

# Research Assessment 2018



Protestant Theological **University**

**Graphic design**

Rick Oudhoff

**Protestant Theological University**

De Boelelaan 1105

PO Box 7161

1007 MC Amsterdam

Phone: +31 88 337 1861

Email: [collegevanbestuur@pthu.nl](mailto:collegevanbestuur@pthu.nl)

Website: [www.pthu.nl](http://www.pthu.nl)

© 2018 PThU

Text and numerical material from this publication may be reproduced in print, by photocopying or by any other means with the permission of the PThU if the source is mentioned.

# Contents

<b>Preface</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4. Response of the institute</b>	<b>21</b>
		(not known whether the PThU will include this part)	
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5 Appendices</b>	<b>23</b>
1.1 The Netherlands System for Quality Assessment of Research	7	App.1.	
1.2 The Members of the Evaluation Committee	7	Short Curricula Vitae of the Evaluation Committee members	23
1.3 Scope of the Assessment (the PThU and its Programmes)	7	App.2.	
1.4 Data provided to the Committee	8	Programme of the site visit	25
1.5 Procedures followed by the Committee	9	App.3.	
1.6 Criteria and Assessment Scale	10	Quantitative data on the institute's composition and financing	27
		App.4.	
<b>2. Assessment of the PThU</b>	<b>13</b>	Explanation of the categories utilized (scores 1-4)	30
2.1 Mission, strategy, targets and research activities	13		
2.2 Research quality	13		
2.2.1 Academic reputation	14		
2.2.2 Research infrastructure and facilities	14		
2.2.3 Organization	14		
2.2.4 Resources	15		
2.3 Societal relevance	15		
2.4 Viability	16		
2.4.1 Governance and leadership	16		
2.5 PhD programme, training and supervision	16		
2.6 Policy on academic integrity	17		
2.7 Policy on diversity	17		
<b>3. Conclusions and recommendations</b>	<b>19</b>		
3.1 The quality of the research at the PThU as a whole	19		
3.2 Facilities and support	20		
3.3 PhD education programme	20		
3.4 Policy on academic integrity	20		
3.5 Policy regarding diversity	20		





# Preface

Theology is a unique discipline within the field of Humanities. It not only covers the study of sources of religious texts and the way religion is perceived and practiced, but also makes contributions to religious thought, leadership formation and academic education within a faith tradition or more specifically a particular church. The academic as well as societal context of Theology is thus incomparable to any other research discipline. Theological publications are read both by peer scholars and professional academics as well as those adhering to a particular confession or church. Consequently, the assessment of the quality of theological research is a challenging and compelling task. As chairman of the 2018 Peer Review Committee of the Protestant Theological University (the PThU) I am very thankful that I could rely on three eminent colleagues from diverse international universities and with complementary theological expertise.

Although the PThU is a rather young unit, the Committee was pleased to note that it has improved its position within the Dutch field of theological research and that it has taken significant measures since the previous evaluation. At the same time we have not hesitated to raise critical issues requiring address in the coming years. This critique is naturally intended as constructive support for the further development of the PThU and we sincerely hope our recommendations will be beneficial for its future.

We express our profound gratitude for all persons at the PThU involved that made this evaluation possible and realize that this has been a tremendous effort. We also like to express our thanks for the way we were received at the PThU during the site visit. I am grateful to my fellow Committee members as well as the secretary to this Committee for their dedication to this evaluation. We have worked together as a true team and I am pleased to conclude that this Assessment Report is the result of consensus opinions of the entire Committee.

On behalf of the Peer Review Committee PThU.

Prof. James Kennedy (Chair)



# Introduction

## 1.1 The Netherlands System for Quality Assessment of Research

All publicly funded research in the Netherlands is assessed regularly in accordance with the *Standard Evaluation Protocol* (SEP 2015-2021) published under the authority of 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 primary aim of assessments under Standard Evaluation Protocol is to reveal and confirm the quality of the research and the relevance of the research to society and to improve these where necessary. This includes:

- Improvement of research quality, including societal relevance of research, research policy, research management, education and training of doctoral candidates, academic integrity, policy on diversity and the facilities.
- Accountability to the board of the research organization, and towards funding agencies, government and society at large.

The present document is the report of an external committee of peers that evaluated the research quality of the Protestant Theological University during a visit in June 2018.

## 1.2 The Members of the Evaluation Committee

The Peer Review Committee consisted of:

Prof. James Kennedy (Chair), Professor of Modern Dutch History and Dean of University College Utrecht, The Netherlands.

Prof. Stephan van Erp, Professor of Systematic Theology and the Study of Religions, KU Leuven, Belgium.

Prof. Jaco Dreyer, Professor of Practical Theology, University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa.

Prof. Jan Willem van Henten, Professor of Religion, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Dr. Chris Mollema was appointed as independent secretary to the Review Committee.

Short Curricula Vitae of the Committee members are presented in Appendix 1.

## *Impartiality*

All Committee members signed a statement of impartiality and confidentiality declaring that they would judge without bias, personal preference or personal interest, and that their judgement is made without undue influence from persons or parties committed to the institute or programmes under review, or from other stakeholders.

## 1.3 Scope of the Assessment (the PThU and its Programmes)

The assessment was commissioned by the Executive Board of the Protestant Theological University as described in its Terms of Reference. It covers all research conducted by the Protestant Theological University (PThU). This university's research involves the theological study of sources, beliefs and practices of the Christian faith worldwide, past and present.

The Protestant Theological University was established in 2007 by a merger of three previous theological institutions in the Netherlands. It is a publicly funded denominational university with campuses in Amsterdam and Groningen. The PThU is a designated theological university that is internationally oriented and open to challenges, compatibilities and interactions with ecclesial and other societal partners. The university covers the entire field of academic classical Theology and has organized its research in three Programmes: Sources (Biblical and Historical Studies), Beliefs (Systematic Theology and Theological Ethics) and Practices (Practical Theology and Social Sciences).

The PThU is academically connected with other faculties, national Research Schools, institutions, research groups and networks on a national and international level. The university maintains special links with the University of Groningen (RUG) and Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (VU). The PThU is located on the VU campus in Amsterdam. There are ongoing research collaborations at various levels between RUG and VU. As an exclusive training institute for ministers in the Protestant Church in the Netherlands (PKN), the PThU is connected to this church through its Supervisory Board, which appoints the one-member Executive Board in the person of the rector. The General Synod

of this church approves the appointments of Ordinary and Personal Professors, while appointments of Extra-Ordinary Professors are approved by the Executive Board of the General Synod. The Wider Board ('Small Synod') approves the appointments of Assistant and Associate Professors. The PThU is largely financed by state funding. Substantial parts of research funding are acquired mainly from the 'third funding stream'.

Education and training of doctoral candidates is organized within the PThU's Graduate School as well as within the Netherlands School for Advanced Studies in Theology and Religion (NOSTER).

Governance and responsibility within the PThU is structured as follows:

- President of the Executive Board, also Rector (Prof. Mechteld Jansen)
- Committee for Research Practice (Prof. M. Barnard [Chair], Rector and Programme Leaders)
- Leader of Programme Sources (Prof. Annette Merz)
- Leader of Programme Beliefs (Prof. Frits de Lange)
- Leader of Programme Practices (Prof. Marcel Barnard)
- Head of the Graduate School (Prof. Marcel Barnard)

The first and most recent external research assessment of the PThU was carried out in 2012, as part of the national *Research Review Theology and Religious Studies*. In 2015, a midterm research review of the PThU (*Midterm Research Review Protestant Theological University 2012-14*) was conducted. Together with the *Institutional Development Plan (2014-2018)* these reviews have been used as the main policy and steering tools for the research of the PThU during the period considered. The research policy is increasingly focused on discipline-transcending approaches and projects.

The current Peer Review Committee was charged with retrospectively assessing the quality of the research at the PThU over the period of 2012-2017. In addition, it was asked to prospectively assess the strategic targets of the PThU and the

extent to which it is equipped to achieve them in the future. Although the research at the PThU is organized within three Programmes (see below), the Committee has been asked to offer a combined evaluation at the level of the entire PThU.

In the Terms of Reference the Committee received, the Board of the PThU requested special attention for two aspects in their assessment:

1. The way in which the PThU and its research programmes formulate and shape their profile and ambitions in relation to national (QRiH) and international developments in academic research;
2. The congruence between profile and ambitions of the PThU on the one hand and the research programmes and results on the other hand.

#### 1.4 Data provided to the Committee

The primary source for the evaluation of the research at the PThU was its *Self-Assessment Report (2012-2017)*. This Self-Assessment Report follows the structure of the *Quality and Relevance* in the *Humanities (QRiH)* instrument, making the national Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP 2015-2021) suitable for the humanities. It joins the domain profile *Theology and Religious Studies*, as it is presented in QRiH ([www.qrih.nl](http://www.qrih.nl)). Regarding the use of tables, the SEP has been followed to ensure continuity and comparability, as PThU's output registration system could only be adapted to QRiH since 2017.

The Self-Assessment Report contained details on the performance during the period of evaluation both academically and in relation to societal relevance. Specific information on PhD education, academic integrity and policy on diversity was additionally provided. The Report also showed quantitative information on the composition of staff, different categories of publications, PhD graduations and funding. Specific indicators (both for scholarship and societal relevance) for PThU's (A) output, (B) external use of output and (C) recognition for output and the corresponding results were also given in the report. For



each of the Research Programmes narratives on societal relevant activities were delivered. In addition, a quantitative benchmark (comparison of input and output figures) with the Tilburg School of Catholic Theology (TST) and a SWOT analysis were presented. The report also included lists, per Research Programme, of the five most important academic publications as well as the five most important societal relevant publications or other societal output in the period under review (2012-2017).

In their preparation of the Self-Assessment Report, the PThU had ordered an *Impact Pathways Report* (IPW) from the *Centre for Science and Technology Studies* (CWTS), and a *Contextual Response Analysis* (CRA) from *Ad Prins Support in Research Management*. Impact Pathways (IPWs) connect the PThU's research with the mobilization of people and resources. They depict outputs of an academic, professional or societal nature and the ways these outputs travel in the world and have an impact on people and conversations. IPWs are embedded within contextually and organizationally identified issues or themes. *Contextual Response Analysis* (CRA) maps the collaborative and user relations of the PThU's research in the societal and academic domains, showing which users create value from knowledge (academic, professional and societal valorisation). Whereas IPWs are traced by way of qualitative methods, CRA is executed through quantitative methods.

Next to the Self-Assessment Report the Committee also received access to a number of documents and publications that were made available on a secured website. This information concerned e.g. the national *Research Review Theology and Religious Studies* (2012), the *Midterm Research Review Protestant Theological University 2012-14* (2015) and the PThU's *Institutional Development Plan 2014-2018*. The website also provided access to previous self-evaluations (2012 and 2015) as well as full text PDF versions of key publications.

During the site visit a number of PhD-theses and a selection of hard copies of published academic books were present and the Committee received upon request overviews of 1) the ratio of tasks for teaching, research and management per staff category, 2) capacity of support staff per category, 3) research funding by external parties (third flow), e.g. Christian foundations and societies, and 4) the PThU's Annual Reports.

#### **1.5 Procedures followed by the Committee**

This assessment is based on the information provided by the PThU (see 1.4) and the interviews during the site visit in Amsterdam (4 and 5 June 2018; see Appendix 2).

In its preparation for the Assessment Report, the Committee evaluated the PThU at two organizational levels: (1) the University as a whole (including the leadership, PhD education, academic integrity, policy regarding diversity and the facilities) and (2) each of the three Research Programmes. In its Report however, the Committee described its assessment, conclusions and recommendations only at the level of the PThU as a whole, in line with the Terms of Reference. In some specific occasions, however, articulations do refer to a particular Programme.

Before the site visit, all Committee members read the Self-Assessment Report. Each member made a preliminary assessment on the aspects mentioned in the Protocol. These preliminary assessments were combined and discussed during the first plenary meeting of the Committee before the interviews began. The result of these discussions was used as input for the various interviews.

All the responsible leaders from each of the levels (the PThU as a whole, the Research Programmes and the Graduate School) were interviewed, as well as a group of four doctoral candidates who were in various stages at their trajectory as well as representing each of the three Programmes. All interviews were conducted by the plenary Committee. After each interview session, the Committee made records on their findings and conclusions.

At the end of the second day, the Committee had agreed upon its preliminary conclusions and recommendations to be used for a short presentation by the Chair of the Committee to the PThU's staff members and PhD students.

All Committee members had an equal input in the overall drafting of the Assessment Report, but experts within the Committee took the lead in the evaluation of individual Programmes. Conclusions and decisions made in the final text were reached through consensus by the entire Committee.

After the site visit a draft version of this Assessment Report was made and in September 2018 this draft was sent to the Chair of the Committee for Research Practice (Prof. Marcel Barnard) for factual corrections and clarifications. The final Report was subsequently submitted to the Executive Board of the PThU.

## 1.6 Criteria and Assessment Scale

In accordance with the *Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021*, the research performance was judged on the basis of three SEP assessment criteria:

### A. Research quality

The Committee assessed the quality and reputation of the research of the PThU and the contribution that the research makes to the body of academic knowledge. The committee also assessed the impact of the research results (academic publications, instruments and infrastructure developed by the unit, and other contributions to scholarship).

### B. Relevance to society

The Committee assessed the quality, impact and relevance of contributions targeting specific public or private societal actors by advisory reports for policy, by contributions to public debates, and so on. The Committee also assessed contributions to areas that the PThU itself has designated as targets.

### C. Viability

The Committee assessed the strategy which the PThU intends to pursue regarding research performance and societal relevance in the years ahead and the extent to which it is capable of meeting its targets. It also weighed the governance and leadership skills of the PThU's research management in its assessment.

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





## Chapter 2:

# Assessment of the Protestant Theological University

Rector:	Prof. Mechteld Jansen
Academic staff in 2017:	19.99 FTE
Research Quality:	2
Societal Relevance:	2
Viability:	3

---

## 2.1 Mission, strategy, targets and research activities

The institution says the following over itself in the *Self-Assessment Report*:

'Rooted in Protestant traditions, the PThU specializes in the theological study of the Christian faith worldwide, past and present. Its research aims for critical reflection on the dynamic areas of faith, churches and World Christianity by focusing on the interaction between faith sources and contemporary or past religious configurations, as well as between religious configurations and socio-cultural contexts. It performs that task in close relation with living Protestant faith traditions. In this way, it gives shape to the four core values that the university has formulated in its *2018-2022 Institutional Development Plan*: 'sharp of mind', 'broadly oriented', 'deeply rooted' and 'rich in spirituality'.

Research at the PThU moves within six contextual and organizational parameters: (1) Integration and Collaboration, (2) Relation with Society, (3) Relation with Churches, (4) Academic Theology, (5) Internationalisation, and (6) Training of a new generation of leading theologians. These six parameters form the environment in nine total impact pathways (IPWs): 1. Biblical texts in various contexts; 2. Christian identities in history; 3. World Christianity: boundaries and connections; 4. Ethics in life course; 5. Re-contextualising the Christian tradition in (post) modern society 6. Arts, ritual and liturgy; 7. Youth and faith; 8. The church in today's society; and 9. Spiritual care.

Based on the PThU's conviction that contemporary questions require a cross-disciplinary approach, it has taken important steps

to create a more dynamic research environment without losing sight of researchers' responsibility for disciplinary training, journals and organizations. Because of the importance of disciplines and sub-disciplines in international scholarship, the PThU intends to maintain its three research programmes, but increasingly encourages collaborative projects and thematic clusters both within the university and with other disciplines outside the university'.

The Dutch-language Institution Plan 2018-2022 claims that the university is to be a 'leading university, specialized in academic theological research'. It goes on to say that

'It is a prominent institution for Protestant Theology within the Netherlands and aims to achieve a leading position. In some research areas the PThU can compete at an international level and it is an acknowledged specialist in the translation of ancient sources to new contexts. It is nationally relevant for church and society. Within the PThU, societal relevance has permeated to the core of its establishment: the PThU's research together with and for its partners has a traceable impact on answering fundamental questions on life, lived religion and the cohesion of society. The PThU serves the Protestant churches and the community by academically thoroughly educated and communicatively skilled theologians'.

## 2.2 Research quality

The Committee concluded that, taken as a whole, the research quality of the PThU is in a very good state, though with some variations within and across the Programmes. Since the previous formal Assessment in 2012 and the Midterm Review in 2015, substantial steps have been taken that contributed to both the quality and quantity of the PThU's academic publications. The Committee appreciated these efforts and noted that the PThU has become academically more productive in a qualitative and quantitative sense: more refereed articles were published (increasingly in A-rated journals as well as more books and less non-refereed articles. Some of the remarks made in the previous

Assessment Report (2012), however, still remain valid (page 28: *tendency to greater fragmentation and the need for strong central leadership*; page 29: *the balance between academic research and church relevance*; page 29: *time for research must be formally structured*; page 36: *The aim to preserve and develop coherence is fully recognized but will need continuous implementation*). In other words, greater focus and coherence in executing a university research agenda has yet to be implemented to the extent that is necessary for a strong research environment.

### 2.2.1 Academic reputation

The PThU is primarily recognized for its national profile. It is the premier Protestant University within the Netherlands and some scholars are internationally acknowledged experts in their field. The list of keynote addresses at international conferences and other universities, and editorships, is less impressive. The academic reputation of the Sources Programme is, in broad strokes, higher than that of the other two Programmes, as apparent from the publications and the media in which the output of this group is published and the observation that all senior scholars of this group are internationally acclaimed researchers. As a relatively small university, and within the global Reformed context, the PThU's reputation is strong. In this respect it could be ranked among the upper level of theological seminaries in the USA, such as Fuller or perhaps Princeton.

### 2.2.2 Research infrastructure and facilities and support staff

The material resources of the PThU are up-to-date and in order. The embeddedness within the Free University at Amsterdam (VU) and the University of Groningen (RUG), gives access to strong and relevant infrastructure and facilities such as ICT, library, etc. Together they have a matching ambition to obtain proper facilities.

The PThU's own support staff however is startlingly low (0.2 FTE), and not primarily dedicated to promoting research. The Committee learned that occasionally additional time for writing a

research proposal is provided to individual researchers. Although this custom-made approach is appreciated, more sustainable solutions are needed. Given the university's low level of participation in academic research grants, and given the institutional resources that are now required at every research institution to be competitive, the Committee urges the university to find ways to make a structural commitment to rectify this situation.

### 2.2.3 Organization

The organization of PThU's research has improved over the last six years by bringing together loose projects into recognizably more coherent Programmes. On the other hand, the impression remains that the PThU still houses a number of tiny fiefdoms that represent a large number of fragmented research topics (see 2.1).

Each Research Programme has a programme leader and the three programme leaders together with the rector form the Research Committee to coordinate all research activities and advise the Executive Board on research-related matters and policy. This seems a logical structure, but the Committee noted that there is such a powerful culture favouring discussions towards consensus decisions ('polder model') that there is no sharply defined distribution of mandates or clear taking of responsibilities. The Committee concluded that the organization of the research subsequently has too much an *ad hoc* character. The leadership has clearly worked to improve output with a strong emphasis on societal relevance, but has put less emphasis on effective planning and strategy and the necessary operational tightness that such matters require.

The comments in this paragraph subsequently relate to the first question raised in the Terms of Reference (see end of paragraph 1.3). First, the Committee could not distinguish a clearly defined vision or strategy or a concise description of the academic research ambitions and targets in the PThU's Self-Assessment Report. Second, based on the interviews the Committee did not

get a sharp picture on where the PThU wishes to position itself in the international academic research environment. The recommendations under paragraph 3.1 are meant to improve the position and quality of research at the PThU in this regard.

The answer to the second question in the Terms of Reference strongly connects with the point of finding the proper balance between performing internationally recognized academic research, and research that is aimed at societal relevance. Each Programme has the ambition to deliver both, as it indeed must. The Committee is of the opinion though that the recent (and laudable) emphasis on societal relevance may have occluded sight of the strategic importance of the university to seize and hold strategic positions in high-profile academic research. Due to time constraints, the faculty cannot be expected to do everything, and strategic choices are therefore required.

#### **2.2.4 Resources**

The Committee compliments the PThU for the good choices made in the re-staffing and rejuvenation of the research groups. The senior research staff remained stable over the last five years. Most of the funding for research (about 80%) comes from direct funding (i.e. funding based on student matriculation and graduations). Direct funding varies from 66% to 95% (2017) among the three Programmes. As a result of few opportunities for funding of Theological research both nationally and internationally on the one hand, and the low success rates of applications for personal research grants on the other, the PThU has effectively abandoned putting further efforts in acquiring research funding from the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) and from the European Research Council (ERC). The Committee appreciated this realistic choice, but sees an ambiguity between the PThU's wish to gain more funding for research and its actual abandonment of NWO as a potential resource. In fact, based on its research quality the PThU is expected to gain more from NWO than it currently does. The comment in the Midterm Review on "Choosing one's battle" (p. 3) regarding external funding applications seems to have been

misinterpreted by some as withdrawing from the battlefield!

In addition to the direct funding, the PThU has a rather stable income from other sources (i.e. mainly from Christian foundations and societies; about 20%). It may be questioned whether this reliance on easily accessible private funding properly incentivizes faculty to seek more competitive (and qualitatively high) possibilities for funding. That might also be said of the university's public funding. Whether this state (in particular concerning the direct funding) will endure in the near future is uncertain since student numbers might decrease. Currently, direct funding as well as the PThU's present type of other funding is, in comparison to funding from grant agencies, rather easy to obtain. That is not a problem in itself, but it can result in complacency that undermines both academic initiative and a tough-minded institutional vision needed for the future.

#### **2.3 Societal relevance**

Over the last years the PThU has made a substantial shift in efforts for societal relevance both for the ecclesial environment and for society at large. In this respect the PThU has taken societal relevance seriously and the Committee rated the overall quality of the results as very good. The societal relevance is clearly evident regarding the churches and the Christian press, but less impressive in respect to the broader public. It is very much the question whether the otherwise laudable efforts towards societal relevance will lead to larger numbers of students or stakeholders – or new or additional sources of income. The Committee noted that the time spent on societal relevant activities can put the time for academic research under pressure. While the amount of time spent of these activities may vary across the institution, one of the programme heads estimated that 40% of the research task of researchers (which is 40% of their total appointment) is now allocated to the category of societal relevance. Though not formally required to do so, the PhD students are – as they themselves report – for a substantial part of their time involved in such activities, while the average time to graduate is already rather long. The Committee, as noted

above, has some concerns about the proper balance, mainly in relation to the PThU's explicitly stated ambition to be an internationally leading academic institution. As an academic institution and not a school for Applied Theology, its prime task is performing research that contributes to new knowledge and insights. To what extent, and which type of societal relevant activities should the PThU's staff members themselves carry out? Are the societal relevant activities directly related to the research results? It also raises the question whether some of its more 'practical' activities could not be more profitably executed by the social partners of the university.

## 2.4 Viability

As a rather small unit which is bi-located and which covers all fields of theology, the PThU is inherently vulnerable. This makes it even more remarkable that the PThU has done so well since its foundation only ten years ago. Factors that enabled this success are: 1) a very dedicated, motivated and enthusiastic staff, 2) the embeddedness within VU and RUG allowing efficient use of shared facilities and shared support, and 3) the steady flow of income so far. Nevertheless, viability is certainly an issue that should receive more attention on various points, as success in the past does not automatically guarantee success in the future. At the moment, viability issues are under-articulated in the self-evaluation, and reflection on realistic ambitions, or the strategic research aims of the university, is largely missing. This issue was also observed by the PThU, as strategic planning was mentioned under *weakness* in its Self-Assessment Report. This includes a discussion of contingencies. Since direct funding, for example, is depending on student numbers, a major problem will arise if these numbers decrease. Predictions of student numbers within the Humanities in general are not optimistic, and such a scenario should therefore be anticipated and a plan B should be available if this situation occurs within the next six years.

### 2.4.1 Governance and leadership

The PThU's leadership has been responsive to the Midterm Review on several points. It is to a great extent aware of what

the current needs of the university are. A prudent HR policy is being propagated: good personnel is being hired, and the university offers tailor-made measures to accommodate researchers. However, the leaders did not convince the Committee that they know how to realize the PThU's future aims in practice. Clearer and sometimes harder choices need to be made and subsequent steps be taken, e.g. regarding the:

- number of research themes
- balance between academic research and societal relevance
- ambition to reach international accreditations and reputation
- matching of articulated ambition with structural support
- incorporation of time allocation to PhD courses and PhD supervision in tasks of staff
- compilation of a comprehensive PThU Graduate School Programme document
- formulation of a robust strategic vision on what the PThU wants to become regarding acquisition of research funding in national or international competition
- anticipation of developments needed to realize its own ambition.

On these issues the Committee found little sense of urgency, which threatens the viability of the PThU as a whole.

## 2.5 PhD programme, training and supervision

Since the previous Assessment and the Midterm Evaluation some improvements in the PThU Graduate School have been implemented such as admission demands, a training and supervision plan, a "go-no go" decision after one year for all PhD students, approval of a data storage plan, courses for staff members on how to supervise PhD students, developing a software system for monitoring progress of PhD students, a regular check of progress in which also supervisors from other universities are involved (including demands on finished manuscripts) and actions to shorten the time until graduation. Over the last six years the number of graduations has slightly risen and since 2015 it is stable at seven per year. However, as was also noted in the 2015 Midterm Evaluation (p. 8), the success rates of PhD students are still alarmingly low.



All the PhD students interviewed by the Committee expressed their satisfaction over the supervision and the stimulating environment at the PThU as well as within the context of NOSTER. They had made a well-considered and motivated choice to enrol at the PThU for their doctoral work. They all appreciated the freedom of study as well as the supervision, and regarded the time spent at the PThU as very fruitful for their personal development and growth. A future career within academia was not the primary ambition for most of them, though all considered it to varying degrees.

In assessing the PThU Graduate School, the Committee encountered some issues that are not yet fully developed or remain unclear. The same was noted in the 2015 Midterm Evaluation (page 7-9) under 'weaknesses'. Specifically, it appears that the courses offered to PhD students are not compulsory. The time needed for organizing and teaching PhD courses is not a formal part of the duties of staff members. There is a separate 15,000 euro budget allocated to the Graduate School's activities, but there is no sub-budget allocated to (staff) activities for the Graduate School. Although the participation in NOSTER is seen as essential for the PhD students of the PThU, the role of NOSTER and the division of courses for PhD students between the PThU and NOSTER is not obvious. At the end of the PhD trajectory no certificate is issued (like e.g. at NOSTER). Quality assurance and monitoring of the progress of the PhD thesis as well as the frequency of contacts between student and supervisor need more attention.

Some of the PhD-students are from abroad and work in joint PhD-projects, i.e. the supervision, training and education takes place at the PThU as well as in the overseas home-institute. This may have consequences for the quality assurance. In general, the vision of the PThU on international PhD students (internationalization) and the future development in this area requires more reflection.

The leadership, the responsibilities and the mandate of the leader of the Graduate School are not clearly established. More specifically, the Committee learned that doctoral candidates – next to their teaching activities – are also required to participate in societal relevance activities. In view of the average time spent before graduation, and to reduce the risk of overloading these young academics, further consideration should be given to the tasks and time management of PhD students. More focus on research, writing and acquisition of academic skills would be beneficial to the overall academic reputation of the PThU and its attractiveness for young scholars.

In summary, the further professionalisation of the Graduate School requires much greater clarity regarding its regulations and governance structure, and a comprehensive list of the duties and responsibilities of supervisors and students which will then be structurally implemented.

## **2.6 Policy on academic integrity**

The University has a number of aspects related to academic integrity that are being implemented, e.g. software to check plagiarism in theses and manuscripts, research data management, code of conduct, a committee for academic integrity, etcetera. Some of these are organized in collaboration with the VU. The Committee noted that the PThU is aware of the importance of academic integrity and that it pays close attention to it. Some doubts, however, concerned the courses on academic integrity provided to the PhD students. These students partly follow courses at the PThU Graduate School and partly at the national Research School for Theology and Religious Studies (NOSTER). Since these courses are not obligatory, there is a risk that some students will not be educated and trained in essential aspects of academic integrity.

## **2.7 Policy on diversity**

Female staff numbers are low, but in comparison to the rest of the academic institutions in the Netherlands, 25% female staff ranks in the top, a qualified distinction. The PThU is giving age as

well as gender high priority when searching for new staff members.

Policy on diversity in general is also important for the transformation of the research agenda. Academic innovation, in a way that is also attractive for the global church, implies incorporation of staff members from various backgrounds. The Committee noted that this aspect needs further attention in the formulation of a vision, strategy and policy on diversity.

# Conclusions and recommendations

## 3.1 The quality of the research of the PThU as a whole (in relation to the PThU's strategy, with general conclusions and strategic recommendations going forward)

In conclusion the Committee found that the university has shown major improvements since the mid-term review. Qualitatively and quantitatively its publication results have substantially risen. It has sought heightened societal relevance, and made assiduous efforts to attract young talent, including a substantially larger number of doctoral students. It has stabilised its staff and has taken big steps in professionalising its Graduate School. At the same time, the PThU remains faced with challenges: the continued fragmentation of research, an overly heavy reliance on a narrow base of 'third stream' resources and at the same time a lack of structural support for research grant-winning. The Graduate School requires additional structuring. Perhaps most important of all, the university needs to develop a strategy for the future in respect to its research ambitions and has to devise a roadmap to achieve these aims.

The overall quality of the PThU's research is very good, though not evenly distributed across and within the research programmes. In some aspects the quality of the Sources Programme performed somewhat better than the other two programmes, as measured by international reputation and academic publications. The strategy regarding academic publications was revised in the assessment period and this already had significant results during the last three years. Staff numbers have been consolidated while some very good recruitments have been achieved.

As a consequence of its establishment as an academic institution in the context of a Protestant church, societal relevance is an inherent characteristic of the PThU. The Committee applauded the quality of the civically engaged research in this respect and concluded that societally relevant research and activities have been taken seriously by the PThU's staff members. This policy resulted in a shift from strictly academic publications towards a mix of publications aimed at peers within academia, peers and professionals (hybrid), or the wider public. In this respect, the choice of the selected key

publications was unclear to the Committee. Key publications were not always the ones that belong to the highest level (academic publishers, international A-ranked journals, etc.). Doubtless there are reasons for the choices, but they were not articulated. The Committee concluded that the balance between these types of output should be considered more thoroughly and in line with the academic ambitions of the PThU and the recommendation made in the 2015 Midterm Review (p. 4, bottom line: '*...PThU has made major strides in the direction of a competitive research institution. Hopefully, this move will continue to be acknowledged, even if it goes somewhat at the expense of the number of publications that are more directly "applicable" in everyday church practice.*').

Realizing that the PThU is a very young institution, the Committee appreciated the achievements over the last assessment period and the current state of this small university. However, its conclusions regarding the viability of the research were less positive due to its concerns about the quality of the PThU's strategic future planning and hesitations whether the management was optimally prepared to lead the university in a clear direction. This holds for a number of topics as outlined in paragraph 2.4. The Committee noted that the Self-Assessment Report missed essential information on future orientation, ambition and planning for the next six years.

### *Recommendations:*

3.1.1. To achieve further focus, coherence and critical mass as well as international visibility, it is recommended to reconsider the number of programmes and sub-themes and to make clearer choices regarding research programmes where the PThU can excel best.

3.1.2. In order to find the proper balance between academic research and societal relevant activities, it is recommended that the PThU describes a vision on what type of societal relevance activities do belong to its own tasks and decides to what extent research time can be spent in relation to these activities.

3.1.3. Concerning internationalisation, the Committee recommends the development of a more differentiated view on what the PThU wants to achieve in this respect (in relation to the

content of its activities, its reputation, its attractiveness and its financial means).

3.1.4. With the intention to help realizing its future aims and steering the PThU towards a less vulnerable situation, the Committee recommends soon putting more emphasis on strategic planning and anticipation on realistic developments in the near future.

### 3.2 Facilities and support

In the opinion of the Committee, the infrastructure and facilities of the PThU are very good. The location of the PThU within the VU and RUG is well-considered, beneficial and efficiently run.

The Committee has concerns about the capacity of support staff and concluded that the current investment in support is too low to handle all the work that comes with the professional organization of a research institution. This evidently translates in problems such as lower success rates in the acquisition of external funding for research.

*Recommendations:*

3.2.1. With the aim to create a sustainable solution for the understaffed capacity for research support, the Committee recommends allocating more resources to this essential component in the organization.

### 3.3 PhD programme

The Committee concluded that the PThU's Graduate School is on its way to a more professional organization for PhD education. It noted that some elements in this respect need a clear vision, a greater sense of urgency and leadership with a distinct mandate.

*Recommendations:*

3.3.1. With the aim to obtain a clear vision on the Graduate School's added value, its relation to NOSTER, its management structure, its quality assurance, its internationalisation plans and not in the least to obtain a full description of its programme and regulations, the Committee recommends organizing a special day

to reflect on the organization and programme of the Graduate School.

3.3.2. The Committee also recommends that it should set a fixed number of course credits that doctoral students must take, including mandatory courses offered by the university itself.

3.3.3. The Committee also suggests allocating a separate budget for costs involved in the running of the Graduate School.

3.3.4. Finally, it is recommended to incorporate a component for teaching in the context of the Graduate School within the tasks of the PThU's staff members.

### 3.4 Policy on academic integrity

The Committee applauded the awareness for Academic Integrity and the measures taken to fulfil the duties in this regard. The only concern relates to the course on academic integrity provided for PhD students, which is surprisingly not compulsory.

*Recommendations:*

3.4.1. In order to avoid the situation that some PhD students are less or not informed about academic integrity matters, the Committee recommends that the courses on academic integrity are compulsory for all students.

### 3.5 Policy regarding diversity

The Committee concluded that the PThU is well aware of the need for a more evenly distribution of female and younger staff members. Less evident, however, was the notion of diversity regarding the representation of international staff members, minority groups or other populations that would increase the diversity of the university.

*Recommendations:*

3.5.1. In view of academic innovation and the attractiveness of the PThU for the global church, it is recommended to pay more attention to an overall vision on diversity and in particular to the policy on diversity that better represents the breadth of the worldwide Protestant tradition.



Chapter 4:

# **Response of the institute (eventually added by The PThU)**



Chapter 5:

# Appendices

## **Appendix 1**

### **Short Curricula Vitae of the Evaluation Committee members**

#### **Prof. dr. J. C. (James) Kennedy (Chair)**

University College Utrecht

Prof. James Kennedy is Dean of University College Utrecht and Professor of Modern Dutch History at Utrecht University. Prior to that he was Professor of Dutch History since the Middle Ages at the University of Amsterdam (2007-2015) and Professor of Contemporary History at the Free University Amsterdam (2003-2007). Although his range of responsibility is wide – as reflected in his *Concise History of the Netherlands* (Cambridge University Press, 2017) and its translation *Beknopte geschiedenis van Nederland* (Prometheus, Amsterdam, 2017), his primary focus is on postwar Dutch history, in particular the place of values and ethics in the public sphere.

Kennedy's works have thus focused on topics such as broad cultural change in the 1960s (*Nieuw Babylon in aanbouw*, 1995; republished 2017), on the history of euthanasia (*Een weloverwogen dood*, 2002) and the public role of the Protestant churches (*Stad op een berg*, 2009). He has participated in research on the history of corruption, leading a research group on the topic between 2006-2010, and contributed in an FP7 project for the European Commission by writing a chapter (with Ronald Kroeze) on the history of anticorruption in the Netherlands (*Anticorruption in History*), published this year by Oxford University Press. He is currently heading two NWO research projects: 'Religion Renegotiated' which concerns itself on Dutch church-state relations since the 1960s and 'The Imperative of Regulation' about the history of Dutch drugs policy. He has written and spoken widely about the place of religion in Dutch society.

#### **Prof. dr. J.W. (Jan Willem) van Henten**

University of Amsterdam

Prof. Jan Willem van Henten studied History and Theology at Leiden University, specializing in Ancient History, Early Judaism and Early Christianity. His PhD (Leiden 1986) concerns martyrdom and the construction of Jewish identities in 2 and 4 Maccabees. He taught

Judaism and New Testament at the Universities of Amsterdam, Leiden and Utrecht from 1985 onward and is currently full professor of Religion at the University of Amsterdam as well as Extra-Ordinary Professor of Old and New Testament at Stellenbosch University. He is also programme director of Religious Studies at UvA. He was academic director of the Netherlands School for Advanced Studies in Theology and Religion (NOSTER) in 1998-2002 and director of the Graduate School of Humanities and vice-dean of Humanities at UvA in 2008-2016. His courses contribute to the BA- and MA-programmes in Religious Studies and he is coordinator of the MA programme in Ancient Studies at UvA. His research projects concern ancient Jewish and Christian literature (preparing commentaries on Second Maccabees and *Jewish Antiquities* 15-17 by the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus), martyrdom in cross-cultural perspective as well as the reception of the Bible in contemporary culture.

#### **Prof. dr. S. (Stephan) van Erp**

KU Leuven, Belgium

Prof. Stephan van Erp is professor of Fundamental Theology at the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies of KU Leuven. He is Head of the Research unit Systematic Theology and the Study of Religion. He studied Theology at the Theological Faculty of Tilburg University (The Netherlands) and Philosophy at the Catholic University Nijmegen. His dissertation on Fundamental Theology and Aesthetics was titled, *The Art of Theology: Hans Urs von Balthasar's Theological Aesthetics and the Foundations of Faith* (Studies in Philosophical Theology, Vol. 25, Leuven, Peeters 2004).

He was a Visiting Fellow of the University of Oxford as well as of King's College London. In Oxford he was a tutor in Philosophy of Religion and Systematic Theology. He also lectured in Fundamental and Dogmatic Theology, and Ethics & Philosophy of Religion at the University of Groningen (The Netherlands), at Radboud University Nijmegen and Tilburg University.

Van Erp is Editor-in-Chief of *Brill Research Perspectives in Theology*, Editor of *Tijdschrift voor Theologie*, Editor of *T&T Clark Studies in Edward Schillebeeckx* (Bloomsbury Press) and *Studies in Philosophical Theology* (Peeters Publishers), Chair of the jury of the Edward Schillebeeckx Essay Prize and organizer of the bi-annual Edward

Schillebeeckx-lecture, Member of the Academic Council of the Foundation Thomas More, and Vice-Chair of the Board of the Vereniging voor Theologie.

**Prof. dr. (J.S.) Jaco Dreyer**

University of South Africa, Pretoria

Prof. Jaco Dreyer is professor of Practical Theology in the Department of Philosophy, Practical and Systematic Theology of the University of South Africa. Prof. Dreyer started his research career in 1986 at the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) in Pretoria. Since 1989 he is lecturing at the University of South Africa (UNISA) and became a full professor in Practical Theology in 2009. Prof. Dreyer's research interests are the development of a public practical theology and the methodology of practical theology. He participated in a collaborative longitudinal research project (with Prof. J.A. van der Ven of Radboud University Nijmegen) on 'Human Rights and Religion' from 1994-2004 and is currently involved in a follow-up project, Religion and Human Rights 2.0, undertaken in collaboration with colleagues from Europe, USA and Africa under the leadership of Prof. Hans-Georg Ziebertz of the University of Würzburg, Germany. His publications include *Is there a God of human rights? The complex relationship between human rights and religion: A South African case* (with J.A. van der Ven and H.J.C. Pieterse, Brill, 2004) and numerous academic articles and book chapters. Jaco Dreyer has worked as a research fellow at the Universities of Nijmegen (The Netherlands), Leuven (Belgium), and Edinburgh (Scotland) and as a guest professor at the Max Weber Centre for Advanced Cultural and Social Studies of the University of Erfurt (Germany).

Prof. Dreyer is a member of the International Academy of Practical Theology since 1999 and has served on the Executive Committee as member-at-large (2009-2011), vice president (2011-2013) and president (2013-2015). He is the current president of the International Society for Empirical Research in Theology (ISERT) and also serves on the Executive Committee of the Society for Practical Theology in South Africa (SPTSA). He is the editor of the ISI accredited journal *HTS Theological Studies Section Practical Theology* and associate editor of *Religion and Theology* (Brill). He also serves on the editorial boards of the *International Journal of Practical Theology* (IJPT, De Gruyter) and the *Journal of Empirical*

*Theology* (JET, Brill). Prof. Dreyer also served on the Midterm Research Review panel of the PThU in 2015.

**Dr. C. (Chris) Mollema** (secretary to Peer Review Committee)

Since 2006, Dr Chris Mollema is senior advisor research at the central staff department 'Strategy, Education & Research' of the Radboud University, Nijmegen. He had a similar position at the department 'Research Strategy' at Wageningen University & Research (1998-2006). In these jobs he is/was prominently involved in research quality, assessments of research units and future planning. He served at several international research assessment committees as secretary or member, and presented recently an invited lecture during the seminar 'Research Evaluation & Assessing Research Quality' at the European Academy, Berlin 2016.

After his MSc (Biology) at Utrecht University and PhD at Leiden University he became senior researcher 'Breeding for Resistance to Insect Pests' at Wageningen University & Research (1987-1998). In this period he established a team of PhD students, postdocs, guest researchers and research assistants working on durable resistance to herbivorous insects in several crops. He acquired a personal grant from the EU to work abroad, so during 1994 he was visiting professor at Warwick University, UK. He is an elected Fellow of the Royal Entomological Society (UK) and a previous editor of the international journal *Euphytica* (1988-1998). From 2001-2005 he was member of the Committee on Agriculture, Food and Biotechnology of the European Science Foundation's programme COST that selects and supervises European collaborative projects. He also served in several committees of the Dutch Ministry of Agriculture (e.g. on Genebanks) and many selection and supervisory committees of PhD projects financed by the national Government.



## **Appendix 2**

### **Programme of the Site Visit, 4-5 June 2018, Amsterdam**

#### **4 June**

Venue: Amsterdam Forest Hotel (address: Amsterdamseweg 465A, 1181 BR Amstelveen)

08.10-08:20 hrs Taxi to the PThU (Mollema)

08:45-08:55 hrs Taxi to the PThU (Dreyer and van Erp)

Venue: The PThU Amsterdam, VU main building, first floor, "E wing", Examination room 1E-29  
(address: De Boelelaan 1105, 1081 HV Amsterdam)

08:30-09:00 hrs Chair and secretary committee meet for programme, logistics and procedures

09:15-09:30 hrs Welcome by the Rector and Programme Leaders

09:30-11:00 hrs Internal meeting (closed session) of committee to prepare interviews and report

11:00-12:00 hrs Presentation on the PThU by the rector and the president of the committee for research practice,  
Prof. Marcel Barnard and interview

12:00-12:20 hrs Writing

12:30-13:30 hrs Lunch (venue: the Basket, De Boelelaan 1109 B, 1081 HV Amsterdam)

13:30-14:30 hrs Brief presentation on the Sources research group by programme leader  
Prof. Annette Merz and interview

14:30-15:00 hrs Writing and coffee break

15:00-16:00 hrs Brief presentation on the Beliefs research group by programme leader  
Prof. Frits de Lange and interview

16:00-17:30 hrs Writing, wrap up first day and preparing second day

18:00 hrs Dinner

Appr. 20.30 hrs Taxi to Hotel

## **5 June**

Venue:	The PThU Amsterdam, VU main building, first floor, "E wing", room 1E-29 (address: De Boelelaan 1105, 1081 HV Amsterdam)
08:00-08:10 hrs	Taxi to the PThU (Kennedy, van Henten, van Erp, Dreyer, Mollema)
08:30-09:30 hrs	Brief presentation on the Practices research group by programme leader Prof. Marcel Barnard and interview
09:30-10:00 hrs	Writing and coffee break
10:00-11:00 hrs	Brief presentation on the Graduate School by head of Graduate School Prof. Marcel Barnard and interview
11:00-11:30 hrs	Writing and coffee break
11:30-12:30 hrs	Interviews with PhD students
12:30-13:30 hrs	Lunch (venue: Examination room 1E-29)
13:30-15:30 hrs	Writing, concluding and preparing presentation of preliminary findings
15:30-16:00 hrs	Presentation preliminary findings by chair of committee (the PThU room 1E-24)
16:00-16:30 hrs	Informal drinks with staff the PThU
16:30-17:30 hrs	Writing report and making agreements on finishing report
18:00 hrs	End of site visit
18.30 hrs	Dinner and internal discussions committee
Appr. 20.30 hrs	Taxi to Hotel or travel home

### **Appendix 3**

#### **Quantitative data on the institute's composition and financing**

Composition of staff (in FTE dedicated to research only)

<b>PThU Total</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Academic staff <sup>1</sup>	13,62	12,72	12,09	11,95	11,48	10,99
Post-docs <sup>2</sup>	1,60	1,27	0,73	1,65	2,23	2,89
PhD students <sup>3</sup>	9,91	7,92	5,45	4,45	5,41	6,11
<b>Total research staff</b>	<b>25,13</b>	<b>21,91</b>	<b>18,27</b>	<b>18,05</b>	<b>19,12</b>	<b>19,99</b>
Support staff	0,20	0,20	0,20	0,20	0,20	0,20
Visiting fellows	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00
<b>Total staff</b>	<b>25,33</b>	<b>22,11</b>	<b>18,47</b>	<b>18,25</b>	<b>19,32</b>	<b>20,19</b>

<b>Sources</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Academic staff <sup>1</sup>	2,78	2,59	2,79	2,88	2,88	3,03
Post-docs <sup>2</sup>	1,60	1,20	0,00	0,00	0,37	1,10
PhD students <sup>3</sup>	2,70	2,49	0,76	0,58	1,01	1,76
<b>Total research staff</b>	<b>7,08</b>	<b>6,28</b>	<b>3,55</b>	<b>3,46</b>	<b>4,26</b>	<b>5,89</b>

<b>Beliefs</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Academic staff <sup>1</sup>	5,78	5,28	4,87	4,20	4,45	4,71
Post-docs <sup>2</sup>	0,00	0,00	0,33	1,05	1,32	1,58
PhD students <sup>3</sup>	3,24	2,74	2,71	2,21	2,05	2,01
<b>Total research staff</b>	<b>9,02</b>	<b>8,02</b>	<b>7,91</b>	<b>7,46</b>	<b>7,82</b>	<b>8,30</b>

<b>Practices</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Academic staff <sup>1</sup>	5,06	4,85	4,43	4,87	4,15	3,25
Post-docs <sup>2</sup>	0,00	0,07	0,40	0,60	0,54	0,21
PhD students <sup>3</sup>	3,97	2,69	1,98	1,66	2,34	2,33
<b>Total research staff</b>	<b>9,03</b>	<b>7,61</b>	<b>6,81</b>	<b>7,13</b>	<b>7,03</b>	<b>5,79</b>

Note 1: Comparable with WOPI categories HGL, UHD and UD; Note 2: Comparable with WOPI category Onderzoeker

Note 3: Standard PhD (employed)

Research staff fte*	Total	Sources	Beliefs	Practices
2012	15,22	4,38	5,78	5,06
2013	14,00	3,80	5,28	4,92
2014	13,02	2,79	5,20	5,03
2015	13,60	2,88	5,25	5,47
2016	13,71	3,25	5,77	4,69
2017	13,87	4,13	6,28	3,46
<b>Average</b>	13,90	3,54	5,59	4,77

\*senior staff (excl. extraordinary chairs and external staff)

#### Funding

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
<b>PTHU</b>						
<i>Funding</i>						
Direct funding <sup>1</sup>	76,26%	82,95%	76,77%	77,56%	75,65%	79,40%
Research grants <sup>2</sup>	8,86%	5,16%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%
Contract research <sup>3</sup>	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%
Other <sup>4</sup>	14,88%	11,89%	23,23%	22,44%	24,35%	20,60%
<b>Total funding</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>
<i>Expenditure</i>						
Personnel costs	87,89%	86,85%	83,65%	81,35%	85,94%	85,17%
Other costs	12,11%	13,15%	16,35%	18,65%	14,06%	14,83%
<b>Total expenditure</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
<b>Sources</b>						
<i>Funding</i>						
Direct funding <sup>1</sup>	62,82%	76,60%	92,11%	91,91%	93,72%	95,40%
Research grants <sup>2</sup>	31,07%	18,10%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%
Contract research <sup>3</sup>	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%
Other <sup>4</sup>	6,11%	5,30%	7,89%	8,09%	6,28%	4,60%
<b>Total funding</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
<b>Beliefs</b>						
<i>Funding</i>						
Direct funding <sup>1</sup>	92,65%	88,78%	81,29%	72,33%	72,07%	77,95%
Research grants <sup>2</sup>	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%
Contract research <sup>3</sup>	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%
Other <sup>4</sup>	7,35%	11,22%	18,71%	27,67%	27,93%	22,05%
<b>Total funding</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
<b>Practices</b>						
<i>Funding</i>						
Direct funding <sup>1</sup>	70,22%	82,07%	63,77%	76,18%	68,43%	65,65%
Research grants <sup>2</sup>	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%
Contract research <sup>3</sup>	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%	0,00%
Other <sup>4</sup>	29,78%	17,93%	36,23%	23,82%	31,57%	34,35%
<b>Total funding</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>	<b>100,00%</b>

Note 1: Direct funding (basisfinanciering / lump-sum budget)

Note 2: Research grants obtained in national academic competition (e.g., grants from NWO and the Royal Academy)

Note 3: Research contracts for specific research projects obtained from external organizations, such as industry, government ministries, European organizations and charitable organizations

Note 4: Funds that do not fit into the other categories

## **Appendix 4**

### **Explanation of the categories utilized**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Meaning</b>	<b>Research quality</b>	<b>Relevance to society</b>	<b>Viability</b>
<b>1</b>	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.
<b>2</b>	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.
<b>3</b>	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.
<b>4</b>	Unsatisfactory	The research unit conducts 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.





Protestant Theological **University**

