinks, that the department is in an especially strong position to compete for external funding. This seems true even in the face of various changes in the funding model that everyone the Committee spoke to (not just at VU, but in every Philosophy institute) mentioned. Discussions with the staff



brought out the extent to which they are committed, and well placed, to apply for and secure external funding. Their success with the various national and international funding schemes and also with private entities, bodes extremely well. It seems clear that their general strategy of division of labour plus clustering is working well for the department when it comes to pursuing outside funding. The Committee believes that strategy is likely a key to their long-term viability.

The Committee was also seriously impressed by the degree to which the leadership of the department was manifestly open to suggestions, to trying new things, and to investing time and attention in what matters. The leadership's commitment to, and interest in, the culture and quality of the Institute was striking and its own evidence of long-term viability.

That all noted, the Committee is concerned that, right now, the excellent research of the VU Philosophy Institute does not enjoy a secure backing of basic funding. The international standing of this programme remains tenuous to the extent that it relies so heavily on the kind of external funding that is now standard in the Netherlands. It would behove the university, long term, to invest in philosophy via some additional basic funding that would put them in a position to leverage their quality over the long term, not least by being able to give outside investors' confidence in the long-term quality of Philosophy at VU.

8.5 PhD programme

That all but one of the recent PhD students who did not have prior employment have landed academic jobs is impressive. It provides strong testimony to the quality of the students the Institute attracts and the quality of the supervision it provides. The Committee does not have information on the details concerning specific placements, but the sheer rate of success is extremely rare. It seems clear that the strict admission and supervision procedures the department has put in place are working well.

Philosophy has been experimenting with the use of "JUDO"s (PhD students who teach), which strikes the Committee an extremely good idea, for two reasons. The first is that in order to be competitive in the academic market, nowadays, one needs teaching experience. Programmes that do not offer this are at a severe disadvantage. The second is that teaching is a remarkably good way for PhD students to learn. Experience teaching philosophy inevitably makes one a better philosopher. The Committee also applauds VU making it possible for graduate students to secure a teaching certification (BKO). This is of great value to those who seek teaching positions in universities. If it would be possible to extend the JUDO model beyond PPE to philosophy more generally, the Committee thinks the payoff would be substantial.

Because so much of the funding in the Institute is external and tied to specific projects the Committee was a bit concerned that the PhD students might be under an unreasonable and counterproductive pressure to write dissertations on topics determined by the project leaders. That concern, the Committee discovered, was unfounded. Philosophy has done an excellent job in ensuring that their PhD students feel and are free to pursue whichever projects they see as most worth investing in.

8.6 Research integrity

VU Philosophy highlights its collaborative culture and its impact on co-authorship. Although the report does not note this fact, the collaborative culture probably works well to encourage an openness about concerns about integrity and clarity when it comes to sources, as well as the quality of the arguments on offer, in ways that, in fact, encourage research integrity.

Strikingly, VU Philosophy is actively involved not just in maintaining research integrity within their program but in shaping the standards for research integrity for the Netherlands. It is good and appropriate that philosophers be involved in developing such standards and VU is taking a lead in doing so.

The Committee noted that PhD students need to attend courses on research integrity and, which is increasingly important, data management. This seems a good policy. There do not appear to be any distinctive or pressing issues concerning research integrity at VU Philosophy.



8.7 Diversity

The Institute has a clear and reasonable appreciation of both the value of diversity and the difficulty of achieving it. The Institute has set as a goal having at least 20% of the senior faculty be women. One special challenge in achieving this target, given the department's general strategy of division of labour and clustering, is that in searching for diversity they also need to think how potential faculty will fit within the model – either by being welcome participants in an already existing cluster or by being part of a large enough group to constitute their own cluster. A single hire can feel like a major addition to diversity, but it is of vital importance that such a hire be of someone who does not then feel left out in the cold.

On a different front, the VU's Philosophy Department undoubtedly contributes to the diversification of the canon by its strong research output in the field of Arabic philosophy, which is seriously underrepresented in Europe, the UK, and the US.

8.8 Recommendations

In making recommendations the Committee needs, first, to express its confidence in the faculty, and, notably, the impressive leadership of the Institute, in setting their course. In light of that, our recommendations are offered in the spirit of suggestions that, from our perspective, look especially advantageous for the department.

- Create a research/teaching balance that gives young faculty the time they need to develop and prove their research programmes;
- Maintain and expand the JUDO programme that has graduate students getting teaching experience as they work on their dissertations. This is a huge market advantage for the department's graduate students and also an effective way to meet teaching demands;
- Coordinate office space so that people who want to come in to work can count on having a desk and on there being others around. This Institute is one in which, clearly, opportunities for casual discussions and easy collaborations will likely pay huge dividends;
- Pursue the possibility of a joint research master in Philosophy and Economics in conjunction with the Erasmus University;
- Develop a strategy for increasing the diversity of the staff, paying close attention to hiring in areas that will have the new appointments either serve to constitute, or fit well within, a research cluster.



9. The Dutch Research School of Philosophy (OZSW)

The Dutch Research School in Philosophy, henceforth OZSW, was established in 2013. The founding document states that the general purpose of the OZSW is “to strengthen the discipline of philosophy in the Netherlands” by: (1) Providing educational programs for all PhD and research master (hereafter: ReMa) students and (2) Facilitating and encouraging national and international cooperation among Dutch researchers active in the field of academic philosophy. The Committee has been asked to investigate whether these two objectives have been accomplished.

9.1 Quality of the PhD and ReMa programme

The OZSW is a well-organised institution. It consists of three sections: Ethics and Practical Philosophy, Theoretical Philosophy, and History of Philosophy, each of which is run by a Section Committee that is responsible for the educational activities in its section. In addition, there is a PhD council consisting of nine PhD students that functions independently of the three sections. This council evaluates the educational activities organised by the sections, and organises activities of its own in the form of 1-day Seminars and 1 to 3-days social events. The PhD Council also plays a role in monitoring PhD Student-supervision, and every two years it grants a Best Supervisor Award.

The PhD and ReMa programme are very well designed. There is a varied offering of courses, study groups, graduate conferences, a summer and/or winter school, an annual OZSW conference — all with a different set up and with their own specific goals. In order to ensure the quality of the courses and the unity of programmes run by individual members, OZSW developed course guidelines and criteria for the organisation of events. There is a uniform procedure in place to evaluate all courses. The results of the evaluations show that the evaluation marks for the courses given between 2013 and 2017 are steadily going up. The same is true of the number of courses and events that are organized and, likewise, the number of PhD students attending the OZSW’s courses and other events.

The students that participate in these activities are all full of praise. They do not only appreciate the quality of the courses, they also like the fact that the OZSW offers ample opportunities to meet students from other universities working in the same field.

The problems the Committee sees concern not so much the OZSW itself but the field it wants to serve. Firstly, not all philosophical sub-disciplines are equally well covered by the programme offered. For example, there have been hardly any activities in the fields of ancient philosophy, logic, aesthetics, and philosophy of language. The explanation is different in each of these cases. Presumably, in the case of aesthetics and philosophy of language there are just too few PhD students to make it worthwhile to organise separate activities for them. Students of ancient philosophy participate in a different research school, the National Research School in Classical Studies. And in the field of logic there exists a summer school and a graduate conference at the European level, while at the national level the Institute for Logic, Language and Computation (ILLC) at the University of Amsterdam organises so many activities for PhD students and ReMa students in the field of logic that it would just be doubling a lot of work if the OZSW would do the same. Unfortunately, however, the activities developed by the ILLC are not — or at least not as far as ILLC’s courses are concerned — accessible to PhD students and ReMa students from other universities. It would be good if something could be done about this.

A second problem concerns financial matters. The OZSW self-assessment does not reveal much about the budget OZSW has to work with, but it states that “staffing at OZSW office has been minimal” and “further growth in members and activities will require enlarging the office workforce.” The self-assessment also states that “compensation to organisers of OZSW events for their commitment in terms of a lessening of their educational work load is an option that continues to be hard to negotiate locally.” In addition, according to the self-assessment “in principle, no-one is paid for teaching at an OZSW course; for external guest lecturers, it is possible to receive a refund in the form of a 25 EUR gift voucher.” Hence, it looks like the



success of the OZSW is largely dependent on the goodwill and enthusiasm of a number of volunteers. The Committee is of the opinion that this is unacceptable.

9.2 OZSW as a national forum for academic engagement in philosophy.

The OZSW aspires to bring together philosophers from all Dutch universities, and all philosophical sub-disciplines. Not only the educational activities, but also the various Study Groups, and the Annual OZSW Conferences serve this purpose well.

Thus, a noticeable side effect of OZSW's educational activities has been the creation of a community of researchers in philosophy in the Netherlands. This has given rise to the idea that the OZSW should strive to become the national Dutch association for philosophy.

In line with this, the OZSW has taken a number of initiatives one would expect from such an association. Examples: (1) The OZSW became a member of the Fédération Internationale des Sociétés de Philosophie. (2) The OZSW played a pivotal role in developing the list of Quality Indicators for Philosophy used in this Research Assessment. (3) The OZSW took part in several activities purporting to strengthen the visibility of academic philosophy within society at large.

These have all been laudable initiatives. Still, to be recognised by all Dutch philosophers as "the" Dutch Association for Philosophy it is of vital importance that all philosophers working in academia, and all philosophical sub-disciplines are adequately represented and involved. As the Committee already noted in the above, in this respect there is still some work to do.

9.3 Recommendations

- The fact that educational activities for PhD students and ReMa students in the field of logic take place outside the OZSW, makes it more difficult for the OZSW to play the central role it wants to play. It would be good if ILLC's educational activities could somehow be "adopted" by the OZSW and thus become accessible for interested PhD and ReMa students from all universities;
- The budget for the OZSW is supplied by the philosophy departments/faculties of philosophy. It would be better if this budget could come directly from the universities, so that also philosophers who are not employed by a philosophy department or faculty of philosophy could become a member of the OZSW;



Appendix A – Curricula Vitae

Frank Veltman's main research interest is in the logical analysis of natural language. At present, he is Distinguished Professor in Linguistics at the School of Foreign Languages of Hunan University in Changsha. Until his retirement in 2014 he was Professor of Logic & Cognitive Science at the University of Amsterdam, where he served as scientific director of the Institute for Logic, Language and Computation from 2004 till 2009. He was a member of several NWO committees (VIDI, VICI, Responsible Innovation, Board of Humanities). Between 2012 and 2018 he was chief editor of the Journal of Philosophical Logic. He held guest professorships at the Edinburgh University, Stanford University, the University of Tübingen, and Peking University in Beijing.

Dieter Birnbacher is professor of philosophy at the University of Düsseldorf, Germany. His main fields of interests are ethics, applied ethics, and anthropology. He has served as a member of the Central Ethics Commission of the Bundesärztekammer (German Medical Association) since 2004. In the same year, he was elected as a member of the German National Academy of Sciences Leopoldina. In 2012, he was awarded a honorary doctorate by the University of Münster. His publications include 10 books and 20 edited volumes on ethics, action theory, medical ethics and environmental ethics as well as on Wittgenstein and Schopenhauer.

Maria Carla Galavotti is Professor Emerita at the University of Bologna. Before retiring she taught Philosophy of Science at the universities of Trieste and Bologna. She is a member of the German National Academy of Sciences Leopoldina, the Pittsburgh Center for Philosophy of Science and Clare Hall College, Cambridge. She produced original research on key issues of contemporary philosophy of science, with special emphasis on the foundations of probability and statistics, the nature and limits of scientific explanation, and the role and structure of models in the natural and social sciences. Her list of publications includes more than 150 titles.

Susan James's main research interests are in the history of early modern philosophy (particularly the philosophy of Spinoza), feminist philosophy and political and social philosophy. Her publications include 'Passion and Action: The Emotions in Early Modern philosophy' and 'Spinoza on Philosophy, Religion and Politics: Spinoza's Theologico-Political Tractatus', both published by Oxford University Press. She is Professor of Philosophy at Birkbeck College London and has held a number of visiting positions in Europe and the United States.

Geoff Sayre-McCord's primary research interests are in metaethics, moral theory, epistemology, and social and political philosophy, in which he has published widely. He is the Morehead-Cain Distinguished Professor at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, where he has been since 1985. He is the Founding Director of the Philosophy, Politics and Economics Society, an international scholarly society for those interested in the issues that arise at the intersection of the three disciplines in the Society's name. He is the Director of the University of North Carolina's Philosophy, Politics, and Economics Program, and the former Chair of the Philosophy Department. Sayre-McCord was a Professorial Fellow in Philosophy at the University of Edinburgh from 2013 until 2016 and is now a Regular Distinguished Visiting Professor there. During 2015-16, he was the Laurance S. Rockefeller Visiting Professor for Distinguished Teaching at Princeton University.

Ruth Sonderegger is Professor of Philosophy and Aesthetic Theory at the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna. She completed her PhD in Philosophy (1998) at the Free University Berlin where she also taught for 5 years as Assistant Professor. From 2001 to 2009 worked as Associate and Full Professor at the Philosophy Department of the University of Amsterdam. She researches the history and systematics of the concept of critique in philosophy and other disciplines as well as the (social) history of philosophical aesthetics.



Appendix B – Programme of the site visit

Tuesday 15 January

| Time | Part | Collocutors |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| 09.00 – 12.00 | | Committee |
| 12.00 – 12.45 | Lunch | Committee |
| TILBURG UNIVERSITY | | |
| 12.45 – 13.30 | Management | Prof.dr. Marc Swerts, Vice-Dean of Research TSHD, Prof.dr. Maureen Sie, Program Leader TiLPS, Prof.dr. Wim Dubbink, Head of Department |
| 13.30 – 14.00 | PhD | Huub Brouwer, Natascha Rietdijk, Silvia Ivani |
| 14.00 – 14.15 | break | Committee |
| 14.15 – 15.00 | Leading staff | Prof.dr. Wim Dubbink, Prof.dr. Maureen Sie, Dr. Matteo Colombo, Dr. Alfred Archer |
| 15.00 – 15.45 | staff | dr. Bart Engelen, dr. Sander Verhaegh, dr. Amanda Cawston, dr. C.E. Harnacke |
| 15.45 – 16.15 | Break and meeting | Committee |
| 16.15 – 16.45 | Second meeting management | Prof.dr. Marc Swerts, Vice-Dean of Research TSHD, Prof.dr. Maureen Sie, Program Leader TiLPS, Prof.dr. Wim Dubbink, Head of Department |
| 16.45 – 17.30 | Meeting | Committee |

Wednesday 16 January

| Time | Part | Collocutors |
|--------------------------|------------|---|
| LEIDEN UNIVERSITY | | |
| 8.30 – 9.15 | Management | Prof. Mark Rutgers, Prof. James McAllister, Dr. Frank Chouraqui, Ms. Carolyn de Greef |
| 9.15 – 9.45 | PhD | Ms. Martine Berenpas, Ms. Nathanja van den Heuvel, Ms. Liu Hao, Ms. Imke Maessen, Mr. Enes Sütütemiz, Ms. Machteld van der Vlugt, |



| | | |
|---------------|-----------------------------|--|
| 9.45 – 10.00 | Break | Committee |
| 10.00 – 10.45 | Leading staff | Prof. Douglas Berger, Prof. Frans de Haas, Professor Göran Sundholm |
| 10.45 – 11.30 | Staff | Dr. Eric Boot, Dr. Stephen Harris, Dr. Dorota Mokrosinska, Dr. Maria van der Schaar, Dr. Rozemund Uljée, Dr. Bruno Verbeek |
| 11.30 – 12.00 | Break and meeting Committee | Committee |
| 12.00 – 12.30 | Second meeting management | Prof. James McAllister, Dr. Frank Chouraqui, Ms. Carolyn de Greef |
| 12.30 – 13.15 | Lunch | Committee |

UNIVERSITY OF GRONINGEN

| | | |
|---------------|---|---|
| 13.15 – 14.00 | Management | Prof. dr. L.W. Nauta, Dr. F.A. Keijzer, drs. M. Hids, Dr. M. Pauly, Prof. dr. B. Streumer |
| 14.00 – 14.30 | Phd | D. van Zoonen, S. van Enckevoort, M. Semeijn, G. Gaszcyk |
| 14.30 – 14.45 | Break | |
| 14.45 – 15.30 | Leading staff (Prof) | Prof. dr. P. Kleingeld, Prof. dr. B. Streumer, Prof. dr.F.A. Hindriks, Prof. dr. J.W. Romeijn |
| 15.30 – 16.15 | Staff (postdoc, assistant, associate, prof) | Dr. H.T. Adriaenssen, Dr. J.A. van Laar, Dr. L. Henderson, Dr. C. Knowles |
| 16.15 – 16.45 | Break and meeting Committee | |
| 16.45 – 17.15 | 2nd meeting management (additional questions) | Prof. dr. L.W. Nauta, Dr. F.A. Keijzer, drs. M. Hids, Prof. dr. B. Streumer |
| 17.15 – 18.00 | Meeting Committee | |

Thursday 17 January

| Time | Part | Collocutors |
|---------------------------|-------------------|---|
| 09.00 – 12.00 | Meeting Committee | Committee |
| 12.00 – 12.45 | Lunch | Committee |
| UTRECHT UNIVERSITY | | |
| 12.45 – 13.30 | Management | Prof. dr. Keimpe Algra, Prof. dr. Ted Sanders, Prof. dr. Martha Frederiks, Dr. Mariëtte van |



| | | |
|---------------|---|---|
| | | den Hoven, Drs. Biene Meijerman, Prof. dr. Paul Ziche |
| 13.30 – 14.00 | Phd | Yara Al Salman, Aldo Ramirez Abarca, Robert Vinkestøijn |
| 14.00 – 14.15 | Break | |
| 14.15 – 14.45 | Programme leaders History | Prof. dr. Mauro Bonazzi, Prof. dr. Teun Tieleman, Prof. dr. Paul Ziche |
| 14.45 – 15.15 | Programme leaders Theory | Prof. dr. Daniel Cohnitz, Prof. dr. Jan Broersen |
| 15.15 – 15.45 | Programme leaders Ethics | Prof. dr. Ingrid Robeyns, Prof. dr. Marcus Düwell, Prof. dr. Rutger Claassen |
| 15.45 – 16.00 | Break | |
| 16.00 – 16.45 | Staff (postdoc, assistant, associate, prof) | dr. Jesse Mulder, dr. Johannes Korbmacher, dr. Annemarie Kalis, dr. Franck Meijboom, dr. Aiste Celkyte, dr. Chris Meyns |
| 16.45 – 17.00 | Meeting Committee | Committee |
| 17.00 – 17.30 | 2nd meeting management (additional questions) | Prof. dr. Keimpe Algra, Dr. Mariëtte van den Hoven, Drs. Biene Meijerman, Prof. dr. Paul Ziche |
| 17.30 – 18.15 | Meeting Committee | Committee |

Friday 18 January

| Time | Part | Collocutors |
|----------------------|---------------|--|
| VU UNIVERSITY | | |
| 8.30 – 9.15 | Management | Prof. dr. Marije Martijn, Prof. dr. Michel ter Hark |
| 9.15 – 9.45 | PhD | Linda Holland, Wout Bisschop, Naomi Kloosterboer, Marina Uzunova |
| 9.45 – 10.00 | Break | Committee |
| 10.00 – 10.45 | Leading staff | Prof. dr. Martin van Hees, Prof. dr. René van Woudenberg, Prof. dr. Govert Buijs, Prof. dr. Reinier Munk |



| | | |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| 10.45 – 11.30 | Staff | Dr. Ben Ferguson, Dr. Annemie Halsema, Jeroen de Ridder, Prof. dr. Henk de Regt, Prof. dr. Catarina Dutilh Novaes |
| 11.30 – 12.00 | Break and meeting Committee | Committee |
| 12.00 – 12.30 | Second meeting management | Prof. dr. Marije Martijn, Prof. dr. Martin van Hees |
| 12.30 – 13.15 | Lunch | Committee |
| ERASMUS UNIVERSITY | | |
| 13.15 – 14.00 | Management | Hub Zwart, Fred Muller |
| 14.00 – 14.30 | Phd | Lydia Baan-Hofman, Jasper vd Herik, Caglar Dede, Eveline Groot, Daphne Truijens, David van Putten |
| 14.30 – 14.45 | Break | Committee |
| 14.45 – 15.30 | Leading staff (Prof) | Jos de Mul, Wiep van Bunge, Jack Vromen, Marli Huijjer, Fred Muller |
| 15.30 – 16.15 | Staff (postdoc, assistant, associate, prof) | Conrad Heilmann, Maren Wehrle, Sjoerd van Tuinen, Han van Ruler, Stefan Wintein, Constanze Binder |
| 16.15 – 16.45 | Break and meeting Committee | Committee |
| 16.45 – 17.15 | 2nd meeting management (additional questions) | Hub Zwart, Fred Muller |
| 17.15 – 18.00 | Meeting Committee | Committee |

Saturday 19 January

| Time | Part | Collocutors |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|---|
| RESEARCH SCHOOL OZSW | | |
| 09.00 – 09.45 | PhD | Jeroen Hopster (UU), Nathanja van den Heuvel (UL), Lucas Wolf (RUG), Eveline de Groot (EUR), Jan Bergen (UvT) |
| 9.45 – 10.00 | Management | Prof. dr. Frans de Haas, Prof. dr. Han van Ruler, Dr. Christine Boshuijzen |
| 10.30 – 14.30 | Meeting Committee | Committee |



Appendix C.1 – Quantitative data TiLPS

Table 1 Research staff in fte TiLPS

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Scientific staff | 1,96 | 2,23 | 1,94 | 3,63 | 3,74 | 5,58 |
| Post-docs | 3,50 | 3,75 | 2,21 | 2,51 | 2,50 | 2,50 |
| PhD students | 6,00 | 5,99 | 5,89 | 5,65 | 4,90 | 3,52 |
| Total research staff | 11,46 | 11,97 | 10,04 | 11,79 | 11,14 | 11,60 |

Table 2 Main categories of research output – TiLPS

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Refereed articles | 14 | 17 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 32 |
| Non-refereed articles | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Books | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Book chapters | 2 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 5 |
| PhD theses | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Conference papers | 3 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 2 |
| Professional publications | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Publications aimed at the general public | 1 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 6 |
| Other research output | 6 | 2 | 9 | 14 | 14 | 14 |

Table 3 Funding – TiLPS

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| Funding in FTE | | | | | | |
| Direct funding | 3.96 | 5.28 | 5.53 | 8.24 | 6.46 | 5.14 |
| Research grants | 6.00 | 5.69 | 3.51 | 2.70 | 1.04 | 1.73 |
| Contract research | 1.50 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 3.64 | 4.73 |
| Other | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total funding | 11.46 | 11.97 | 10.04 | 11.79 | 11.14 | 11.60 |
| Expenditure in k€ | | | | | | |
| Personnel costs | 1650.2 | 1634.1 | 1764.1 | 1450.2 | 1356.1 | - |
| Other costs | 149.9 | 106.7 | 115.3 | 133.1 | 137.3 | - |
| Total expenditure | 1800.1 | 1740.9 | 1879.4 | 1583.3 | 1493.4 | - |

Table 4 PhD candidates TiLPS

| Enrolment | Success rates | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|-----|----|--------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|------|--------------------------------|------|--------------------------------|------|------------------|------|--------------|---|
| | Starting year | | | Graduated in year 4 or earlier | | Graduated in year 5 or earlier | | Graduated in year 6 or earlier | | Graduated in year 7 or earlier | | Not yet finished | | Discontinued | |
| M | F | M+F | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | |
| 2009 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 100 | 2 | 100 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2010 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 100 | 2 | 100 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2011 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| 2012 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 66.7 | 2 | 66.7 | 1 | 33.3 | 0 | 0 |
| 2013 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 5 | 6 | 11 | 1 | 9.1 | 5 | 45.5 | 7 | 63.6 | 7 | 63.6 | 4 | 36.4 | 0 | 0 |



Appendix C.2 – Quantitative data Leiden

Table 1 Research staff in fte Leiden

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Scientific staff | 1.9 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 4.3 | 4.9 |
| Post-docs | 2.5 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.0 |
| PhD students | 5.5 | 4.4 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 2.9 |
| Total research staff | 10,0 | 8.6 | 8.2 | 8.4 | 9.4 | 8.8 |

Table 2 Main categories of research output – Leiden

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Refereed articles | 8 | 11 | 12 | 17 | 9 | 10 |
| Non-refereed articles | | 1 | 1 | 2 | | |
| Books | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | | 2 |
| Book chapters | 5 | 10 | 10 | 12 | 8 | 8 |
| PhD theses | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Conference papers | 9 | 20 | 15 | 11 | 7 | 12 |
| Professional publications | 3 | | 5 | 3 | 1 | |
| Publications aimed at the general public | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4 |
| Other research output | 20 | 26 | 10 | 18 | 13 | 12 |

Table 3 Funding – Leiden

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Funding in FTE | | | | | | |
| Direct funding | 1.9 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 3.0 | 3.5 |
| Research grants | 8.0 | 6.4 | 5.4 | 4.7 | 2.9 | 1.9 |
| Contract research | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 3.6 | 3.4 |
| Other | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total funding | 10 | 8.7 | 8.2 | 8.4 | 9.5 | 8.9 |
| Expenditure in k€ | | | | | | |
| Personnel costs | 561,523 | 520,141 | 524,886 | 547,412 | 645,592 | 637,361 |
| Other costs | 24,500 | 37,400 | 118,600 | 82,100 | 71,800 | 98,300 |
| Total expenditure | 586,023 | 557,541 | 643,486 | 629,512 | 717,392 | 735,661 |

Table 4 PhD candidates Leiden

| Enrolment | | | | Success rates | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|---|---|-----|--------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|-----|------------------|-----|--------------|---|
| Starting year | | | | Graduated in year 4 or earlier | | Graduated in year 5 or earlier | | Graduated in year 6 or earlier | | Graduated in year 7 or earlier | | Not yet finished | | Discontinued | |
| | M | F | M+F | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| 2009 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 1 | 50 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2010 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 100 | 2 | 100 | 2 | 100 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2011 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 50 | 1 | 20 | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| 2012 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 33 | | | 2 | 67 | 0 | 0 |
| 2013 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | | | 1 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 6 | 4 | 10 | 2 | 20 | | | | | | | 4 | 40 | 0 | 0 |



Appendix C.3 – Quantitative data GRIPh

Table 1 Research staff in fte GRIPh

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Scientific staff | 9.4 | 10.2 | 9.1 | 8.8 | 9.1 | 9.7 |
| Post-docs | 8.1 | 11.8 | 9.4 | 6.4 | 4.7 | 5.9 |
| PhD students | 15.1 | 15.7 | 17.2 | 20.0 | 16.9 | 17.2 |
| Total research staff | 32.6 | 37.6 | 35.6 | 50.4 | 30.7 | 32.8 |

Table 2 Main categories of research output – GRIPh

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Refereed articles | 51 | 63 | 51 | 43 | 41 | 34 |
| Non-refereed articles | 5 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 3 |
| Books | 2 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Book chapters | 17 | 32 | 25 | 14 | 11 | 14 |
| PhD theses | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 11 |
| Conference papers | 10 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 4 |
| Professional publications | 11 | 13 | 20 | 11 | 11 | 10 |
| Publications aimed at the general public | 9 | 12 | 9 | 9 | 4 | 3 |
| Other research output | 8 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 3 |

Table 3 Funding – GRIPh

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Funding in FTE | | | | | | |
| Direct funding | 13.9 | 15.8 | 14.9 | 16.7 | 16.3 | 19.2 |
| Research grants | 17.1 | 19.8 | 18.7 | 15.3 | 13.8 | 13.8 |
| Contract research | 1.9 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 1.7 | 0.7 | 0 |
| Other | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total funding | 32.8 | 37.6 | 35.8 | 33.7 | 30.8 | 33.0 |
| Expenditure in k€ | | | | | | |
| Personnel costs | 22748 | 26219 | 23759 | 22991 | 20868 | 21419 |
| Other costs | 4351 | 3469 | 3338 | 3729 | 4314 | 3416 |
| Total expenditure | 27099 | 29688 | 27097 | 26720 | 25182 | 24835 |

Table 4 PhD candidates GRIPh

| Enrolment | | | | Success rates | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|----|---|-----|--------------------------------|----|--------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|-----|------------------|----|--------------|---|
| Starting year | | | | Graduated in year 4 or earlier | | Graduated in year 5 or earlier | | Graduated in year 6 or earlier | | Graduated in year 7 or earlier | | Not yet finished | | Discontinued | |
| | M | F | M+F | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| 2010 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 50 | 1 | 67 | 1 | 83 | 0 | 83 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 0 |
| 2011 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 60 | 2 | 100 | | 100 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2012 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 33 | | 33 | 0 | 33 | 4 | 67 | 0 | 0 |
| 2013 | 3 | | 3 | 2 | 67 | | 67 | | 67 | 0 | 67 | 1 | 33 | 0 | 0 |
| 2014 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 25 | | 25 | | 25 | 0 | 25 | 3 | 75 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 15 | 9 | 24 | 10 | 42 | 4 | 58 | 1 | 63 | 0 | 63 | 9 | 38 | 0 | 0 |



Appendix C.4 – Quantitative data Utrecht

Table 1.1 Research staff in fte History of Philosophy

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Scientific staff | 1.97 | 1.79 | 1.88 | 1.78 | 1.67 | 1.51 |
| Post-docs | 1.74 | 1.35 | 3.26 | 4.64 | 4.25 | 2.90 |
| PhD students | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Total research staff | 3.71 | 3.14 | 5.14 | 6.42 | 5.92 | 4.41 |

Table 1.2 Research staff in fte Theoretical Philosophy

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Scientific staff | 5.02 | 3.66 | 2.32 | 2.75 | 3.94 | 3.42 |
| Post-docs | 2.68 | 3.97 | 2.52 | 4.83 | 2.59 | 1.79 |
| PhD students | 6 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 5 |
| Total research staff | 7.70 | 7.63 | 4.84 | 7.58 | 6.53 | 5.21 |

Table 1.3 Research staff in fte Ethics Institute

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Scientific staff | 4.69 | 5.32 | 4.80 | 4.64 | 4.99 | 5.22 |
| Post-docs | 2.73 | 3.70 | 3.05 | 3.32 | 2.50 | 1.32 |
| PhD students | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 8 |
| Total research staff | 7.42 | 9.02 | 7.85 | 7.96 | 7.49 | 6.54 |

Table 2.1 Main categories of research output - History of Philosophy

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Refereed articles | 7 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 7 |
| Non-refereed articles | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Books | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Book chapters | 9 | 13 | 19 | 10 | 6 | 9 |
| Book editorship | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| PhD theses | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Conference papers | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Professional publications | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 5 |
| Publications aimed at the general public | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other research output | 55 | 63 | 72 | 61 | 62 | 36 |



Table 2.2 Main categories of research output – Theoretical Philosophy

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Refereed articles | 14 | 5 | 11 | 9 | 11 | 21 |
| Non-refereed articles | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Books | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Book chapters | 4 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| Book editorship | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| PhD theses | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Conference papers | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Professional publications | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Publications aimed at the general public | 8 | 6 | 9 | 8 | 10 | 5 |
| Other research output | 78 | 37 | 26 | 75 | 86 | 54 |

Table 2.3 Main categories of research output – Ethics Institute

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Refereed articles | 19 | 17 | 14 | 17 | 12 | 8 |
| Non-refereed articles | 4 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Books | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Book chapters | 26 | 13 | 16 | 8 | 14 | 12 |
| Book editorship | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| PhD theses | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| Conference papers | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Professional publications | 24 | 16 | 14 | 16 | 13 | 27 |
| Publications aimed at the general public | 11 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 8 |
| Other research output | 115 | 119 | 143 | 146 | 142 | 145 |

Table 3.1 Funding – History of Philosophy

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Funding in FTE | | | | | | |
| Direct funding | 1.97 | 1.79 | 1.88 | 1.78 | 1.67 | 1.51 |
| Research grants | 0.99 | 2.66 | 5.51 | 6.95 | 7.25 | 4.36 |
| Contract research | 0.75 | 0.19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total funding | 3.71 | 4.64 | 7.39 | 8.73 | 8.92 | 5.87 |
| Expenditure in k€ | | | | | | |
| Personnel costs | 311.7 | 363.4 | 522.8 | 618.4 | 606.8 | 438.2 |
| Other costs | 9.0 | 12.7 | 22.1 | 27.0 | 27.9 | 17.5 |
| Total expenditure | 320.7 | 376.1 | 544.9 | 645.4 | 634.7 | 455.7 |



Table 3.2 Funding – Theoretical Philosophy

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Funding in FTE | | | | | | |
| Direct funding | 3.42 | 3.38 | 2.30 | 2.43 | 3.12 | 2.79 |
| Research grants | 4.55 | 4.47 | 4.66 | 4.77 | 1.91 | 2.97 |
| Contract research | 3.25 | 2.43 | 0 | 3.43 | 4.31 | 2.92 |
| Other | | | | | | |
| Total funding | 11.22 | 10.28 | 6.96 | 10.63 | 9.34 | 8.68 |
| Expenditure in k€ | | | | | | |
| Personnel costs | 813.6 | 842.8 | 508.3 | 755.0 | 693.4 | 605.2 |
| Other costs | 32.4 | 29.2 | 19.8 | 32.3 | 25.5 | 24.8 |
| Total expenditure | 846.0 | 872.0 | 528.1 | 787.3 | 718.9 | 630.0 |

Table 3.3 Funding – Ethics Institute

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-------------------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Funding in FTE | | | | | | |
| Direct funding | 3.26 | 2.75 | 3.25 | 3.44 | 4.91 | 4.54 |
| Research grants | 6.49 | 9.38 | 9.13 | 8.63 | 6.78 | 2.92 |
| Contract research | 1.42 | 0.53 | 0.40 | 0.05 | 0.05 | 2.01 |
| Other | | | | | | |
| Total funding | 11.17 | 12.66 | 12.78 | 12.12 | 11.74 | 9.47 |
| Expenditure in k€ | | | | | | |
| Personnel costs | 784.3 | 963.1 | 929.4 | 892.7 | 876.5 | 745.5 |
| Other costs | 32.6 | 38.7 | 38.2 | 35.5 | 30.9 | 23.4 |
| Total expenditure | 816.9 | 1001.9 | 967.6 | 928.2 | 907.4 | 768.9 |

Table 4 PhD candidates

| Enrolment | | | | Success rates | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|----|---|-----|--------------------------------|----|--------------------------------|----|--------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------|-----|------------------|----|--------------|----|
| Starting year | M | F | M+F | Graduated in year 4 or earlier | | Graduated in year 5 or earlier | | Graduated in year 6 or earlier | | Graduated in year 7 or earlier | | Not yet finished | | Discontinued | |
| | | | | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| 2009 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2010 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 50 | 2 | 100 | - | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2011 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 50 | 4 | 67 | 5 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 17 |
| 2012 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 50 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| 2013 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 33 | 3 | 50 | - | - | - | - | 2 | 33 | 1 | 17 |
| Total | 12 | 6 | 18 | 3 | 17 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | 17 | 2 | 11 |



Appendix C.5 – Quantitative data ESPhil

Table 1 Research staff in fte ESPhil

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Scientific staff | 14.70 | 15.90 | 15.74 | 15.74 | 17.74 | 16.74 |
| Post-docs | 5.00 | 5.40 | 5.00 | 4.40 | 2.50 | 1.90 |
| PhD students | 6.40 | 7.40 | 4.20 | 5.70 | 4.66 | 3.70 |
| Total research staff | 26.10 | 18.70 | 24.94 | 25.84 | 24.90 | 22.34 |

Table 2 Main categories of research output – ESPhil

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Refereed articles | 47 | 42 | 36 | 44 | 27 | 33 |
| Non-refereed articles | 19 | 38 | 9 | 35 | 32 | 20 |
| Books | 16 | 16 | 21 | 15 | 17 | 13 |
| Book chapters | 41 | 37 | 52 | 46 | 33 | 25 |
| PhD theses | 4 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Conference papers | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 |
| Professional publications | 52 | 66 | 22 | 23 | 82 | 62 |
| Publications aimed at the general public | 65 | 69 | 22 | 45 | 147 | 67 |
| Other research output | 35 | 2 | 11 | 63 | 38 | 17 |
| Lectures outside ESPhil | 199 | 168 | 105 | 404 | 285 | 152 |

Table 3 Funding in k€ - ESPhil

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Funding | | | | | | |
| Direct funding | 2,342 | 2,358 | 2,154 | 2,019 | 2,571 | 2,551 |
| Research grants | 584 | 517 | 545 | 525 | 507 | 431 |
| Contract research | 116 | 147 | 49 | 18 | 25 | 4 |
| Other | 298 | 621 | 476 | 436 | 655 | 807 |
| Total funding | 3,340 | 3,643 | 3,224 | 2,998 | 3,758 | 3,793 |
| Expenditure in k€ | | | | | | |
| Personnel costs | 2,956 | 3,083 | 3,000 | 2,981 | 2,614 | 2,818 |
| Other costs | 544 | 717 | 622 | 582 | 594 | 660 |
| Total expenditure | 3,500 | 3,800 | 3,622 | 3,563 | 3,208 | 3,478 |

Table 4 PhD candidates - ESPhil

| Enrolment | | | | Success rates | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|---|---|-----|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|----|--------------------------------|---|------------------|----|--------------|---|
| Starting year | | | | Graduated in year 4 or earlier | | Graduated in year 5 or earlier | | Graduated in year 6 or earlier | | Graduated in year 7 or earlier | | Not yet finished | | Discontinued | |
| | M | F | M+F | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| 2012 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | | | | 1 | 50 | | | 1 | 50 | | |
| 2013 | 3 | 0 | 3 | | | | | 1 | 33 | | | 2 | 66 | | |
| Total | 4 | 1 | 5 | | | | | 2 | 40 | | | 3 | 60 | | |



Appendix C.6 – Quantitative data VU

Table 1 Research staff in fte VU

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Scientific staff | 5.3 | 5.7 | 5.2 | 6.2 | 7.0 | 7.0 |
| Post-docs | 3.3 | 3.1 | 4.3 | 4.9 | 3.2 | 2.2 |
| PhD students | 1.0 | 0.0 | 4.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 7.0 |
| Total research staff | 9.7 | 8.9 | 13.5 | 17.1 | 16.2 | 16.2 |

Table 2 Main categories of research output – VU

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Refereed articles | 44 | 66 | 59 | 54 | 51 | 56 |
| Non-refereed articles | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| Books | 11 | 9 | 14 | 10 | 10 | 9 |
| Book chapters | 8 | 19 | 18 | 15 | 23 | 19 |
| PhD theses | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Conference papers | 7 | 19 | 12 | 6 | 10 | 3 |
| Professional publications | 6 | 8 | 18 | 9 | 8 | 4 |
| Publications aimed at the general public | 15 | 18 | 13 | 17 | 5 | 8 |
| Other research output | 2 | 6 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 9 |

Table 3 Funding VU

| | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
|-------------------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| Funding in FTE | | | | | | |
| Direct funding | 6.66 | 6.4 | 6.75 | 7.55 | 6.97 | 6.11 |
| Research grants | 5.18 | 4.65 | 1.86 | 3.87 | 5.63 | 5.87 |
| Contract research | 0.26 | 4.93 | 7.79 | 8.61 | 7.73 | 9.84 |
| Other | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total funding | 12.1 | 15.98 | 16.4 | 20.03 | 20.33 | 21.82 |
| Expenditure in k€ | | | | | | |
| Personnel costs | 1065 | 1047 | 814 | 1241 | 1753 | 1930 |
| Other costs | 218 | 214 | 167 | 254 | 359 | 395 |
| Total expenditure | 1283 | 1262 | 980 | 1496 | 2112 | 2325 |

Table 4 PhD candidates VU

| Enrolment | | | | Success rates | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|---|---|-----|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------|---|--------------|---|
| Starting year | | | | Graduated in year 4 or earlier | | Graduated in year 5 or earlier | | Graduated in year 6 or earlier | | Graduated in year 7 or earlier | | Not yet finished | | Discontinued | |
| | M | F | M+F | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| 2008 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2009 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2010 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2011 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2012 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2013 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Total | 3 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |



Appendix D – 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 |

