

Research Review
Philosophy, 2005-2011

Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities (QANU)
Catharijnesingel 56
PO Box 8035
3503 RA Utrecht
The Netherlands

Phone: +31 (0) 30 230 3100
Telefax: +31 (0) 30 230 3129
E-mail: info@qanu.nl
Internet: www.qanu.nl

Project number: Q347

© 2013 QANU

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

CONTENTS

Preface	5
1. The review committee and review procedures	7
2. General remarks	11
Assessment at Institute and Programme level	17
3. Delft University of Technology	19
4. Eindhoven University of Technology	25
5. Erasmus University Rotterdam	31
6. Leiden University	47
7. Tilburg University	59
8. University of Twente	73
9. Utrecht University	79
10. VU University Amsterdam	93
Appendices	105
Appendix A: Profiles of the committee members	107
Appendix B: Explanation of the SEP scores	109
Appendix C: Programme of the site visit	111

PREFACE

This report seeks to assess the research in Philosophy undertaken in 18 programmes at 8 universities in the Netherlands during the period 2005-2011. It does not offer a complete overview of research in Philosophy in the Netherlands, since some universities did not participate, and a considerable range of research in Philosophy is done outside Philosophy Departments.

The Committee is grateful to the participating research programmes, and to the institutes and universities of which they form part, for compiling and presenting the extensive and detailed evidence that provided the main basis for the evaluation, and is very aware that this was a demanding task. We are also grateful for the attention and the thoughtfulness with which members of institutions and programmes who met with the committee responded to questions, and for their considerable patience in correcting misunderstandings and in answering follow-up questions that arose after these meetings. We were particularly impressed by the energy and good sense of the representatives of those programmes that were undergoing or had recently undergone substantial restructuring, and by the diversity and vitality of the philosophical cultures that we encountered.

Although the Committee had only limited time to meet with PhD candidates, whose experience and work form so vital a part of philosophical culture and research, we encountered a great deal of enthusiasm and a strong sense that the PhD candidates were a valued part of the research effort and could take pride in it. We are grateful to those candidates who took time to meet with us.

The completion of the report has been delayed to take account of comments made by some of the participating programmes. While this has led only to very limited changes in scores, it has proved useful, and the report has benefited from these comments. Reasoned replies to these comments and other clarifications have been incorporated into the body of the report.

We are above all grateful to Floor Meijer and her colleagues whose experience, skill and good cheer were indispensable for the collaborative production of a long and intricate document.

Onora O'Neill
Chair, Review Committee Philosophy

1. THE REVIEW COMMITTEE AND REVIEW PROCEDURES

Scope of the assessment

The Review Committee ('Committee') was asked to perform an assessment of the research in Philosophy at the University of Utrecht (UU), University of Leiden (LEI), Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR), VU University Amsterdam (VU), Tilburg University (TiU), Eindhoven University of Technology (TU/e), Delft University of Technology (TUD) and University of Twente (UT). This assessment covers the research in the period 2005-2011.

In accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 for Research Assessment in the Netherlands (SEP), the Committee's tasks were to assess the quality of the institutes and the research programmes based on the information provided by the institutes and through interviews with the management and the research leaders, and to advise how this quality might be improved.

Composition of the Committee

The composition of the Committee was as follows:

- Onora O'Neill, chair, professor emeritus at Cambridge University, UK; former President of the British Academy; member of the House of Lords;
- Robert Audi, professor at the University of Notre Dame, USA;
- Dorothea Frede, professor emeritus at the Universities of California at Berkeley and Hamburg, USA/Germany;
- Diderik Batens, professor emeritus at the Centre for Logic and Philosophy of Science, Ghent University, Belgium;
- Rudolf Bernet, professor emeritus at the University of Leuven, Belgium.

A profile of the Committee members is included in Appendix A.

Dr. Floor Meijer of the Bureau of QANU (Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities) was appointed secretary to the Committee.

Independence

All members of the Committee signed a statement of independence to safeguard that they would assess the quality of the institutes and research programmes in an unbiased and independent way. Any existing personal or professional relationships between Committee members and the programmes under review were reported and discussed in the Committee meeting. The Committee concluded that there were no unacceptable relations or dependencies and that there was no specific risk in terms of bias or undue influence.

Data provided to the Committee

The Committee received detailed documentation consisting of the following parts:

- Self-evaluation reports of the units under review, including all the information required by the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP), with appendices;
- Copies of the key publications for each research programme.

Committee remarks on the data provided

The amount of information provided was impressive, but the committee noted that for future occasions it could be useful:

- To provide clearer guidance on the inclusion and exclusion from the self-assessment report of publications whose authors have only limited or short-term membership of an institute or programme.
- To provide some separate and systematic information about the national research school and its contribution to postgraduate training, including doctoral. While the programme was highly thought of and appreciated by the PhD students with whom the Committee spoke, it was difficult to assess its systematic importance. Its importance is likely to increase in the future and could represent a remarkable opportunity for smaller institutes and programmes to ensure that their PhD candidates receive outstanding training across a wide philosophical range.
- To acknowledge that, given the small size of many of the programmes, and the fluctuations in staff and staffing levels, the computation and comparison of outputs per fte by year is often unrevealing.
- To state explicitly that publication cultures differ in different fields of philosophy, and that the proportions of work in leading international journals or with leading publishing houses may legitimately differ, and equally that the readiness with which research can be made available in forms suitable for a wider public may legitimately differ. There is no single profile of research excellence or societal relevance that is equally appropriate for all sorts of work.
- To address the fact that the programmes interpreted the classification of their publications in various ways. Some were very clear about the different categories of publication, some were not.

Procedures followed by the Committee

The Committee proceeded according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 (SEP). Each programme was assigned to two reviewers, who independently formulated a preliminary assessment. The final assessments were based on the documentation provided by the institutes, the key publications and the interviews with the management and programme leaders. The interviews took place between 4 and 7 November 2012 (see the schedule in Appendix C) in Leiden.

Before the interviews, QANU and two representatives of the participating universities briefed the Committee on the content and procedures of research assessment according to SEP. Subsequently, the Committee discussed the preliminary assessments and agreed upon procedural matters and aspects of the assessment.

At the end of the site visit, the Committee discussed the scores and comments. The texts for the committee report were finalised through email exchanges. The first assessor was responsible for writing the draft assessment and for sending it to the second assessor, who had to amend and/or approve the assessment. With the approval of both assessors, the assessment was inserted into the report. After receiving all assessments, the secretary compiled the report and returned it to the committee for a final approval. The approved version of the report was presented to the faculties for factual corrections and comments. Their responses were provided to the Committee in July, who considered them by correspondence during August and September. The final report was presented to the Boards of the participating universities and was printed after their formal acceptance.

The Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) 2009-2015 uses a 5-point rating scale (see Appendix B). The committee slightly adapted this rating scale. To increase differentiation between programmes, it was decided to extend the 5-point scale to a 9-point scale (1, 1.5, 2, ..., 4.5, 5). The .5 was used to indicate that a programme is in-between two integer ratings. For example,

4.5 for quality means that the quality of the research is at the international top, but that some improvements are possible.

The Committee would like to stress that it has taken the SEP instructions on the use of the scale and the meaning of scores very seriously. While it is aware that some Review Committees use only the top half of the scale, this Committee has chosen to use the full range of the five point scale, and to apply the scores according to the descriptions provided by the SEP. This means, for instance, that a score of 5, which expresses that a programme is 'world leading' can, by definition, only be given very rarely. By awarding scores of 3 and 4, the Committee indicates that it judges that the programmes are either 'good' or 'very good', not just according to national, but also according to international standards. In doing so, the Committee has tried to resist the ongoing trend of inflation of scores, which leads to a situation wherein variation between scores disappears and scores therefore lose their usefulness for making rankings and distinctions (Cf. Rathenau Instituut, 'Twenty years of research evaluation', July 2013).

The Committee is aware that, as a result, the scores awarded in the present review are generally lower than those in the previous one (1999-2004). This should not be interpreted as a sign of diminished quality. Given that the descriptors for the rankings have been changed, it was to be expected that a programme that did precisely as well in this period as in the previous period might in some cases receive a lower score, because the bar has been raised, and that a programme that was doing better might not receive a higher numerical score. The Committee urges institute and programme leaders, and others who may be interested in and make use of these scores, to interpret them in line with the current scale and the current descriptors and to view them in relation to the qualitative comments.

In view of dissatisfaction expressed by some programmes about the preliminary report, the Committee reviewed the report and the scores, over a number of weeks. They acknowledge that the task of using the descriptors and assigning scores involves judgement, and that at the boundaries judgement may differ. However, only one of the arguments for changing scores was judged convincing. The scores assigned reflected careful deliberation by the entire Committee, and not only by first and second reviewers of programmes. However, the Committee accepted that it could usefully clarify some of the comments made, and the entire text has been reviewed with that in mind. In particular it has sought to make it entirely clear to those who read and use the report that scores have been assigned in accordance with the current descriptors, and that they represent a score for the entire review period, not only for the end of the period, but often covering periods of institutional transition. We ask institutional leaders and others to bear this in mind in the use that they make of the scores, and not to assume that these scores represent anything other than success in meeting the standards set out by the descriptors.

2. GENERAL REMARKS

The Committee did not try to reach an overall assessment of the quality of research in philosophy in the Netherlands, being well aware that some universities with high-quality philosophy programmes did not take part in this evaluation exercise (including University of Amsterdam, University of Groningen and Radboud University Nijmegen), and that work in philosophy is done in programmes that were not part of this evaluation.

However, an overview of philosophy research in the eight universities and 18 programmes that were included in the exercise confirmed the view that there is a great deal of good, very good and excellent research in Dutch philosophy departments, some of it at the world's top in its specific field. Moreover, work of high quality is being done in the major areas of philosophy, including theoretical philosophy (logic, metaphysics, epistemology, and philosophy of science); history of philosophy (ancient, medieval, early modern, nineteenth and twentieth centuries); practical philosophy (ethics, political philosophy, legal philosophy, applied philosophy). In addition, there is a remarkable range of work on philosophy and technology, which has shown particularly robust growth in the last decade and which *seen as a whole* is at this point is matched in very few universities outside the Netherlands.

The Committee is grateful to the institutes and programmes for all their hard work in assembling information for this exercise, and for the care that they took in replying to questions that may sometimes have been inept. Although the Committee has commented on the difficulty of reaching a view of the accuracy, completeness and standardisation of the information provided on research quality, and in particular on the quantitative information, no members of the Committee underestimate how hard it is to provide such information, or the amount of judgement that is needed to compile robust and informative listings of research or and research-based publications.

The evaluation criteria

Like other assessment committees, this Committee has not always found the headings quality/productivity/societal relevance/viability easy to apply. The Committee offers some comments first on the two levels of assessment (institute and programme), then on quality and productivity, then on societal relevance and finally on viability.

Institutes and programmes

Making separate judgements of quantity and productivity raised a particular problem for those institutes that contain a single research programme. In general, the Committee resolved this problem by combining the assessment of quality and productivity for the institute and the programme in such cases. However, in cases where institutes have a number of programmes, the Committee retained the format of separate evaluations, sometimes at the cost of some repetition.

Research quality

In a future exercise of this type, the Committee hopes that it might be possible to offer more guidance on the variety of possible forms of research publication that are relevant, and on ways of indicating quality. It did not always feel well placed to judge outputs that were listed simply as 'chapters' or 'lectures', particularly if these were in less well-known journals or less well-known publishers, and least of all when they were published in academic journals that would not often be read in philosophy departments. We were well aware that the role of peer review varies in different fields of philosophy, and that there is no undisputed list of leading journals or publishers, although it is important not to exaggerate the level of disagreement.

Nevertheless, the Committee benefited from the care with which some programmes explained why they had chosen particular benchmarks or research metrics, and noted how useful it was to have evidence of how they sought to achieve high quality in their research publications, and supported one another in achieving high standards. These explicit accounts of research aims, quality control measures and intended audiences often provided useful evidence about quality under this heading.

Research productivity

It is well understood that there is no standard unit of research output, and the evaluation scheme was not rigid. This seemed appropriate to the Committee, but there may be some room for reflection on the different types of ‘books’ and ‘articles’ that are produced. A research monograph is not the same as a scholarly edition of a classical text; articles may be ground-breaking or trivial – and so on. Nevertheless, the Committee found the tabulation of numbers and types of research publication broadly helpful – and more so when accompanied by some self-aware commentary or analysis.

After the site visit, it came to the Committee’s attention that some programmes had included publications by visiting academics in their self-assessment reports. The Committee made some inquiries, and certain publications were delisted and the extent of employment of those holding various posts was clarified. This was helpful. Before this clarification it was already decided that no programme would have its score reduced because of uncertainty about the membership of the programme, since the Committee was not in a position to judge the extent of affiliations of all members of other programmes. This decision has not been altered. Nevertheless, the Committee suggests that it would be helpful in the future to provide more systematic evidence when work is done by those holding visiting appointments concurrently with full time appointments elsewhere.

In general, the Committee does not believe that it is possible to reach highly precise judgements – as perhaps suggested by metrics such as ‘output per fte’ – but thinks that it is possible to reach broadly reasonable views, provided that data are collected on a comparable basis. It strongly recommends that clearer guidance on the inclusion and exclusion of publications whose authors have limited or short-term membership of a programme be provided for future exercises.

Productivity of doctorates

The Committee was also asked to comment on the rate at which institutes and programmes produce successful PhD candidates. This was difficult since the number of PhD candidates was very low in many programmes, reflecting the difficulty in obtaining research funds to appoint internal candidates, and the reality that in some cases external candidates are less likely to complete the PhD. The Committee noted that this is a subject of some discussion, but did not reach general conclusions, other than scepticism about laying much weight on very small numbers.

However, the Committee is concerned that the small numbers might mean that isolation could be a problem for these candidates. Although the few PhD candidates with whom the Committee met spoke warmly of the National Research School, it was noted that this is in transition, and no systematic information about rates of participation was received. It seemed to the Committee in principle a very valuable way of ensuring that candidates in small programmes and institutes receive a high-quality philosophical training. But there was insufficient information for the Committee to take a view of what actually happens. Equally, the Committee received detailed and thoughtful accounts of the steps taken to assist rigorous

supervisions and systematic progression to completion (for example, joint supervision; regular meetings and reports on progress; systematic requirements to present work; assistance in reaching a high standard of work; required and subsidised conference attendance; and more) from some programmes, but not from others. The Committee suggests that there is much good experience to be shared, but that it may not be shared systematically at present.

Societal relevance

The Committee also thinks that it could be useful to encourage programmes to be more explicit about the various audiences with which they seek to engage in sharing their research in philosophy. In particular, it could be useful to say rather more about the differing audiences for whom particular sorts of engagement can be useful, for example by distinguishing work aimed at the general public, work that has a broadly educational purpose at various levels, work that is intended for specific professional or commercial audiences (including commissioned work), and work that is intended specifically for policy-makers – or for their critics and collaborators in civil society. It might be useful for programmes to explain *which* audiences they seek to address, and *why* they direct their attention to those particular audiences. The Committee appreciates that some highly technical work in philosophy will not be appropriate for a general audience, but it also believes that the range and diversity of potential audiences mean that even highly specialised work is likely to be relevant to at least some wider audiences if suitably presented. It noted some excellent examples in which programmes explained exactly whom they were aiming to reach with which aspects of their wider engagement work.

Viability

A striking feature of the institutes and programmes evaluated was that many had been subject to considerable restructuring within the very recent past. The types of restructuring varied, and for the most part the initiative appeared to have come from elsewhere within the institution. While there can be sound academic and other reasons for restructuring, more is not always better. In some cases we had the sense that programmes were being required to amalgamate with other groups or research teams with which they had little affinity. Nor was it always clear to us what had been achieved by restructuring. One sign of the arbitrariness of some recent cases of restructuring was the emergence of titles for programmes that appeared to be little more than lists of fields of inquiry or issues that might be considered. We do not think this is generally useful for building the reputation or the viability of programmes, and would have liked to see a clearer rationale for what had been done or was proposed. Perpetual revolution is not the way to build academic reputation.

However, a judgement of viability must look to the future rather than to the past. The most serious threat to viability arises when a programme becomes too small, loses talent, loses focus, or is uneven in its level of competence, or too reliant on interim appointments. When this happens, the prospect of securing research grants or appointing internal PhD candidates is reduced, the remaining staff is under pressure, and the remaining PhD candidates may be isolated. It also becomes hard to evaluate such programmes because their profile varies greatly within the evaluation period. The only cases in which the Committee worried about the viability of programmes reflected either institutional change or the loss of key members of staff. Good academic programmes have to be kept in good health, and that means anticipating ways in which a programme may be made vulnerable by too much changing of direction, or by losses of key members, or by requirements to enter collaborations which detract from rather than support the research they are best equipped to do. The Committee comments on these matters at appropriate points, and recognises that it is a central responsibility of the institutes to anticipate and address risks to viability.

A range of issues that were not listed as specific areas for assessment also drew our attention.

Coverage and collaborations

The Committee gained an incomplete but nevertheless interesting view of the scope of philosophy research in the Netherlands. Much of the work, including of the most impressive work, falls within the classical domains of history of philosophy, theoretical philosophy, and practical philosophy, although not every institute defined its programmes in this way. Certain other domains of research were less in evidence, including non-Western philosophy (however, the Leiden programmes have plans to extend their work in this area) and aesthetics: this would also be the case in other high-quality systems. The Committee did not obtain much overview of work being done in the philosophy of religion, but assumes that this is in part done, as elsewhere, in institutes of theology and religious studies. It noted that the specific focus of the programmes in the technological universities had made questions of technology prominent in some institutions, but that it was important that PhD candidates in those (and other) programmes maintain a wide engagement and competence in the philosophy of science. None of this appeared to depart much from the pattern that one would expect to find in other university systems with high standards.

However, a rather more unusual pattern was evident in the research collaborations – and lack of collaborations – between philosophy and other disciplines. The Committee noted that engagement with the social sciences was quite often directed very much to some branches of social sciences rather than others, and that there appeared overall to be more integration and joint research with departments of economics and sociology than with departments of law and politics. This is mildly surprising since work in ethics and political philosophy also lends itself particularly well to engagement with the latter departments. There also appeared to be some separation between those programmes that were strongly connected to business schools and those that were strongly connected to institutes of economics. While these facts no doubt have historical origins, the Committee believes that they could and should be a focus of some reflection at the level of institutes as well as departments.

The Committee was also unclear on how much philosophical research in applied philosophy is being done outside the institutes and programmes that were evaluated. For example, how much research in bioethics is being done in medical schools, and to what standards? How much research into business ethics is going on in business schools and to what standards? As there is a tendency – in no way limited to any one country – for applied ethics done in faculties that deal with the area of application to be less philosophically rigorous, it may be worthwhile looking at the full range of work being done on some future occasion.

The Committee noted that the recent reorganisations have led to the near disappearance of faculties of philosophy in Dutch universities. For the most part the evaluated programmes and institutes are now functioning within multi-disciplinary faculties and institutes. There is some risk that the disciplines that philosophical inquiry demands may be marginalised as a consequence. Any philosopher will be aware of this problem, which recurs in many university systems. But it needs to be addressed systematically by the institutes and universities of which they are part. The risk is that a programme that concentrates too much on interdisciplinary integration may foster and encourage some work that does not meet the highest standards of philosophical rigour. The Committee did not gain a systematic view of this problem, which is often most apparent in the sort of teaching provided at the Bachelor and Master level, or in the training of PhD candidates, but it is a set of issues that needs vigilance.

Finally, the Committee noted that it may prove useful for Philosophy Institutes to coordinate sufficiently to avoid excessive clustering of research, and to look ahead to ensure that no large but unintended gaps in the overall research profile and competence emerge.

Assessment at Institute and Programme level

3. DELFT UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

Programme TUD:	Philosophy of Technology, Design, and Values		
Programme director:	Prof. Ir. P.A. Kroes, Prof. M.J. van den Hoven, Dr. M. Franssen		
Research input 2011 (tenured) :	fte	4.07	tenured, 12.28 total fte
Assessments:	Quality:	3.5	
	Productivity:	4	
	Relevance:	4.5	
	Viability:	4	

Since all philosophy research is conducted within one single programme at Delft University of Technology (TUD), there was no separate assessment at the institute level and at programme level. Accordingly, the following assessment covers both the institute and the programme.

1a. The institute

At TUD, Philosophy research is conducted within the Faculty of Technology, Policy and Management (TPM), which is one of the seven engineering schools of Delft University of Technology. The self-evaluation report describes TPM as a multidisciplinary faculty combining expertise from the engineering sciences, the social sciences and the humanities.

TPM is subdivided into three Departments. Philosophy research takes place in the Department of Values and Technology, which since 2009 combines the Sections of Philosophy, Safety Science, and Technology Dynamics and Sustainable Development.

1b. The programme

The programme Philosophy of Technology, Design and Values is the only philosophical research programme within the faculty of TPM. It started in 2003, and its mission is 'to contribute to the overall aim of technology to improve the quality of human life by the philosophical and normative examination of modern technology in its social context, from a perspective focused on the design, development and implementation of technical artefacts, systems and infrastructures by engineers'.

The self-evaluation report identifies the following research objectives:

- Development of theories/frameworks for describing technical artefacts and sociotechnical systems;
- Development of theories/frameworks for analysing design for moral values;
- Development of conceptions of responsibility adequate for engineering practice.

In achieving its objectives, the programme is structured through a focus on three related domains. These are (in order of importance):

1. *moral issues in and about technology*
philosophical background area: (applied) ethics, meta-ethics
2. *engineering design*
philosophical background area: methodology, theory of action
3. *technical artefacts and socio-technical systems*
philosophical background area: metaphysics, philosophy of science

Together with groups at the technical universities in Twente and Eindhoven, the programme participates in the 3TU.Centre for Ethics and Technology (3TU.Ethics) founded in 2007 as one of the six ‘centres of excellence’ of the federation of the three Dutch universities of technology. This centre coordinates collaborative research projects where ethical issues of technological innovations and developments are studied and in which engineers working on these innovations are also involved.

Cooperation with Eindhoven is especially tight: both programmes focus on the design phase of engineering and share a general analytic approach to philosophy. The research groups at Delft and Eindhoven drew up a joint research programme in 2005, ‘Philosophy of Technical Artefacts’, for the period 2005-2010.

2. Quality and academic reputation

The self-evaluation report states that, given its mission and objectives, the academic quality of the programme is to be assessed in terms of both its disciplinary and interdisciplinary performance. The programme serves a double audience of academic philosophers on the one hand and engineers and other practitioners involved in technology, engineering and applied science on the other. The selected key publications reportedly reflect the aim to combine philosophical with practical relevance and deliver quality for both.

To testify to TUD’s academic reputation, the self-evaluation report states that the Delft programme has been very active in developing a body of knowledge for philosophy of technology and has received international recognition for doing so. Researchers have been invited to contribute to (and co-edit) volumes on the subject, have organised and hosted international conferences and workshops, and held memberships of editorial boards and of international academic institutions and organisations.

Assessment/remarks

The research objectives of the programme are clearly stated and have clear societal relevance. The decision to concentrate on design aspects of engineering practice addresses an important area of contact between engineering practice and ethical reasoning, also addressed by the group at TU/e. The Committee would have liked more information about the extent to which the published work reaches the intended ‘double audience’ of philosophers and engineers, and not only the smaller numbers with qualifications and interests in both areas. The published work is of a good standard; some of it appears in leading journals, and there is evidence of active contribution by way of memberships of scientific organisations and work on journals.

While the focus is both clear and important, the Committee found it hard to work out the distinctive contribution of TUD to the 3TU.Ethics, and to separate this from the contributions of other programmes in Philosophy and Technology.

3. Resources

During the assessment period, the employment of tenured staff remained fairly stable (the total number of tenured staff members increased from 3.59 in 2005 to 4.75 in 2010 and 4.07 in 2011), but the staff time available for research increased by more than one-third due to participation of tenured staff members in funded research projects or due to personal research grants (from NWO’s Veni-Vidi-Vici programme and from the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study, NIAS). Temporary research staff doubled between 2005 and 2010 (from 4.43 to 9.89), with its first decrease only in 2011, primarily due to the ending of contracts of several post-doc researchers. The years 2009 and 2010 were exceptional for the availability of

funds for relatively short-term employment of post-doc researchers and for the accumulation of research grants for permanent staff members.

The main sources of funding in the period under review have been direct funding by the TUD (which has been diminishing since 2009) and research grants from the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). The share of research grants in the total research time has fluctuated between 45% and 55% during the assessment period, with a notable increase during the final two years. The share of research grants in the programme's total research time is expected to remain around or slightly above 50% during the coming years.

Of the projects that ran during the assessment period, 12 were funded by the NWO, and 4 projects received funding through BSIK, a temporary fund for the development of the national knowledge infrastructure created by the Dutch Parliament in 2002. There were also 2 projects with EU funding, which were both consortium projects, being executed partly at Philosophy of Technology, Design and Values.

The 3TU.Centre for Ethics and Technology has allowed several of the PhD projects to be partly funded by engineering groups within the TPM Faculty, other faculties within TUD, or commercial companies. Thus, since 2007, a small percentage of research has been funded as contract research.

Assessment/remarks

The Philosophy Section is obviously well appreciated within TUD and has been well funded. Especially over the past two years, the programme has also been very successful in bringing in outside funding. It needs to consider how this success can be retained for the next period, or whether some adjustment of its aims would now be appropriate. It is important for the institute to develop a resilient strategy for addressing a situation in which competition for funding is likely to be more rather than less intense.

4. Productivity

Between 2005 and 2011, the number of refereed articles has varied between 13 and 33. Apart from the peak in 2006, due to the publication of a special issue of *Studies in History of Philosophy of Science*, the number has grown steadily. The number of book chapters dips in 2006 but then shows a rising line, with a peak in 2009, which is explained by the publication of two handbook-like volumes. Editorship of journals, too, has increased, from 2 in 2005 to 8 in 2011. Since 2009, 10 refereed international books have been published.

Of the six PhD candidates who started their research before 2007, three graduated in four years and one in five years. Two have not yet finished. Of the eight PhD candidates who have finished their PhD, all were able to find a job immediately or shortly after obtaining their doctorate. One found a job at the Dutch Rathenau Institute for Technology Assessment, two went on to teach at colleges of applied science, three went on to a post-doc research position (one of which is within the programme), and two have a temporary assistant professorship at the programme's home Section of Philosophy.

The programme is involved in organising and hosting international conferences and workshops. The frequency increased from about three per year during the first part of the assessment period to an average of seven per year during the final two years.

Assessment/ remarks

The programme has made successful use of its resources to produce high quality work across the evaluation period. The number of publications per research fte is good, and many publications are of high quality. The number of conferences and workshops hosted also reflects high productivity.

However, the number of PhD candidates is low, especially in comparison to the number of staff members and the number of research grants. Even if small, the programme has done well in creating a cohort of excellent PhD candidates, and this may continue to be the right strategy; but it is one that could be reviewed from time to time.

5. Societal relevance

According to the self-evaluation report, the closeness to engineering education and engineering research at TUD offers the opportunity to communicate with engineers who are engaged in the development of future technologies, and to link philosophical expertise to the concerns and drivers of engineering practice. It is the official policy of TUD that, ultimately, a clear insight into the characteristics of modern technology and high tech societies of the 21st century is important to the self-understanding of our culture, and that to contribute to this is part of the responsibility of a technical university.

During the assessment period, the efforts of the programme have been directed on the one hand to contributing to defining and developing the discipline of the philosophy of technology and on the other to developing initiatives to enhance its societal relevance. Regarding the latter, 3TU.Ethics plays a prominent role.

The Centre addresses urgent a range of social issues through academic cooperation, engagement with policymakers, and the media. It is part of the Centre's mission to act as an intermediary between the philosophy groups involved in 3TU and a wider range of those with an interest in ethical issues concerning technology. The Centre has striven for and achieved media visibility. Contact with engineering practice is achieved by directly involving engineering research groups from the three universities in research projects. The Hague Institute for Global Justice (www.thigj.org), an official partner institution of 3TU.Ethics, is instrumental in providing access to policymakers. Several programme members hold advisory positions on government committees.

Assessment/ remarks

The Committee notes that the programme secured a lot of its societal relevance by 'contributing' to 3TU.Ethics, the joint vehicle of the philosophers at the three technical universities and the largest centre for applied ethics in the Netherlands. The Committee agrees that work in the philosophy of technology can make an important and distinctive contribution to the self understanding of contemporary societies, and that it can reach a wide variety of different groups.

6. Strategy for the future

According to the self-evaluation report, within the Faculty of Technology, Policy and Management the section of Philosophy is recognised for adding important insights to questions that the faculty addresses. The section plays a key role in the current restructuring of the faculty, in particular in setting up the new Department of Values, Technology and Innovation.

The self-evaluation report also reports a high viability of the programme. There is a growing recognition of philosophy of technology as an important sub-discipline within philosophy, and 3TU.Ethics is expanding quickly.

The strategy of the programme leaders has been to concentrate on establishing the academic status for the field of philosophy of technology and engineering among its academic peers, in particular academic philosophy, and on collaborating with engineers in order to show that philosophy may contribute to solving problems occurring in engineering practice.

With respect to the composition of the research staff, the strategy will continue to be to hire staff preferably with a double background, both in philosophy and in science and/or engineering. However, so far a considerable number of PhD candidates have had only a little philosophical training. It is considered important that a thorough philosophical expertise is maintained at the level of the tenured staff. The programme also aims to hire more female staff members, if possible, as at present there is a male bias. No extension of tenured staff is to be expected in the near future, due to funding cuts at the university level. This means there is no room for supervising more PhD candidates and postdocs.

For the near future, the programme seeks to further intensify collaboration with other research groups within the TPM Faculty and TUD as a whole, in order to extend policy-oriented and contract research. To stabilise funding, the programme will continue to invest heavily in obtaining NWO grants, in particular from the Veni-Vidi-Vici programme, but it will also make more efforts to secure EU funding.

With respect to philosophical content, the research programme has set itself two major targets for the coming period, namely:

- to become a world leader in design for values, and;
- to develop together with other research groups within TPM and elsewhere a coherent conceptualisation of the notion of a sociotechnical system and methods for modelling such systems.

Assessment/remarks

The programme has a clear and optimistic strategy of maintaining the current and very successful policies, while recognising the changing and in all likelihood more competitive funding climate, both in the Netherlands and at the EU level. The Committee accepts that such optimism is a good strategy, and that the present focus is clearly productive, but also thinks that it would be worthwhile considering how the programme might develop if funding were less available. In short, it may be useful to have a strategy for stabilisation even while working to continue the recent trajectory into the future.

7. PhD training and supervision

PhD candidates at Philosophy of Technology, Design, and Values fall under the graduate programme of the Delft Faculty of Technology, Policy and Management, which sets requirements regarding skills and attendance at seminars and peer groups. If they form part of 3TU.Ethics graduate programme, there are some additional specific requirements for their coursework.

Candidates either enter the graduate programme directly or through TUD's MSc programme Philosophy of Science, Technology and Society. Part of the first year is devoted to coursework. Candidates may first choose a topic and then look for a suitable daily supervisor

from among the Centre's assistant or associate professors, or they may instead choose a daily supervisor first and then define their topic for dissertation research.

The core supervision team consists of the daily supervisor and the official 'promoter' (supervisor), a full professor. The full supervisory committee consists of the daily supervisor, the intended promoter, at least one other staff member of 3TU.Ethics, a staff member of a technical department (if relevant), and, optionally, a member from one of the foreign partner universities.

According to the self-evaluation report, the progress rate of the PhD candidates employed in 2005-2011 has improved relative to the progress rate of PhD candidates in the previous assessment period. This is considered a result of the new policy of letting PhD candidates gradually build up their thesis by writing papers, instead of looking upon their thesis as a monograph to be written in the final phase of the project.

A 'research day' is organised every year, where the whole 3TU.Ethics community meets to present and discuss research ideas and a distinguished invited speaker gives a keynote address. Every two weeks the Section of Philosophy holds a candidate colloquium, where PhD candidates present the results of their research. Candidates are also expected to present their results at national and international conferences and workshops. Each year, funds are available to attend one European and one transatlantic conference. PhD candidates are encouraged to spend some time abroad for research, and many candidates have been able to arrange a stay elsewhere.

Assessment/ remarks

This is an ambitious and well organised approach to research training: it could serve as a model for many programmes, in and beyond philosophy. For a future evaluation it might be useful to assemble data on the career destination of those who complete their PhD, and to gain a view of the extent to which they continue to work either in philosophy or in technology, or go in other directions. This information might prove useful in thinking about future directions for the programme.

Conclusion

This is an impressive programme, which has been riding a wave of success in a range of ways that the Committee has confirmed. Apart from some comments on specific matters that may need attention, it thinks that the main task of the next few years is likely to be that of moving from a phase of innovation and growth to one of steady state, while maintaining the excitement and energy of the last decade. As far as the Committee is concerned, this looks feasible.

4. EINDHOVEN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY

Programme TU/e:	Philosophy and its Applications to Technology	
Programme director:	Prof. A.W.M. Meijers	
Research input 2011 (tenured) :	fte	3.40 tenured, 11.54 total fte
Assessments:	Quality:	4
	Productivity:	3.5
	Relevance:	4.5
	Viability:	4

At the Eindhoven University of Technology (TU/e) all philosophy research is conducted within one single programme, which is embedded in a highly multidisciplinary setting. To reflect the fact that there is no specific research institute for philosophy, the committee has chosen not to assess the institute level separately. Accordingly, the following assessment covers both the institute and the programme.

1a. The institute

Philosophy research at TU/e is carried out at the Faculty of Industrial Engineering and Innovation Sciences (IE&IS). As its name suggests, this faculty covers two separate research and educational areas (Industrial Engineering and Innovation Sciences), which are represented by two schools.

The Department of Philosophy and Ethics is part of the School of Innovation Sciences, whose mission is to be a leading national and international centre of basic and applied research in the interdisciplinary field of innovation sciences. Research activities in the School focus on interactions between technological, economic, psychological and social developments, with an emphasis on pervasive and long-term changes.

The programme in Philosophy and its Applications to Technology is one of the five research programmes of the interdisciplinary School. To stimulate synergy and collaboration, the five research programmes are embedded in a single local research centre called the Eindhoven Centre for Innovation Studies (ECIS). Furthermore, the School organises joint seminars and working groups on interdisciplinary themes. At the university level, it cooperates in interdisciplinary projects with departments in the engineering sciences.

In addition to its local, multidisciplinary embedding, the programme is also strongly rooted in the disciplinary 3TU.Centre for Ethics and Technology (3TU.Ethics, described in the Delft chapter of this report). Until 2010 there was a bilateral cooperation with TU Delft in the programme 'Philosophy of Technical Artefacts'. According to the self-evaluation report, the Delft-Eindhoven programme was pivotal in coordinating research activities and in creating the critical mass required to establish the Netherlands as a key player in the philosophy and ethics of technology.

Researchers of the Department of Philosophy and Ethics also participate in the National Research School for Practical Philosophy. This School offers a programme for PhD candidates, a forum for researchers, and a platform for cooperation. The head of the Department of Philosophy at Eindhoven has been chair of the board of the Research School since 2009.

1b. The programme

The self-evaluation report states that the Philosophy Department at TU/e was previously embedded in a larger humanities/social sciences department and did not become a separate unit until 2009. Reportedly, this was made possible by the increased demand for philosophy and ethics teaching in the engineering programmes at TU/e, and the substantial expansion of staff that resulted from it. Between 2001-2003 and 2008-2009, eight new assistant and associate professors were hired. Subsequently, the acquisition of research money via external grants made it possible to hire new PhD candidates and post-docs. The self-evaluation report is confident that over the next two to five years, the Department of Philosophy and Ethics will continue to grow.

The guiding idea of the Philosophy and its Applications to Technology programme is that the analysis of many real-world problems concerning technology requires a philosophical perspective, and that these problems in turn inspire a substantial modification and extension of existing philosophical methods and theories. Members also believe that philosophical analysis in this area should be informed by empirical work on design, use and innovation, including the social, psychological and economic mechanisms that shape these activities; hence they aim at interdisciplinary cooperation. Areas of philosophy to which the programme primarily seeks to contribute are: ethics, meta-ethics, philosophy of science, epistemology, and metaphysics.

2. Quality and academic reputation

According to the self-evaluation report, TU/e has established itself as a prominent centre for research on philosophy and the ethics of technology, and both philosophers and researchers from other disciplines acknowledge the quality of the research results. Evidence for this is provided by discussion papers and book reviews devoted to the programme's work.

The decision to broaden the scope of research at TU/e to foundational philosophical work is reported to be extremely fruitful. According to the self-evaluation report, in the Netherlands there is considerable cooperation and coordination in the field of practical philosophy (ethics, meta-ethics, political and social philosophy, philosophy of law, applied ethics) and the success of the Research School for Practical Philosophy is remarkable, while there is a lack of organisation and critical mass in other philosophical disciplines.

Indicators showing the academic reputation of researchers include editorships, refereeing, chairing or membership of committees, invited lectures, and the organising of workshops and membership of conference programme committees.

Assessment/remarks

This programme dates back to 2000 and has grown substantially since then. Initially, its focus involved much joint research with the Technical University of Delft, but this pattern has not continued. The research approach is now more general: two dissertations were presented as evidencing this and as exemplary – one on actions with artefacts, the other on 'Engineering Flesh' (tissue engineering is among the biomedical developments the programme investigates). Artefacts have been a concern of the programme since its inception (and of some of its faculty for many years) and have figured in a number of its publications. Its research also extends to cultural evolution in the philosophy of science; this, as well as PhD training in the general philosophy of science, merit continuing emphasis.

The aim of research has been – appropriately in the Committee's judgment – quality rather than quantity. Some of the submitted publications, including the enormous handbook edited

by the programme director, are impressive, and the programme is visible internationally for its contributions to the philosophy of technology. This is a strong programme and it would be reasonable for the programme to aim to place a larger proportion of papers in the very top tier of journals.

3. Resources

The staff of the programme has grown from 1.94 fte tenured and 4.71 fte total in 2005, to 3.40 tenured and 11.54 fte total in 2011.

Funding has more than doubled since 2005. Direct funding was rising until 2010 but went down in 2011, as PhD and post-doctoral research are not funded directly by the university anymore (as of 2008). Funding through research grants has been rising considerably. In 2011, 60% of funding came from research grants, mostly from NWO.

In the Eindhoven Centre for Innovation Studies, Philosophy and Its Applications to Technology is one of five programmes. Since 2009, synergy between the programmes is rewarded with funding, and the philosophy researchers have applied for and received funding for proposals submitted together with researchers from other departments. One of these led to an NWO grant. Funding has also been obtained to organise several workshops.

Assessment/ remarks

The competition for external grants is keen and has led to a drop in numbers in the programme. Co-financing ('matching') is available only for the most applied projects. This increased level of competition for external funding is apparent for many programmes, and may become fiercer in the future. It is a strength of the programme that it has a highly focused aim, in an area of applied philosophy of great societal relevance with relatively few players. It is important not to lose this strength, while also ensuring that applied work is grounded in the thorough engagement with the theoretical positions that it seeks to apply. This is demanding, but in view of the programme's strength not unrealistic.

4. Productivity

The output in terms of publications has risen from five refereed articles in 2005 to 18 in 2011. When corrected for the increased number of staff, the number of publications per fte in the programme is not very high, and in fact it has diminished over the years. Also, the number of academic publications per fte at TU/e is rather low. By policy, the aim is that, for each 0.4 fte research appointment, there should be (at least) two publications per year – typically, a refereed article and a refereed book chapter.

The number of refereed book chapters showed a peak of 18 in 2009, due to the publication of the *Handbook Philosophy of Technology and Engineering Sciences*. In addition, in 2009, there were 4 full books, while in 2011 there was only one book and one refereed book chapter.

Of the three PhD candidates hired between 2003 and 2007, one graduated after five years and the other two after six years. The Department aims to reduce PhD completion time to four years. Currently, the programme employs six PhD candidates. Three PhD contracts (of candidates hired after 2007) were ended after the first year, for different reasons.

Assessment/ remarks

The programme's research productivity has grown across the period, but, productivity in terms of PhD completions has not. The output includes 65 refereed articles and 49 book chapters, which is a substantial amount for the period in question. Academic books number

16, which is also considerable, and there are a good number of conference papers listed as appearing in proceedings volumes. This level of published work reflects a large increase in the number of fte's. Just five PhD theses were completed in the relevant period. The expressed aim is to have one PhD candidate per faculty member (though usually two supervisors work with each candidate), which would require considerable further success in recruiting PhD candidates.

The comment on the productivity of PhDs should not be read as a criticism of the quality of the PhD programme. While the average completion time for the PhD is five to six years, the dropout rate is very low, and the requirement of a semester abroad during the third year may have great benefits. Given present strengths there may be good reasons to continue to recruit relatively few but excellent candidates and to give them an intensive training.

5. Societal relevance

According to the self-evaluation report, the application of fundamental philosophical insights to real-world issues involving the design and use of technology is central to the programme's main objectives. Therefore, part of the research focuses on issues of societal relevance, such as the validation of climate models, the increasing use of military robots, the production of bio-fuels, the design of persuasive technologies to promote sustainable behaviour, and the ethics of brain implants. In the last three years, three NWO-funded MVI ('Responsible Innovation') research programmes have been initiated. These involve a dialogue with external stakeholders at various stages of the research process. The programme's recruitment policy aims to facilitate its goal of combining foundational philosophical work with applications to technology.

An important part of the mission of 3TU.Ethics, in which TU/e participates, is to act as a platform for discussions about ethical issues related to technology, and to bring together academics, non-academic experts and policy-makers in workshops and other activities. Some examples of such contributions are given in the self-evaluation report.

Programme members have also contributed to teaching materials and published opinion articles in national and international newspapers. One group member is an accredited clinical ethicist.

Assessment/remarks

The programme has a good range of engagement with a range of wider audiences on topics of high societal relevance. This includes both engagement with policy issues and interaction with the Rathenau Institute on persuasive technology. The role of 3TU.Ethics, which is shared by the three technical universities, should also be mentioned here. This Centre is the largest centre for applied ethics in the Netherlands and the largest centre for ethics and technology in the world and provides a way of supporting public engagement with diverse audiences.

6. Strategy for the future

The department's recruitment policy is to attract research staff with a solid background in a philosophical discipline, and preferably an additional background in one of the sciences (engineering). This facilitates combining foundational philosophical work with applications to technology. All newly hired assistant professors are offered a personalised tenure track of four to six years toward an associate professorship, with clearly defined performance targets.

According to the self-evaluation report, recent changes in the educational system at Eindhoven University of Technology (TU/e) towards a Bachelor College setup have created substantial opportunities for the Department of Philosophy. Among other things there will be a mandatory course in the history and ethics of technology for first-year candidates in all bachelor programmes at TU/e. A conservative estimate is that the Department of Philosophy will be able to double its teaching activities in the next 2-5 years, and permanent staff at the School of Innovation Sciences is financed on the basis of teaching activities. The changes are not only relevant for a healthy growth of the department; they also create opportunities to cooperate with researchers in other departments.

The programme intends to continue cooperation with TU Delft on the philosophy of technology and with Delft and Twente on the ethics of technology in 3TU.Ethics.

Assessment/remarks

There is no problem of viability, and the linkage between the ethics of technology and the other philosophical considerations that bear on it should continue to offer a fertile field for innovative work. The committee notes the attractive terms offered to newly appointed assistant professors, considers this a strong indication of confidence and of good future prospects and hopes that it can be maintained.

7. PhD training and supervision

The self-evaluation report holds that all PhD candidates are supervised by at least two senior researchers, one of whom is available on a daily basis. They also have an Advisory Committee, usually consisting of the supervisors, the intended promoter and one or two external experts. All PhD candidates are formally evaluated near the end of their first year of employment, when a decision is made to continue or discontinue their contract. The Training and Guidance Plan contains clear deliverables and objectives for this evaluation.

This diversity of PhD candidates' backgrounds requires tailor-made coursework programmes. For projects in practical philosophy, courses are attended at the Graduate School of 3TU.Ethics and the Research School in Practical Philosophy (NRSPP). For projects in theoretical philosophy, courses are attended from the Dutch/Flemish Network for Philosophy of Science and Technology (NFWT). This network will most likely be replaced in the near future by the Chamber for Theoretical Philosophy of the Netherlands Research School for Philosophy.

At the local level, PhD candidates are expected to attend weekly seminars at the Department of Philosophy and to present their papers regularly at the department's workshops. They are also expected to attend interdisciplinary seminars and research days at the School of Innovation Sciences. PhD candidates are encouraged to spend a semester at a foreign university in their third year and to participate actively in international conferences. The externally funded research programmes finance these activities.

PhD candidates are expected to publish at least two research papers within their contract period in journals or edited volumes, to present regularly at international conferences and to organise academic activities (seminars and workshops). Supervisors increasingly focus PhD work on separate research papers, to be collected in a PhD thesis.

Assessment/remarks

This is a tailor made approach to doctoral training, and supervision, that recognises the demanding diversity of competences needed to work in these fields. Overall, the approach to

PhD training and supervision described here is both demanding and impressive. In the opinion of the Committee it should bear fruit in the quality of the posts that candidates obtain upon completion. It raises a question for future evaluation programmes: might it be more useful to evaluate the effectiveness rather than the productivity of PhD programmes?

Conclusion

The programme is achieving a great deal, and has acquired a distinctive reputation. Over time the relative emphasis placed on work in the philosophy of technology and in related areas including fundamental philosophical questions and interdisciplinary research that bears on technology may vary. The programme is strong enough to be flexible about this. The Committee does not think that there is any fixed formula for the apportionment of time, and considers all these aims to be mutually supporting.

5. ERASMUS UNIVERSITY ROTTERDAM

A. Institute level

1. The institute

The Faculty of Philosophy is the smallest of the seven faculties of the Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR) and one of the last three autonomous philosophy faculties in the Netherlands. Its research aims to contribute to fundamental debates raised by current developments in society, science and art, and to current debates in philosophy at large.

The faculty is responsible for the following research programmes:

1. History of Philosophy: ‘The Renaissance to the Early Enlightenment in the Dutch Republic’ (EUR 1);
2. Theoretical Philosophy: ‘Institutions’ (EUR 2);
3. Philosophy of Man and Culture: ‘Ontology of Mediation’ (EUR 3);
4. Practical Philosophy: ‘The Constitution of Normative Practices’ (EUR 4).

At the local level, the faculty has close ties to the Erasmus School of Economics and its Tinbergen Institute, as well as to the Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication. These ties will be formalised further with the official start of the Graduate School for the Social Sciences and the Humanities in September 2012. All staff members will join this initiative.

Most of the research staff members are involved with the National Research Schools (NRS). As of September 2012, the faculty is host to the National Research School of Ethics. In the future, this School will be transformed into a National Research School for Philosophy (‘Nederlandse Onderzoeksschool Wijsbegeerte’, OZSW) by adding ‘chambers’ for the history of philosophy and theoretical philosophy.

2. Quality and academic reputation

According to the self-evaluation report, all four research programmes address fundamental issues in current philosophical debates. The programme leaders and several other members of staff are described as leading in their fields of expertise (early modern philosophy, philosophy of science, philosophy of economics).

Furthermore, the self-evaluation report mentions that the programmes have applied for and obtained research grants from the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). Three major grants from NWO enabled the start of a new programme in Practical Philosophy, entitled ‘The Constitution of Normative Practices’.

Assessment/ remarks

The committee agrees that several members of staff (tenured as well as non-tenured) have excellent reputations in their research domains. Their work is prominently visible internationally through their publications and their participation in international conferences and regular institutional contact. The quality of the faculty’s work will be reflected in the review of the programmes.

During the interview, the institute management pointed to efforts to ensure that individual programmes pursue a common policy and achieve high quality across their respective areas. To the Committee, however, it seems that there are in fact considerable variations between

the areas, which reflect the impacts of departures and appointments, varying success in attracting funding for PhD students, and differences in publishing success. While the institute *taken as a whole* has critical mass and does high-quality research, some of its programmes lack this critical mass, or have done so at certain points during the period evaluated, and so understandably work(ed) and publish(ed) rather selectively within the fields in which they are or were active. This is not a weakness, but it is a consequence of the fact that at times during the evaluation period some of the programmes have had rather few staff, and rather few PhD candidates, and could not realistically produce work in a number of significant fields in their areas.

Given that the evaluation protocol recognises multiple types of work, all of the programmes produced work of high quality in one or more categories, and the overall programme at EUR does high-quality work across all the recognised categories. However, it is worth noting that international standards emphasise the publication of articles in refereed journals and with leading international publishers, and that particular attention needs to be paid to these sorts of publication.

3. Resources

In the years 2005-2011 the faculty's research staff has grown from 17.5 to 20.9 fte (fulltime equivalent). This is due to the growth in the Practical Philosophy section. Staff numbers in the Ontology of Mediation and Institutions programmes have diminished slightly, while staff numbers in the Renaissance programme have gone down and then up again.

Direct funding, research grants and contract research increased initially, although grants have gone down again since 2009. Direct funding is by far the greatest source of funding for research and education.

Assessment/remarks

It is the Committee's impression that the institute is doing well in obtaining resources. Three major grants were received from NWO. The quality of the staff is apparently such that it was sufficient to insist that they file the applications. The institute was also able to obtain the funding required for organising the National Research School for Philosophy from its own university.

The Committee did note that expenditures do not seem to match income. Expenditures for research have been higher than income since 2008, whereas for administration the funding is consistently higher than expenditure. This pattern of funding needs some clarification.

4. Productivity

The Faculty of Philosophy as a whole published between 17 and 35 refereed articles per year between 2005 and 2011, between 26 and 62 book chapters, and between 7 and 17 books. There were also between 12 and 36 professional publications and between 20 and 42 publications aimed at the general public. In all these categories, the higher numbers are in the last three years, suggesting that scores would have been higher if the evaluation had covered only the second half of the period.

Numbers of publications vary between the research programmes. Researchers in the Institutions programme, with relatively low staff numbers, published many articles, and researchers in Ontology of Mediation published high numbers of book chapters but fewer articles.

In 2003-2007, 0 to 4 standard PhD candidates started per year. Out of a total of 11, only one graduated after four years, and four more did so after five years. Five of them have not yet finished, while one dropped out. In addition, during the years under assessment, there was a total of four contract PhD candidates, without employee status. Only one of them has graduated so far. To improve completion time, the institute encourages PhD candidates to write dissertations that consist of a collection of previously published papers rather than monographs.

Assessment/ remarks

Publication cultures are different in different fields of philosophy. The same holds for the visibility of publications in citations. The Committee established that the publication profiles of the different programmes at EUR are highly differentiated. In the period under review, the History of Philosophy programme produced many scholarly editions and monographs, while the Constitution of Normative Practices programme provided many publications for wider audiences. Although the latter was the 'most productive' programme, a higher proportion of the work in the other three programmes received international recognition.

The Committee notes that the output of PhDs deserves attention. The overall number of PhD candidates is low, and the number of candidates who finish their PhD within a reasonable period of time is even lower. These figures are even more striking if one compares them to the number of tenured staff members, the NWO grants obtained, and the success of the research master's programme. Some other Dutch universities, as well as universities abroad that operate a similar graduation system, achieve better results in this respect. The Committee advises the institute to coordinate its recruitment and supervision efforts to ensure a steady flow in all programmes.

Given the varying numbers of staff and low number of PhD candidates in each programme, it is unclear whether computing 'output per fte' is informative, particularly given the different publication policies of the programmes and changes in membership. However, both for academic publications and for professional ones, the output of the institute as a whole across the period is reasonable.

5. Societal relevance

Striving for societal relevance is an integral part of the mission of the Rotterdam Faculty of Philosophy, according to the self-evaluation report. The faculty emphasises that peer-reviewed publications certainly matter, but so does addressing current cultural, political and societal issues in the Dutch media, with the conceptual expertise that characterises the philosopher. This is referred to as the 'two-tier policy'. In addition, some faculty members engage with policy-makers at various levels.

Assessment/ remarks

The Committee noted that the Institute has a healthy concern for the societal relevance of its research. As one would expect, this concern is more visible in some of the four sections than in others. It is clear that the publication profile of the Constitution of Normative Practices programme aims at direct societal relevance to a range of audiences, including through accessible publications for wider audiences. However, a good case can also be made for seeing the output of the other programmes as having societal relevance. For example, the work of the History of Philosophy programme is clearly relevant to the self-understanding of Dutch high culture since the early modern era; the work of the Institutions programme has implications for scientific culture, and the work of the Ontology of Mediation programme bears on a range of contemporary political and social issues. While recognising the distinctive

and direct contribution of the Constitution of Normative Practices programme, the Committee concluded that all of the programmes have a good, if diverse, societal relevance, and accordingly that the institute is doing well in this respect. It would be useful for the institute to encourage each programme to think specifically about its contribution under this heading, while stressing that the aim should not be a uniform type of contribution.

6. Strategy for the future

The self-evaluation report states that the four programmes are quite autonomous when it comes to determining their strategy for the future. The faculty ‘accommodates and enables’ these strategies, while at the same time it encourages research staff members to obtain research grants. The faculty’s personnel policy is directed largely by successful research applications. In the future, seeing that NWO’s funds are expected to decrease while the number of applications is increasing, a special effort will be made to acquire European grants.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee has established that the challenges mentioned in the 1999-2004 review were adequately met, and the Institute kept up its high quality. There is a strong concern for strategy and policy within the faculty. The replacement of two professors was performed with the required attention, and the newcomers were integrated in a considered and careful way. Also, the decision to organise the new research school was carefully considered, and the organisation itself was well prepared in terms of human and financial resources.

The Institute is anxious to retain its status of a faculty, which it sees as a warrant for independence. It is striking that some philosophy institutes of other universities are happy to have merged into more interdisciplinary groupings. Exchanging experiences might be useful.

The Committee understands the special situation of philosophy of economics within EUR and appreciates the attention paid to this in research as well as teaching. It also noted that at one stage in the evaluation period much of the research on philosophy of science, philosophy of physics and mathematics, and metaphysics was being conducted by non-tenured staff, but that towards the end of the evaluation period the key researchers were promoted, that success in attracting grants in this area is now robust, and that a parallel improvement in recruiting doctoral students and PhD completions is underway.

These positive developments should be enhanced by taking on responsibility for the National Research School of Philosophy, which will be useful in ensuring that the full range of graduate training needs are actually and successfully addressed.

Notwithstanding these positive developments, some members of the Committee considered the SWOT analysis provided in the self-evaluation report overoptimistic. The only negative comments in that analysis are external (projected decisions of the former Dutch government; EUR’s changed policy on undergraduate teaching) or shared with all philosophy departments (‘demographic constitution’). Where ‘quickly growing student numbers’ were mentioned in the self-assessment report (also in the section on viability), the interview mentioned a ‘drop in student numbers over the past year’, which would be a potential threat for the future if it continued – although the Committee understands that this is not expected. The Committee did not think that an assumption – shared by many programmes – that additional EU funding would be forthcoming was robust, given the likely levels of competition.

7. PhD training and supervision

The self-assessment reports that all PhD candidates take part in the seminars held by each chair. At a bi-annual presentation, in the presence of all faculty members, they present their progress in a 10-minute talk. In addition, they are all affiliated to a National Research School, such as the Research School for Ethics or the Huizinga Institute for Cultural History.

The creation of the National Research School in Philosophy and the Rotterdam Graduate School for the Social Sciences and the Humanities will provide further structure to the training and supervision of PhD candidates, according to the self-evaluation report.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee notes that the evidence presented did not fully answer some questions about the training of PhD candidates, which may be resolved when the Institute takes responsibility for the National Research School, and the remit of NRS is broadened to cover training in the full range of philosophical specialisations. The Committee did not receive separate evidence of the contribution of the NRS to graduate training, but it was highly spoken of by the PhD candidates (from various institutions) with whom the committee met.

The Committee noted that information about the achievements of the PhD candidates left some questions unanswered, mainly where the level of graduate training is concerned. For example: what gaps in preparation have been noted? Is the expectation that successful PhD candidates will be able to compete for entry-level posts in philosophy in the Netherlands, or indeed internationally, robust? Are those who successfully completed their degree likely to be as well prepared as international comparators – for example, those completing their PhD in leading US universities? Are the same assumptions made about the level of preparation and the career trajectories of funded and ‘external’ PhDs? The Committee noted some variety in responses to questions on the latter point. It is important to achieve clarity on these points as EUR takes over responsibility for the National Research School.

B. Programme level

The Committee assessed the following programmes of the Faculty of Philosophy of the Erasmus University of Rotterdam:

	Quality	Productivity	Relevance	Viability
The Renaissance to the Early Enlightenment in the Dutch Republic	5	4	5	5
Institutions	4.5	4.5	3.5	4
Ontology of Mediation	3.5	4	5	3
The Constitution of Normative Practices	4	3.5	4	4

The detailed assessment of each programme follows in the next section of this report.

Programme EUR 1 (or EUR 11): The Renaissance to the Early Enlightenment in the Dutch Republic

Section:	History of Philosophy	
Programme director:	Prof. L. van Bunge	
Research input 2011 (tenured) :	fte	1.55 tenured, 4.35 total fte
Assessments:	Quality:	5
	Productivity:	4
	Relevance:	5
	Viability:	5

Brief description

This programme concentrates on the early modern age, and in particular the history of philosophy in the Dutch Republic. Much of the scholarship involved undertakes contextual analyses and translations of canonical texts by authors such as Erasmus, Descartes, Spinoza, Locke, and Bayle. An important issue is the impact of early modern philosophy on the making of modernity, and many publications address the early Enlightenment of the latter half of the seventeenth century.

Quality

The programme forms a well-conceived unity, with a good distribution of specialisation between the three key researchers. The group's concentration on 'star figures' of the early Enlightenment, of high importance for European culture, such as Erasmus, Descartes, Spinoza, Locke and Bayle, makes the programme unique not only in the Netherlands but in the world of scholarship at large. It attracts visiting scholars from all over the world because of the numerous connections between their philosophical arguments and the history of science, religion, politics and cultural life in general during the same period.

The quality of publications by the members of the group is very high. It consists more of monographs and critical editions than articles. Editorial work is a time-consuming task that historians of philosophy have to shoulder, and while it is not always counted as original research, the best work of this type involves a high order of originality. Given the unique focus of research of the programme worldwide, it represents an important contribution to international scholarship.

The scientific relevance of the research is evidenced by numerous contacts with researchers from all over the world, by the many conferences attended by its members and by those they organise.

Productivity

The quantity of output in books, editions, and articles is high and shows that the research is internationally well received and has been consistent over the past years. The fact that the number of refereed articles is lower than average is explained by the focus on time-consuming editorial work. This is expected to improve after the completion of the edition of the correspondence of Pierre Bayle.

The number of PhD candidates is on the low side. This is partly due to the programme's concentration on a particular time period that attracts specialists rather than students with a more general interest in philosophy. The Committee noted that most of the candidates do not finish their work in time, and that this is a concern that the department is aware of and hopes to improve by an even more careful selection of candidates who are well prepared to work to

the deadline and have a good command of Renaissance Latin. These efforts should also help the department in seeking to appoint more internal PhD candidates.

Societal relevance

The value of the work for a range of wider publics is shown by the fact that the programme is one of the national organisations that keeps alive the importance of the early Enlightenment to Dutch culture. It plays an active and successful part in public events, and publishes material for schools, for the general public and for specialised audiences.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

The group has a clear perspective for the future development of its research. The group's leader will expand his research into eighteenth-century Enlightenment in the Netherlands, the second major researcher will dedicate his work to Erasmus, and the third will make philosophy of war part of his studies. In addition, the group intends to focus on trade and commerce in the age of Enlightenment and its reflections in philosophy – it will host an international conference on this topic in 2015. The Committee regards these moves as promising expansions that are well within the compass of the researchers' competence. This will ensure that the programme will retain its importance in the future and make it more attractive for PhD students interested and prepared to work in that period, both nationally and internationally.

Conclusion

The present organisation of the programme and its prospects for the future are in principle very good. The members are advised, however, to coordinate and strengthen their efforts to design attractive projects in order to succeed in the stiff competition for funded candidates. Success will also depend on strengthening international contacts, and creating a 'virtuous spiral' that increases the chances of attracting competent PhD students from across the world who are competent to work in the special area of Early Enlightenment.

Programme EUR 2 (or EUR 12): Institutions

Section:	Theoretical Philosophy	
Programme director:	Prof. J. Vromen	
Research input 2011 (tenured) :	fte	0.85 tenured, 4.15 total fte
Assessments:	Quality:	4.5
	Productivity:	4.5
	Relevance:	3.5
	Viability:	4

Brief description

This programme includes philosophy of science, analytical metaphysics and logic. The majority of members focuses on the philosophy of economics, especially the methodology of economics and foundational issues in economic theory. They also contribute to current debates on realism, causation and mechanisms. Other programme members focus on natural science, philosophy of physics and mathematics, and metaphysics.

Quality

This programme is quite specialised, being largely built around the subject of economics, with two subgroups: one (started in 1996) concentrating on the philosophy of economics and the other focused on general philosophy of science, construed as encompassing epistemology. The programme achieves greater breadth by holding seminars that cover general philosophy, although applications to the philosophy of economics are stressed. The representative publication list includes some very high-quality work, some of it published in internationally prominent journals. The Committee found the programme's overall quality very high, with coherence enhanced by the focus on economics.

Productivity

The number of refereed articles is impressive (apart from the apparent anomaly of 2006) and offsets the comparatively small number of book chapters. Relative to the overall publication figures, one might have expected more conference papers on the list, but the overall publication output is very positive. However, it is surprising that only one PhD thesis was completed between 2007 and 2011. There are currently several PhD candidates in the programme, so the low rate of PhD completion might change.

Societal relevance

The topics of published research vary considerably, though economics is a recurring focus. Some papers are quite technical, but the emphasis on economics enhances the relevance of the programme to many societal concerns. During the interview the programme director noted that policy consultations on economic issues tend to be posed to professional economists, to the exclusion of philosophers. While this may be a pattern that cannot easily be altered, the research results of the faculty mean that they could contribute to a range of wide audiences. The committee believes that the programme has further potential to reach not only the wider public, but specific professional and business audiences, and that it will be able to add to the diversity of its already considerable societal relevance .

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

Viability is not in question for this programme, but greater philosophical breadth and a wider range of policy-related work and applications to policy could enhance its attractiveness both to potential students and to funding agencies. The programme leaders already recognise the desirability of more and wider publications that addresses public policy and are planning to achieve this.

Conclusion

The programme acknowledges the challenge of giving greater emphasis to general philosophy of science, both in publications and in the selection and supervision of PhD candidates. Its suggestion is not to shift the academic centre of gravity of the programme or to compromise on quality. The Committee agrees that applied work of high quality can have an impact on public policy and public understanding. This programme is clearly viable, but wider communication of its combination of philosophical breadth and diverse applications to policy could enhance its attractiveness both to potential students and to granting agencies and might facilitate interaction between philosophy of science – especially of economics – and moral philosophy, which could be beneficial.

Programme EUR 3 (or EUR 13): Ontology of Mediation

Section:	Philosophy of Man and Culture	
Programme director:	Prof. J. de Mul	
Research input 2011 (tenured) :	fte	1.9 tenured, 4.9 total fte
Assessments:	Quality:	3.5
	Productivity:	4
	Relevance:	5
	Viability:	3

Brief description

This programme concentrates on mediation, in various senses of the term. It approaches our understanding of the world and ourselves as intimately connected to both the traditional and emerging forms of mediation of the structuring of our perception of reality.

The three interrelated sub-programmes are:

- Computer-Mediated Identity Formation;
- ‘Intermediality’ in Contemporary Art, Philosophy and Politics;
- Intercultural Mediation.

Quality

The aim of the programme is to bring together very divergent research interests: computer-mediated identity formation, ‘intermediality’, intercultural mediation. It thereby aims to explain the ‘mediatic turn’ – how mediating structures change our perception, conception and interpretation of the world and ourselves. This is a very ambitious project because it seeks to incorporate ‘intermediality’ in contemporary art, philosophy, and politics as well as intercultural mediation.

The main strengths of the programme lie in its systematic use of the history of philosophy, in its attempt to apply the hermeneutical method to new domains, and in its openness to recent developments in contemporary continental philosophy. Although the Committee has some reservations about the thematic coherence and soundness of the methodological approach, it appreciates the high profile of several researchers and the innovative spirit of the programme, which in its own way plays a leading role in the Netherlands and beyond. All components of the programme seem to have well-organised forms of interdisciplinary collaboration. It has also been fairly successful in securing external funding. Although realising that the more recent focus on life-sciences (‘bio-hermeneutics’) fits with the programme’s research interest, the committee wondered how the relevant technical competences would be developed and linked. The quality of the publications by the contributors to the different components of the programme is generally good; some of it is excellent.

The academic reputation and international visibility of members of the programme is good to very good. Among the different sections ‘intercultural mediation’ seems most promising, but needs to achieve a clearer profile.

Productivity

The programme has produced a large number of publications. However, the Committee had some difficulties in assessing the list because it was inordinately long and the classification was hard to follow. Most of the publications are books and book chapters; there are few articles in refereed journals of international standing. While peer review is not always a measure of quality, it would be possible to be more explicit about the measures of quality the programme currently sets for itself and the reasons why they are the appropriate measures.

A clear testimony to the programme's success is the large number of PhD candidates with different geographical and disciplinary backgrounds. The rate of completion of dissertations is good, and the concern for their placement deserves to be noted.

Societal relevance

The Committee noted the considerable effort of the members of the programme to reach out to wider audiences. This is illustrated by publications of general interest and public lectures, by the provision of advice and training provided for stakeholders and administrators, by fieldwork in urban development and by provision of education in prisons. All of these activities show a genuine concern for critical societal and political issues and an engagement in concrete initiatives.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

The Committee's concerns for the future viability of the programme are linked to its past accomplishments. The programme may have rather too few permanent staff members to take forward work in such a wide range of fields. The Committee appreciates the effort taken to make the programme internationally more visible, but suggests that greater focus in the planning of future research may be useful. Because most philosophy departments in the Netherlands do not work in this area – or rather these areas – the Committee suggests that the programme might consider developing a very visible focus – for example in philosophical aesthetics and related approaches to politics or other areas in which it is not too crowded – which could help give the work of this group of highly motivated, open minded and well-qualified researchers a high international profile.

Conclusion

This is an attractive and diverse programme that covers a very broad field, or perhaps range of fields, in contemporary continental philosophy. A corollary of that diversity is that the Committee also suggests that more attention should be paid to a better integration of its different components and methodologies. Rather than adding new lines of research and increasing the quantity of mid-range publications, the programme should work on developing a clearer profile and on securing its international visibility, and its presence in top rated international journals. In the field of continental philosophy, as in other fields, specialisation with a clear focus is essential.

Programme EUR 4 (or EUR 14): The Constitution of Normative Practices

Section:	Practical Philosophy
Programme director:	Prof. I.A.M. Robeyns
Research input 2011 (tenured) :	fte 1.63 tenured, 7.45 total fte
Assessments:	Quality: 4
	Productivity:3.5
	Relevance: 4
	Viability: 4

Brief description

This research programme was reorganised in 2008, i.e. midway through the evaluation period. It covers a wide area of research in practical philosophy. There are three clusters:

- In the first cluster, normative questions in ethics and political philosophy are addressed. Researchers strive to develop a theory of justice based on the capability approach and take a special interest in issues of care.
- The second cluster is politically oriented and revolves around the concept of ‘interpassivity’, which names and supposedly helps explain the increasing failure by people to act on the norms to which they subscribe.
- The third cluster is situated at the intersection of meta-ethics, moral psychology and the philosophy of action; it studies our understanding of what it takes to make reasonable moral decisions, and aims to elucidate the concepts of moral agency and free will. The implications of the findings of neuroscience are taken into account whenever relevant.

Quality

This programme has made progress since the arrival of its current programme director in 2008, and in this case reorganisation has had positive effects during the latter half of the evaluation period. The number of PhD candidates has increased, and the quality of articles in refereed journals and monographs is now high, and covers important issues in contemporary work on responsibility and freedom, theories of justice as well as a distinctive line of work on the disengagement of citizens from politics. This work does not, of course, cover the full range of themes in ethics and political philosophy. At present, the interdisciplinary connections are mainly with sociology; although a programme that does work on justice might as readily or more readily make connections with law or politics, or both. While at this point the programme is not a world leader, the work is competitive with that done in excellent departments elsewhere, and the improvement in the more recent part of the evaluation period is impressive.

Productivity

Productivity has risen in recent years, and publications are appearing in internationally recognised journals and series. It is probably too early to talk about consistency of levels of output, but there is good evidence that the overall lower productivity than that of other EUR programmes in philosophy reflects the past. Indeed, if the Committee had considered only the years 2009-2011, the score for this aspect would have been higher. In the case of this programme, looking at output per fte across five years is clearly not informative. Equally, the number of PhDs has risen, but this is not yet reflected in increasing numbers of completions. If things continue to go well, these should rise considerably.

Societal relevance

Work done in this programme combines high academic quality judged by the usual indicators (articles in refereed journals, books with leading publishers) with intrinsic societal relevance. However, the identification of the areas of collaboration that could best contribute to societal relevance could benefit from some further thought, and might include more interaction with politics and law. The Committee does not wish to be prescriptive about the exact direction that should be taken, but recommends that specific directions be explicitly considered, explored, selected and pursued.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

The programme as currently configured is viable, but it would be worthwhile to think through which connections to specific types of work in the social sciences, other disciplines, and other institutions should be emphasised. Since the programme stresses normative work in ethics and political philosophy, it may wish to link to normative approaches to politics and jurisprudence as well as to sociology.

Conclusion

This programme did not receive the highest ratings for productivity or quality, but this is largely a matter of timing. The programme is more than viable as it is at present, its productivity and the quality of its work have been strengthened since 2008-9, and it seems likely to sustain a higher level of these than could be achieved in the earlier part of the evaluation period. The programme is well placed to develop a range of fruitful links with partners within and beyond EUR.

6. LEIDEN UNIVERSITY

A. Institute level

1. The institute

Since September 2008, Philosophy in Leiden has been part of the Faculty of Humanities. The former Faculty of Philosophy became the Leiden University Institute of Philosophy (LUIPh). Though this change has not always enhanced efficiency, according to the self-evaluation report, its financial consequences turned out to be manageable, and the merger presents opportunities to develop research programmes together with other parties.

It is the mission of the Institute of Philosophy to conduct ‘internationally recognized research in Western philosophy, with a keen eye to issues of the 21st century.’ The institute investigates fundamental political and ethical issues and proposes new applications of philosophical theory. In addition, it reflects on the universal, global and local aspects of knowledge and knowledge acquisition. Since philosophy develops conceptually in interaction with its history, historical studies constitute an integral part of the Institute’s research.

Since the last review period, the number of programmes has been reduced from three to two:

1. Philosophy (and history) of the Sciences and Humanities, recently renamed Philosophy of Knowledge: The Universal, the Global, and the Local (LEI 1);
2. Agency and Interaction: Conflict, Community and Rational Justification, recently renamed Normativity and Its Sources: Agency, Interaction and Conflict in a Globalizing World (LEI 2).

The remaining researchers of the former third programme (Philosophy of Man, Technology and Culture) will maintain teaching and research in the area of continental philosophy at Leiden University.

2. Quality and academic reputation

The self-evaluation report claims that the Institute of Philosophy aims to compete at the highest level of international research in philosophy. It hopes to publish in the best journals, and with the most distinguished publishing houses in their fields. However, it is also stated that in view of numbers, budget, spread of research interests, and, notably, research time available to individual researchers, LUIPh cannot compete with major international players. The institute likes to compare itself to Trinity College Dublin or the Essex Philosophy Department in terms of size, quality and diversity. It aspires to grow to the size of the Philosophy Department of Edinburgh University.

In the Philosophy of Sciences and Humanities programme, 15% of articles is reported to belong to the top 10%, while in Agency and Interaction, this number is 9%.

Assessment/remarks

The committee notes that the research of LUIPh reaches a high standard, as evidenced by refereed articles, book chapters, and monographs. Most of its researchers have excellent scholarly records and are internationally well connected, as shown by their cooperation with institutions both nationally and internationally, and by the number of visiting scholars.

3. Resources

Staff numbers at the LUIPh have remained roughly the same between 2006 and 2011. With 9.8 fte, tenured staff has gone slightly down in 2011, while total research staff remained stable at 16.7 fte.

Funding has also remained fairly stable, with a slight peak in 2008 and 2009. Direct, internal funding still makes up the majority of the institute's funding sources, but its percentage has gone down since 2009, thanks to the growth in the percentage of research grants from 26% to 39%. This growth took place for both research programmes.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee noted that outside funding has increased over recent years, and the institute is aware that more needs to be done in view of the increasingly stiff competition. These facts speak for effective leadership and good cooperation within the LUIPh as a whole. The institute is in a good position, with a strong reputation, but because of its limited size, it needs to make strategic choices about the focus of its research.

4. Productivity

The LUIPh's researchers published between 2 and 24 refereed articles per year in the review period. Numbers vary greatly between years, with the low point of 2 articles in 2006. The number of refereed books varies between 0 and 2 per year. In a comparison of output relative to input, the programme LEI 1 (Philosophy of Sciences and Humanities) has a somewhat higher ratio of publications per fte and also of academic publications per fte than LEI 2 (Agency and Interaction).

Out of the six standard PhD candidates who started between 2003 and 2007, one graduated within four years, one in slightly over five years, and two took more than seven years to graduate. One dropped out, and one has not finished yet. In this period there was one self-funded PhD candidate, who graduated in four years, and one on a scholarship who took slightly over four years.

Assessment/remarks

The quantity of scientific output of the members of the LUIPh is comparable to that of other institutions of similar size. Since a peak in 2009, there has, however, been some decrease, and the Committee feels that the institute could aim to increase the quantity of scientific output, which does not quite match the high standards of the key researchers. The same seems to apply to the recruitment of good graduate students. The output of PhDs has been fair to middling; a few excellent candidates finished within four years and have obtained positions as researchers in their respective fields in other research institutes, but others are taking much longer. In addition, there is currently a large group of unfunded candidates whose relation to and supervision by the institute is unclear to the Committee. Close attention should be given to the recruitment, supervision and progression of PhD candidates, whether internal or external.

5. Societal relevance

The self-evaluation report describes philosophy as reflection on science, humanities, and society. As such, LUIPh aims to offer the results of its research not only to fellow academic philosophers, but also to the wider academic community, philosophy professionals, and society at large. Researchers are said to contribute regularly to reunion days for alumni, to offer refreshment courses for philosophy teachers at high schools, to add to high school exam syllabi, and to teach Studium Generale lecture series and commercial philosophy

courses for the general public. Furthermore, they participate in discussion groups and contribute to other activities aimed at the general public (books, contributions to and interviews in *Filosofie Magazine*, events of the national Month of Philosophy). According to the institute, almost 40% of the output of the institute's researchers is directed at audiences other than their direct academic peers. However, participation in societal debates or institutional stakeholders (official, business, professions, etc) is said to depend on demand rather than LUIPH's own initiative.

Assessment/ remarks

The institute estimates that 40% of its output is directed to external audiences. But despite this impressive percentage, the outreach seems mainly to local audiences and to occasional interactions of the kind expected from every institute of philosophy. The committee believes that it should be possible to communicate many aspects of this philosophical work of the institute both to the wider public that is interested in culture in general, and to various professional, institutional and commercial audiences with an interest in specific issues.

6. Strategy for the future

Over the coming years, LUIPh means to continue its standing policy: all research staff are expected to develop research proposals every year, which will be given weight during the yearly assessment interviews.

The LUIPh's research policy has reportedly been designed to enhance members' chances for acquiring external research funds, and to develop connections to humanities and social sciences disciplines. This includes increasing involvement with the faculty and university research profiles 'Dynamics of diversity', 'Global interaction of people, culture and power through the ages' and 'Political legitimacy: institutions and identities'.

The possibilities for appointing younger staff – who are eligible for more kinds of NWO and European funding than senior staff – are limited, according to the self-evaluation report. Of the three researchers who are expected to retire soon, only two will be replaced unless new funding can be raised. One way to do this is to expand researchers' teaching duties; options for teaching Philosophy of Science as well as Ethics courses in the Faculty of Medicine and in Biology will be explored in the near future.

A further initiative is the development of Comparative Philosophy. In a faculty involved in the comparative study of the world's histories and religions, the development of the systematic and comparative study of the world's philosophies is expected to give LUIPh a place in the faculty and to provide further integration with the 'Dynamics of diversity' and 'Global interaction' profiles. Currently, a programme that covers teaching, research, and research training is being prepared with stakeholders in LUIPh, the Faculty of Humanities and University College The Hague.

According to the self-evaluation report, the exploration of further possibilities of cooperation and co-application for research funds together with other European parties is high on the agenda for the next couple of years. Also, developing Political Philosophy is considered vital. This should happen in cooperation with the political and academic organisations in The Hague, preferably together with the neighbouring universities of Rotterdam and Delft.

Assessment/ remarks

On the whole, the performance of the institute has been very good over the last years. Some members of the LUIPh have established lines of productive cooperation with members of

other Dutch universities working in the same field, and while some other attempts to increase cooperation have not been successful, these efforts should be continued.

The Committee notes that after the reduction of the number of programmes from three to two, the remaining programmes have tried to tighten their profiles. The ‘Agency, Interaction, and Conflict’ programme is presently in transition, because of the departure of its key researcher to Groningen. Two attempts to attract internationally renowned successors have failed, apparently at the last minute, and not for reasons connected with the LUIPh. According to the Committee, the institute’s prospects depend very much on finding a successor with a high profile. In addition, much depends on the success of the institute’s efforts at developing ‘Comparative Philosophy’, a project that intends to provide systematic and comparative study of the world’s philosophies, in cooperation with comparative studies in other institutes at Leiden. As far as the Committee could see, this project is still at an early stage, and it is not entirely clear how the LUIPh, given its modest size, will cope with such an ambitious project that presupposes a lot of interaction with other institutes and the necessary linguistic competence to participate in research in non-Western philosophy.

LUIPh profits from the reputation of the University of Leiden as the Netherlands oldest and internationally best-known university, but needs to define a future focus that will uphold that reputation. The Committee notes that this may be difficult until new senior appointments are in post, but regards it as important that the institute not rest on its laurels, but work actively to define its future profile.

7. PhD training and supervision

Leiden University policies no longer permit the appointment of PhD candidates with employee status on the university budget, and it is increasingly hard to recruit grant-funded candidates. Hence, the Humanities Faculty in Leiden has recently begun to encourage the registration of external, self-funded PhD candidates, for whom the writing of a dissertation is not their main occupation (normally).

In accordance with the regulations of the Leiden Graduate School of Humanities, PhD candidates are assigned two supervisors. They participate in meetings organised by the LUIPh research programme to which they belong and are usually involved in organising at least one international conference during their stay in Leiden.

Leiden University and/or the Graduate School of Humanities provide training in transferable skills (ie. academic English, academic writing, but also writing a research proposal, career planning). More specific training, as well as interaction with PhD candidates in their field outside Leiden, is provided by National Research Schools (e.g. Research School of Ethics, OIKOS). These organise, for instance, master classes, summer schools, and invite authorities in their fields to lecture and work together with research master and PhD candidates.

Most internal PhD candidates get the opportunity to teach and to follow didactic courses (in all for no more than 20% of their time). Depending on previous experience, some will obtain the Basic Qualification for Teaching at university level (BKO).

The external PhD candidates constitute a mixed group with various backgrounds, who work on their PhD dissertation at different paces, usually alongside a regular job. Since the group has recently expanded, LUIPh has started to organise meetings for them in order to ascertain their needs, and to provide occasions for contact with other faculty than their supervisor and with their fellow PhD candidates. Usually, they are unable to follow a full training

programme, but the aim is to involve them more in activities of the research programme that they are part of. According to the self-evaluation report, this will hopefully have a positive influence on the time they need to complete their dissertation.

Assessment/ remarks

In view of the low numbers of PhD candidates in recent years, the Committee encourages the Department in its efforts to attract more international candidates. The fact that there is already considerable interaction with foreign universities should be helpful in doing so.

Given the system that forces all institutes to compete nationwide for funds, the members of the institute should coordinate their efforts to design projects that make possible the recruitment of funded PhD candidates. Furthermore, the institute should look carefully at its policy of admission and supervision of PhD candidates to ensure that they progress reasonably fast. There should also be a joint policy for the admission and supervision of external PhD candidates. Acceptance should not be left to the individual researcher, and rigorous supervision of those candidates should be guaranteed.

B. Programme level

The Committee assessed the following programmes of the Institute of Philosophy at the Faculty of Humanities of Leiden University:

	Quality	Productivity	Relevance	Viability
Philosophy of Sciences and Humanities, <i>recently renamed as</i> Philosophy of Knowledge: The Universal, the Global, and the Local	4.5	4	3.5	4
Agency and Interaction: Conflict, Community and Rational Justification, <i>recently renamed as</i> Normativity and its Sources: Agency, Interaction and Conflict in a Globalizing World	4.5	3.5	3.5	3

The detailed assessment of each programme follows in the next section of this report.

Programme LEI 1:**Philosophy of Sciences and Humanities**

recently renamed as **Philosophy of Knowledge: The Universal, the Global, and the Local**

Programme director:

Dr. J.W. McAllister

Research input 2011 (tenured) :	Previously Prof. F.A.J. de Haas, Prof. B.G. Sundholm
Assessments:	fte 5.0 tenured, 8.7 total
	Quality: 4.5
	Productivity: 4
	Relevance: 3.5
	Viability: 4

Brief description

The research in this programme studies conceptions of knowledge and their historical development, paying special attention to the interplay of the universal, the global, and the local in the construction and validation of knowledge claims. Members share an interest in philosophy of knowledge, as well as its relation to psychology and cognitive science: how do educational practices in philosophy support cognitive development; how do we recognize patterns in data sets; what are the presuppositions of judgement and reasoning?

Quality

The Committee notes that this is a wide-ranging programme that encompasses ‘philosophy of knowledge’ – a commodious label that includes far more than traditional epistemology – and the history of philosophy, ancient, medieval, and modern. The programme naturally includes logic as well, as well as philosophy of science and the history of science. Continental philosophy is covered (as one element in the broad range of the programme), though this subfield has less emphasis in the overall programme.

The programme’s inclusion in the Faculty of Humanities has been positive in enhancing research of faculty-wide interest, for example into globalisation in the realms of knowledge and power. Cooperation with other research groups in the Humanities faculties is enhanced by this inclusion. The programme’s representative publications are of very high quality, and they appear in internationally known journals and in volumes from prestigious publishers.

Productivity

Productivity has been in general considerable. The research output shows variety, including topics as different as the history of ancient philosophy, philosophy of mind and language, and philosophy of science. Major grants have been obtained; the number of PhDs completed (seven in total) is reasonable given the size of the programme’s faculty, and the number of conference papers is large and suggests wide participation in philosophical exchanges of ideas.

Societal relevance

The authors of professional publications and publications aimed at the general public continue a philosophical tradition that is well known in Leiden. Conferences, colloquia, and public professional activities by the faculty are also a positive element in the societal relevance of the programme. The committee appreciates the efforts by the programme’s members in addressing circles outside academia, but regrets that these efforts concern only a tiny part of the research of the programme. The Committee hopes that it may be possible to develop a stronger overall contribution for the programme as a whole.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

The viability of the programme appears solid, but viability as well as quality might be enhanced by greater unity in the programme. Some further linking of high-level philosophical writing and publications of general interest might be a positive and attainable goal. It may also help – especially in graduate education but also in research – to enhance the unity of the programme, perhaps with greater emphasis on epistemology as well as on the wider issues of philosophy of knowledge.

Conclusion

If ‘Philosophy of Knowledge’ continues to be an attractive name, this may suggest that – as the Committee is inclined to believe – a recognition that a stronger emphasis on epistemology would be beneficial, as it has links to both philosophy of science and philosophy of mind and language. Attention should be given (and apparently is being given) to making adjustments that enable the programme to continue to make similar contributions after the older members retire, since they have produced a significant proportion of the prestigious publications. If this transition is well managed, the programme and its reputation are likely to grow.

The Committee noted an institutional proposal to take advantage of the University of Leiden’s strength in East Asian studies to develop a specialisation in Comparative Philosophy, and heard various views of that proposal. While the proposal is intellectually exciting, the Committee believes that this is a difficult and expensive field in which to create a strong reputation, or to attract PhD candidates.

Programme LEI 2: Agency and Interaction: Conflict, Community and Rational Justification

Recently renamed as **Normativity and its Sources: Agency, Interaction and Conflict in a Globalizing World**

Programme director: Dr. B.J.E. Verbeek/Dr. H.W. Siemens (2011-present)

Research input 2011 (tenured) : Previously Prof. P. Kleingeld (2006-2010)
Assessments: fte 2.0 tenured, 5.2 total
Quality: 4.5
Productivity: 3.5
Relevance: 3.5
Viability: 3

Brief description

This programme studies questions in the areas of political philosophy, continental and analytical ethics. The researchers focus on public policy and legitimacy, political identity and cultural interaction, conflict and democratic practices, global justice and cosmopolitanism. In addition, they study the theoretical and normative foundations of moral and political action, e.g., moral commitment, practical reason, and authority.

Quality

This programme has a distinguished history and reputation for original and high-quality research, published in good journals and with leading publishers, which was largely sustained during the evaluation period. However, quite recently there has been pressure on sustaining quality. At present, the programme is running with reduced senior faculty: the recent departure of the professor of Practical Philosophy has left a gap. The members of the Department with whom the Committee met were admirably candid about the current situation, which is not easy for them. The Committee was made aware of efforts to make a senior appointment, but also that this had not gone as smoothly or as fast as was hoped. Work published in the evaluation period has been good, but it will not be feasible to sustain this without new appointments with the necessary seniority and appetite for leadership.

Productivity

The Committee noted some decline in research productivity: an unsurprising corollary of the present staffing situation that should be remedied by appropriate appointments. It also appreciated the candour with which members of the programme explained that they had aimed to sustain quality even at the expense of productivity (for example by encouraging PhD candidates to try publishing in leading journals). Productivity for the period as a whole is indeed not as high as desirable, but the Committee thinks that the programme's priorities are right.

Productivity of doctorates has been low. During the period under review the programme produced only one doctorate. While the PhD candidates of the former programme director stayed when she moved, none of these candidates has yet finished. The Committee noted various initiatives to increase productivity of PhDs, including Siemens's joint programme with Universidad Diego Portales Santiago (Chile), which comprises five PhD candidates. The recently started NWO Open Competition Programme 'Between Deliberation and Agonism', supports one PhD candidate and two post-docs. Once again, the Committee does not attach too much significance to small numbers, but there is no disguising the fact that overall

numbers are small and completions are very few, and that action is needed to ensure that it becomes easier rather than harder to recruit PhD candidates.

Societal relevance

Members of the programme were quite candid about the limited range of their current public engagement, which concentrates on reaching wider public audiences (speaking at schools, Philosophy Associations), but is light on contributing to national debates or to the deliberations of institutions, professionals or civil society. One of the aspirations of the intended shift of focus to political philosophy is to construct a platform for a greater variety of engagement with national debates and institutional actors, and to take advantage of Leiden's proximity to The Hague. This seemed to the Committee a sensible and feasible plan.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

This is a programme of good quality in a difficult situation, and appears to be caught in various institutional cross-currents. The intended shift of focus to Political Philosophy seemed to the Committee a sensible one, partly because that is not a focus adopted by other philosophy programmes in the Netherlands. The programme should also support a broadening of the range of types of engagement with various publics. Finally, the Committee noted that recent reorganisations in the University had been seen as bureaucratic rather than productive for the programme.

Conclusion

The Committee was impressed by the candour with which members of the programme talked about their difficulties. They find themselves in an awkward situation in which major changes have begun but are not completed. The Committee sympathises with them. This is a good programme in a tough position, and it is essential to resolve the current difficulties. The changes that seem most urgent are according to the Committee:

- making senior appointment(s);
- realising the promise of a focus on political philosophy;
- maintaining research and improving PhD productivity.

7. TILBURG UNIVERSITY

A. Institute level

1. The institute

Philosophy at Tilburg University (TiU) is part of the Tilburg School of Humanities (TSH). In addition to Philosophy, TSH also includes Communication and Information Sciences, Language and Culture Studies, and Religious and Ritual Studies.

The School currently has eight research programmes, three of which have been assessed by the Committee as part of this review:

1. Practical Philosophy, collaboration between the ethics group and the group in legal philosophy, with practical reason as its overarching theme. The programme focuses on normative issues at the intersection of ethics, politics and law (TiU 1).
2. Theoretical Philosophy, which is mostly philosophy of science and logic, combined with philosophy of language, and some philosophy of mind (TiU 2);
3. History of Philosophy, where researchers strive to understand society as objectified reason, using and investigating approaches from German, Anglo- and Francophone traditions of philosophy. One philosophical anthropologist was grouped with this programme for the assessment (TiU 3).

TSH has a number of research centres, one of which is the Tilburg Centre for Logic and Philosophy of Science (TiLPS). TiLPS research almost coincides with the research in Theoretical Philosophy.

The School also contains a Graduate School that provides training for all PhD candidates.

Assessment/ remarks

The Committee found the coherence among the philosophy programmes hard to assess because during the interviews the institute was represented by the Dean and the Vice-Dean of Research of TSH, and the report contains no SWOT analysis of the philosophy research programmes as a whole, but only a SWOT analysis of the entire School and SWOT analyses of the three programmes in philosophy.

2. Quality and academic reputation

Since its establishment in 2007, TiLPS has aimed to establish its reputation as a research centre for logic and philosophy of science. In the Practical Philosophy programme, the ethics group is described as having a strong focus on both meta-ethics and business ethics, while the legal philosophy unit has developed a distinctive research profile, with considerable international cooperation. The History of Philosophy programme contributes to philosophical discussions in three language areas and to international conferences, and in particular to national and Dutch-Flemish activity in this area.

International cooperation includes a collaborative PhD programme with Kiel, Glasgow and Antwerp (and Bologna, as from 2013) in legal philosophy, a Visiting Fellows Programme, a Sydney-Tilburg conference series on the philosophy of science, and an international conference series on models and simulations. TiLPS has received three NWO internationalisation grants.

According to a table included in the self-evaluation report, the number of publications in top 10% and top 25% journals¹ by researchers in the three philosophy programmes combined has risen over the review period, from 3 in 2005 and 9 and 10 in 2006 and to 21 and 26, respectively, in 2011. Editorial positions, refereeing, keynote lectures at conferences, book contracts and participation on panels and advisory boards are listed in the self-evaluation report as further indicators of quality, productivity and viability.

Assessment/ remarks

Of the three programmes, the strongest in the past six years has been the one in Theoretical Philosophy, as shown by the number of refereed articles in leading journals, by success in obtaining external funds, and by the level of international contact and cooperation. The Committee judged that quality is at a rather lower level in the Practical Philosophy programme and, despite the prominence of some of its members, also in the History of Philosophy programme. The Committee did not gain a clear view of the institute's overall view of the research aims of its philosophy programmes, and suggests that there would be some benefit in discussion of research aims between and across these programmes.

3. Resources

When the three programmes are viewed together, funding is mostly internal, but the share of external funding is growing. In 2011, research grants accounted for 25% of the total budget. There are, however, major differences between the programmes.

TiLPS, the centre where most of the Theoretical Philosophy research is carried out, has increasingly attracted funding from research grants since 2009. In 2011, 40% of funding was in the form of research grants, while 60% was direct funding from the university. The grants allowed the centre to hire new junior researchers. So far, the grants have been obtained at the national level, and not from European funding agencies.

In Practical Philosophy, the contribution of research grants varies, with a maximum of 29% of total funding in 2010, dropping to 18% in 2011.

History of Philosophy has been funded solely internally. Efforts to obtain external funding have been made but have not yet been successful. The Faculty Board has recently allotted 0.8 fte extra research time to this programme.

Assessment/ remarks

In the History of Philosophy programme there is virtually no outside funding, whereas in Theoretical Philosophy there is considerable external funding. In both cases this is unsurprising. What is surprising is that outside funding for the Practical Philosophy programme has dropped markedly in recent years, particularly given the programme's focus on business ethics and legal studies, both currently areas of considerable public interest in which funding is quite often available. The Committee suggests that both the institute and the Practical Philosophy programme pay explicit attention to the selection of areas that are likely to attract external funding.

4. Productivity

The output table in the self-evaluation report shows an increase of the number of refereed articles (from 12 in 2005 to 39 in 2011) and book chapters (from 12 in 2005 to 46 in 2011).

¹ The ERA 2010 Ranked Journal List was used for self-assessment, since the ERIH list has been found not to be a suitable basis for measuring quality.

The number of professional publications has decreased over the review period (from 22 in 2005 to 11 in 2011).

The number of PhD theses completed in the period under review is modest. Five PhD candidates who started their research between 2003 and 2005 have completed their degrees, while of the five who started in 2006 and 2007, one has dropped out, and four have not yet finished.

Assessment/ remarks

The Committee notes that scientific productivity as shown by publications has been somewhat uneven in the different programmes. The picture for the recruitment and progression of PhD candidates is not altogether positive. In all three programmes, due to limited funds, the number of PhD candidates who have started since 2005 has been low, and few have managed to complete their degree on time. As the documentation shows, the successful PhD graduates have been doing well in obtaining positions. But the recruitment, supervision and progression of PhD candidates clearly require greater faculty attention.

5. Societal relevance

TSH defines 'valorisation' as one of the central goals of the School. A list of indicators is used to measure the impact of research within society. No summary of measures of social relevance is given in the self-evaluation report for philosophy as a whole.

Members of the Practical Philosophy programme contribute to meetings and volumes on several issues, informing policy-makers and general public discussion. Members of the Theoretical Philosophy programme give talks, and several have written books or articles that have featured in public or political debate. In History of Philosophy, too, members contribute to the public debate through talks and articles.

Assessment/ remarks

The Committee concludes that, in principle, the work of all three programmes is of relevance to various specific groups outside the university. The connection of the Practical Philosophy programme to legal studies is reflected, directly and indirectly, in public discussion of important questions arising from its contributions in business ethics and international law. Recent appointments may add to the programme's contributions to public discussions. The Theoretical Philosophy programme has been successful in establishing Tilburg on the international scene as a research centre and should make the relevance of theoretical philosophy and logic for science and technology intelligible. However, the Committee received rather little information on that point in the self-evaluation report. The History of Philosophy programme speaks to a wider public that is interested in the development of recent continental philosophy, and its leading researcher is very active in lecturing and writing in forms that are of interest to a broader public.

6. Strategy for the future

As mentioned in the self-evaluation report, the Department of Philosophy is in the process of identifying and implementing a focal point for its research which

- builds on and groups together research in which the Department already has a successful track record (and thus the best prospects for a successful focal point);
- is sufficiently broad to allow the selected researchers to pursue productive lines of joint research;
- is affording a distinctive profile to Departmental research;

- is enhancing opportunities for external funding.

A preliminary analysis is said to suggest that the theme ‘Democratic Problem-Solving: Scientific, Moral and Legal Perspectives’ meets these four criteria.

TSH researchers claim to be interested in the possibilities of the developing field of the digital Humanities, which integrates computational modelling with more classical approaches to the humanities. The self-evaluation report states that TSH places great emphasis on this development and has set up an e-Humanities Lab where researchers from various disciplines cooperate. In the self-assessment report at the programme level, the Theoretical Philosophy researchers make only a fleeting mention of this development.

Assessment/remarks

The members of the three programmes maintain good contacts with other institutions, nationally and internationally, as witnessed by the organisation of conferences, participation in conferences, memberships on advisory boards. Much depends, however, on success in replacing the key researcher in the Theoretical Philosophy programme in the field of logic and theoretical philosophy. The Committee strongly recommends that the programme maintains its present focus, since this it is the most visible of the three programmes. It was not clear to the Committee whether the proposed title ‘Democratic Problem-Solving: Scientific, Moral and Legal Perspectives’ is more than a label that covers a very wide range of work that could be done in practical and theoretical philosophy.

Given that much of the prominence of TiLPS in recent years has been due to the key researcher in Theoretical Philosophy and his excellent international contacts, it is essential to replace him with an equally prominent researcher in the same field, otherwise the identity of theoretical philosophy and of the Tilburg Centre for logic and philosophy of science will no longer be maintained.

The Practical Philosophy programme is strongly encouraged to continue its interaction with law and economics and business. There is also scope for more integration of this programme with the History of Philosophy (and other parts of the department). While the latter’s wide focus (from German idealism to Postmodernism) may sometimes make it difficult to find common ground, this has been managed successfully by research groups in practical philosophy and in continental philosophy elsewhere.

Some of the key researchers of the historical programme are internationally well connected, as its staging of international conferences shows, but whether ‘Recognition’ is a sufficiently coherent theme to keep the programme together and make it externally visible is not entirely clear. There has been philosophical research on various understandings of recognition in various universities in various countries for some decades, and it may not now be sufficiently fruitful to provide the research theme for an entire programme. If the programme continues to use this as an integrating theme, then some attention needs to be given to the specific questions that are to be addressed, to their interconnections and to articulating what is distinctive about the programme’s work.

7. PhD training and supervision

The Graduate School of Humanities at TSH oversees all research-based degrees, i.e. all PhD tracks, including training and supervision plans, progress and final submission. It strongly supports PhD candidate participation in national and international research schools and their regular training programmes. Philosophy candidates, in particular, can attend courses

organised by the Dutch Graduate School in Logic (OzsL), the Netherlands School for Research in Practical Philosophy (OZSE), and the European Summer School in Logic, Language and Information (ESSLLI). Candidates also participate in the Summer and Winter meetings of the Vereniging voor Wijsbegeerte van het Recht (the Dutch chapter of the Vereinigung für Rechts- und Sozialphilosophie).

Candidates are encouraged to give presentations at conferences and workshops, to apply for the funding of the travel money they need for this (in excess of the budget they receive for the purpose), and to spend time abroad and engage with foreign experts in the field of their dissertation. Dissertations are now often composed of publishable articles, so that candidates also receive hands-on experience with the publishing and refereeing cycle.

The daily supervisor of the PhD candidate makes arrangements with the candidate for regular consultations, and advises on how to deal with possible gaps in their knowledge and skills for a successful completion of the project. He or she also sees to it that the PhD candidate's research is discussed on a regular basis in a relevant research group.

According to the self-assessment report, alumni of the PhD programme are doing well. For example, all PhD candidates in legal philosophy obtained a research position directly after graduation. Two of them now hold tenured positions. Of the former Logic PhD candidates, one is an associate professor at the Netherlands Defence Academy, one has a postdoc-position at TU Delft, and one teaches mathematics at Haagse Hogeschool.

Assessment/remarks

The department is indeed making a fine effort to improve the training of its PhD candidates, although this is not at present reflected in the success of its PhD recruitment and completion rates. It is unclear to the Committee whether the programmes will do well in attracting highly talented candidates unless it is guaranteed that the TiLPS and the Practical Philosophy programme maintain their respective concentration, and the History of Philosophy programme has a focused profile that unites the research interests of its members and secures focused training of the doctoral candidates.

B. Programme level

The Committee assessed the following programmes in Philosophy within the Tilburg School of Humanities:

	Quality	Productivity	Relevance	Viability
Practical Philosophy	4	4	4	4
Theoretical Philosophy	4.5	4.5	4	3
History of Philosophy	3.5	3.5	3.5	3

The detailed assessment for each programme follows in the next section of this report.

Programme TiU 1:

Programme director:

Practical Philosophy

Prof. A. Thomas (Ethics) and Prof. H.K. Lindahl (Legal and Political Philosophy)

Until 31-01-09 Prof. J.J. Graafland, until 01-03-12 Prof. G.C.G.J. van Roermond

Research input 2011 (tenured) : fte 1.2 tenured, 3.73 total fte

Assessments: Quality: 4

Productivity: 4

Relevance: 4

Viability: 4

Brief description

The programme combines an ethics unit and a legal philosophy unit. The overarching theme is practical reason, understood as individual and shared practices for resolving normative questions through reflection and analysis. The grouping together of previously separate research groups is expected to increase the programme's viability.

In the ethics unit, research has mainly focussed on moral psychology, business ethics, and egalitarianism. In the legal philosophy unit, the main theme has been a general theory of legal order, but also includes research on applied areas, including human rights, tolerance and immigration. Until 2010, there was a separate line of research into the philosophy of ageing.

Quality

The best work done in this programme is of a high order, and published in leading international journals and series. There is a good range of work in both ethics and the philosophy of law, and a good spread from meta-ethics and legal theory to more applied topics, with a particular strength in business ethics. This is a proper programme in practical philosophy, taken in a broad and demanding sense. None of this has happened by chance, as is apparent from the thoughtful discussion of journal quality metrics and the decision to use the Australian Research Council's ranked list, rather than more questionable metrics such as ERIH.

Productivity

The Committee noted that this robust range of work is being supported by a sharply declining number of researchers, at both tenured and PhD level. Staff numbers have gone down from 5.96 fte in 2007 to 3.73 fte in 2011. It is unlikely that the range and quality of work done in the last decade can be maintained unless the trend is reversed. Despite the decline in the number of fte's, the programme has done well in maintaining its publication level, and nurtures a strong set of international relationships.

However, the number of PhD candidates recruited and graduating during the evaluation period is disappointingly low. Numbers have halved in this period, and the number graduating is small. This is a matter that needs addressing urgently if the programme is to retain its good reputation. While it may be true that the proposed collaborative programme in 'Globalisation and legal theory' will add to PhD numbers, it may turn out that not many of those who are recruited into it will have philosophy as their primary discipline, and it is evident that they will have to compete with programmes in other universities, some of which are philosophically robust and even impressive.

Societal relevance

Members of the programme undertake diverse and relevant forms of public engagement. Their activities mainly reflect the specialisations of individual researchers, rather than a 'team effort', but the range is convincing and of value. If the programme were larger, more could be done, but the Committee does not see a case for prioritising engagement with wider public audiences, which might under present circumstances be at the expense of the core philosophical research.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

This is a good programme under considerable pressure because of a lack of adequate external funding and consequent lack of staff and PhD candidates. What is needed is not obscure: an adequate level of funding and a better flow of PhD candidates. The Committee notes that the theme 'Democratic Problem-Solving: Scientific Moral and Legal Perspectives' is being suggested as one that could cover the needs both of TiU 1 and of TiU 2. While this rubric covers much that could be done in the two programmes, and some things that are done in TiU 2, it is hard to see the theme as more than a wrapper for a wide range of possible work. If the real intent is a merger, it would be better to make that explicit and to take a systematic view of the issues and the ways in which philosophical standards are to be maintained rather than submerged.

Conclusion

As the programme candidly points out in its self-evaluation, 'the principal difficulties encountered by the practical philosophy group are its modest size and insufficient external funding.' In a way, that says it all.

Programme TiU 2:

Programme director:

Theoretical Philosophy

Prof. S. Hartmann (Epistemology and Philosophy of Science) and Dr. R. Muskens (Logic and Language)

Research input 2011 (tenured) :

fte 2.38 tenured, 8.10 total fte

Assessments:

Quality: 4.5

Productivity: 4.5

Relevance: 4

Viability: 3

Brief description

This programme is dedicated to the study of logic and philosophy of science. Within the group there are also interests in the philosophy of mind and language. While traditional models of reasoning, decision-making and knowledge acquisition assume idealized, abstract models of reasoning, much of the work done within Theoretical Philosophy investigates the extent to which such idealizations can be replaced by models of rationality that are closer to the reasoning of real people.

Most of the Theoretical Philosophy research is subsumed under TiLPS – the Tilburg Center for Logic and Philosophy of Science. TiLPS consists of two groups:

- Epistemology and Philosophy of Science,
- Logic and Language.

The former Philosophy of Mind group was not part of TiLPS, but of Theoretical Philosophy.

Quality

The quality of refereed papers is very good and so are the journals and series in which they are published. Some research is directed towards innovative results, and may lead to new approaches. The group clearly aims for the best publication place for each paper. The researchers are prominent, and the key researcher in Epistemology and Philosophy of Science stands out.

While external funding was literally nil in 2006-2008, the Committee noted that it has increased since then, and approached a reasonable level in 2011. This is obviously a positive factor, particularly if the group can continue on this trajectory.

The academic reputation of the group is good. However, it was not a good idea for the self-evaluation report to drown internationally significant committee memberships and the like in a mass of evidence about matters that are at best locally significant.

Productivity

In the opinion of the Committee, productivity presents a mixed picture. Productivity in terms of publications is very good, at present. Staff numbers have risen from 2.7 fte in 2005 to 8.10 fte in 2011, and the publication rate has increased accordingly, mainly in the form of refereed articles. This clearly reflects the productive contribution of Prof. Hartmann. However, most positions are non-tenured, and some loss of staff is expected in the autumn of 2012. In the self-evaluation report, the picture painted is of a few core staff members keeping things together with a certain amount of improvisation.

Productivity of PhD candidates is low: Both recruitment and completion rates are fairly low, and the fact that PhD training is said to be functioning well, which is listed as strength in the

SWOT analysis, is not complete consolation. The Committee notes that it is difficult to build up a PhD programme with a rotating faculty. It sees greater continuity of staffing as essential for recruiting good PhD candidates.

Societal relevance

The list of societally relevant work given in the self-evaluation is convincing. There is a diversity of related activities, some directed to scientists (especially social scientists), some to the philosophically interested public, and some to the general public. The amount, however, is not large, and members of the group appear not to take an active part in significant social and political debates, or to popularise their research results. One reason for this may be that the core group is small and another that it has been under construction and reconstruction throughout the evaluation period.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

The Committee considers the viability of the programme fairly problematic. The size of the group is minimal, and it is currently understaffed in relation to its notional size. Two staff members left the group in 2012, and the availability of a third staff member was severely reduced – some of these people were highly productive. In addition, a retirement in 2009 had already deprived the group of an experienced researcher.

It is the Committee's conviction that an appropriate successor to Prof Hartmann is essential for the Theoretical Philosophy group, perhaps especially within a School of Humanities, and important for philosophical work that bears on the social sciences. However, further appointments are also likely to be needed to maintain the profile.

In the self-evaluation report, the innovative capacity of the group is directly linked (under the heading of *Viability*) to the interaction between the groups working on epistemology and philosophy of science on the one hand, and logic and language on the other. The very same interaction is mentioned first among the strengths (see also the *SWOT analysis*). It is hard to understand why these considerations would become irrelevant because three staff members have left or largely left the group. If they are to retain relevance, action is needed.

Conclusion

Notwithstanding its small size and the fact that the group was in almost constant evolution, it has done well in quality, in productivity of high-quality publications, and even in societal relevance. The group deserves congratulations for these achievements in difficult circumstances.

In view of the present threat to the viability of the group, the Committee would like to stress its unanimous agreement on the following two statements.

- It is of utmost importance that the 'lost' staff members be replaced as soon as possible. In the absence of prompt action to this effect, this group, which was already small, will no longer have critical mass and will moulder away.
- In particular it is highly desirable that Stephan Hartmann be replaced by a senior philosopher who has a strong reputation in epistemology and philosophy of science (which the Committee understands has indeed happened after the site visit).

Programme TiU 3:	History of Philosophy	
Programme director:	Prof. P.G. Cobben	
Research input 2011 (tenured) :	fte	1.40 tenured, 3.83 total fte
Assessments:	Quality:	3.5
	Productivity:	3.5
	Relevance:	3.5
	Viability:	3

Brief description

The programme History of Philosophy has the added title ‘Morality and Ethical Life’. Its main objective is the clarification of a systematic philosophical problem with the help of philosophical discussions in history, in this case: the tradition of German Idealism and its critical reception (especially in the traditions of Phenomenology, Neo-Kantianism, transcendental philosophy and the Frankfurt School). This combination of a historical and systematic approach is a feature that distinguishes it from other research groups in the history of philosophy in the Netherlands.

The object of reflection for this programme is contemporary society, specifically the internal unity between objective knowledge and the normative framework that it presupposes, i.e. between theoretical and practical reason. Understanding society as objectified reason can be approached from many philosophical viewpoints. The notion of Recognition has recently been found to be a unifying paradigm. In addition, there is one philosophical anthropologist, whose research was assessed along with the History of Philosophy programme.

Quality

As the addition to the programme’s title ‘Morality and Ethical Life’ shows, it aims to treat systematic problems in ethics on the basis of philosophical discussions in the history of philosophy, with a focus on German idealism and its critical reception in Phenomenology, Neo-Kantianism and the Frankfurt School. The research on German idealism and on Neo-Kantianism in particular is of outstanding scholarly quality and international visibility.

The Committee fully appreciates the challenge and difficulty of bringing together historical and systematic research, including normative research, under one heading. However, it is not clear whether in the past years the different components of the programme have profited from each other’s results. In its self-evaluation report, the programme does not make clear the specific contribution of phenomenology to its research on the Paradigm of Recognition.

The quality of the dissertations seems to be good, and the daily supervision of the PhD candidates has improved in recent years. Some candidates did part of their research abroad. The relatively high number of external PhD candidates may largely be due to the fact that French philosophy is attractive to some prospective PhDs, since few Departments offer it. But this does not seem to be matched by successful applications for funding of internal PhD projects.

Given the significance of the work and the international reputation of some of its members, the lack of success in the acquisition of external funding is puzzling. The Committee pondered the self-evaluation report submitted and wondered whether this might be remedied by changes in strategy or in other ways. It concluded that the programme needs to address the question with some urgency.

Productivity

While the programme lists a large number of publications their quality is uneven as shown by the samples provided and by the different levels of publishing organs and journals. The publications are also unevenly spread over the years, but it proved difficult to link this to the arrival and departure of key members of staff. With the exception of the year 2011, the number of completed doctoral dissertations is low, and no information is given about the placement of the candidates.

Societal relevance

Given the type of research done by the programme, the efforts to reach out to wider public audiences appropriately include contributions to the national media, while Paul Cobben served on the organising committee of the annual national Day of Philosophy, and chaired the advisory committee on philosophy in secondary education. Not all members participate equally in this endeavour, and despite the programme's focus on morality and ethical life, there seems to be fairly little interaction with institutional stakeholders (policy-makers, officials, business, and professions).

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

The future viability of the programme very much depends on its ability to attract funding for PhD candidates from external agencies. The Committee is concerned by the fact that one prominent faculty member is working at Tilburg only on a temporary basis, as the end of his appointment will be a serious loss to the history of German philosophy. The programme also needs to formulate a long-term strategy for focusing its research and to engage in succession planning for the anticipated retirement of some of the researchers, and to ensure that it maintains its existing network of international collaborations.

Conclusion

Like other programmes in the History of Philosophy, this programme has been struggling to find a common focus for its different components. Its research in phenomenology does not have the same international visibility as its research on German Idealism and Neo-Kantianism. However, given the distinction of some of the members, we concluded that it should not be impossible to find a strategy for acquiring external funding and recruiting funded doctoral candidates.

8. UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE

Programme UT:	Interpretive and Normative investigations of Technology and Technological Culture	
Programme director:	Prof. P. Brey, Prof. P.P. Verbeek	
Research input 2011 (tenured) :	fte	2.62 tenured, 9.63 total fte
Assessments:	Quality:	4
	Productivity:	4
	Relevance:	5
	Viability:	5

Since at the University of Twente (UT) all philosophy research is conducted within one single programme, there was no separate assessment at the institute level and at the programme level. Accordingly, the following assessment covers both the institute and the programme.

1a. The institute

Philosophy research at Twente is embedded in the Department of Philosophy of the UT which falls under the Faculty of Behavioral Sciences. All research at the UT is organised in research institutes. These serve as multidisciplinary research units centred around particular technologies. Because of this context, the focus of the Philosophy Department is mainly on the philosophy of technology, with a strong emphasis on connections between conceptual philosophical work and the empirical realities of research in technology itself. The Department of Philosophy has chosen to participate in three of the University's four research institutes: CTTT (Centre for Telematics and Information Technology, roughly 60% of the research), MIRA (Institute for Biomedical Technology and Technical Medicine, 30%), and MESA+ (Institute for Nanotechnology, 10%). In this way, it is able to reflect ethically and philosophically on the technologies that are central to the university's research.

While being embedded in the research institutes of the University of Twente, a large part of the programme (>80%) is also embedded in 3TU.Ethics, which acts as an intermediary between the participating philosophy groups and the various stakeholders involved in ethical issues concerning technology. This centre provides a disciplinary embedding, in addition to the multidisciplinary embedding of UT's research institutes. The future national Research School in Practical Philosophy, in which many researchers of the programme will participate, as well as the Dutch-Flemish Network for Science and Technology offer additional disciplinary embedding.

1b. The programme

At the UT, philosophy research takes place in the programme 'Interpretive and Normative Investigations of Technology and Technological Culture'. This single research programme of the Philosophy Department has existed since 2007 but builds on a previous programme with very similar objectives. The mission of the programme is to contribute to improving the role of technology in society through a philosophical analysis of technology and its role in contemporary society.

The programme has both interpretive and normative aims. Its central interpretive aim is to understand the way in which technological artefacts and practices give shape to, and are themselves shaped by, core aspects of modern culture and society. Its central normative aim is to provide evaluations and assessments of technologies and their social and cultural impacts.

The programme has a strong focus on technology, specifically on information and communication technology (ICT), biomedical technology and nanotechnology. It emphasises the relation between technological practices, artefacts and systems on the one hand, and core aspects of society on the other. Other distinguishing features are the presence (and, to some extent, the integration) of both Anglo-Saxon and Continental research approaches and the focus on three philosophical domains: ethics, philosophical anthropology, and the philosophy of science (engineering).

The programme has the following scientific objectives:

- to analyse and interpret the hermeneutical and existential relations between human beings and technologies, and to assess the quality of these relations;
- to develop frameworks and methods for analyzing ethical aspects of emerging technologies and to investigate ways in which the ethical and political debate concerning emerging technologies and their implications can be improved;
- to investigate the relation between modern technology and well-being, and to contribute to practices of technology design, policy-making and public debate that take implications for well-being into account;
- to investigate the way in which values, norms and implications for agency are embodied in technological artefacts and structures, and to study implications for design;
- to develop a philosophical account of science that does justice to the central role of scientific practice in modern scientific research and to the special status of the engineering sciences.

It is an objective of the programme to develop its philosophical accounts in close interaction with engineers and social scientists, so as to benefit from their expertise as well as develop theories and ideas that are considered useful in their disciplines. In addition, its research is intended to have an impact not just in scholarly circles, but just as much in professional and popular circles.

2. Quality and academic reputation

The self-evaluation report states that the philosophy of technology has made great advances over the past twenty years, and is establishing itself as a recognised, coherent philosophical sub-discipline. The programme of the UT notes that it is known for its focus on the role of technology in society.

To testify to Twente's leading role in the philosophy of technology, the self-evaluation report argues that members of the research staff are often invited to deliver keynotes at conferences in the field, to publish in anthologies and handbooks, and to join editorial boards for journals and book series. Six out of the seven tenured or tenure-track researchers have received, or been considered eligible for, NWO grants.

Assessment/ remarks

The academic reputation of the institute and the programme are evaluated in relation to their participation in schools and institutes at the UT, and their international visibility. The institute's interest in empirical research and societal issues that reach beyond applied ethics (related to new technologies) is very successful in the first respect. Descriptive and normative approaches, analytic and continental philosophy are in balance. Recent research involves new interdisciplinary collaboration with biomedical sciences and law. The institute and the

programme have a good capacity to react to new developments in their fields of research. The programme has numerous international links, and a high international profile.

3. Resources

The tenured staff numbers have remained roughly unchanged during the period under review. Non-tenured staff has grown from 1.13 fte in 2005 to between 7 and 8 since 2008. The increase in the years 2005-2007 was due to a rapid succession of successful applications for Veni, Vidi and Vici funding (NWO), as well as success in obtaining a number of other substantial grants, allowing for the inflow of new PhD and postdoctoral researchers. Even though most of those grants have recently expired, departmental staff members have succeeded in securing new funding from different sources.

The ratio of tenured staff to non-tenured research capacity is decreasing: tenured staff research capacity, after an increase between 2005 and 2007, has slightly decreased, while at the same time, the number of PhD candidates has increased substantially. The Department is now advertising two new tenure-track positions, which when filled will contribute to workload reduction and open up further opportunities to attract additional funding.

During the period under review, direct funding made up between 21% and 40% of the programme's funding. Research grants made up more than half of total funding, with a peak of 74% in 2006, while contract research has risen to 8% or 9% in recent years.

Assessment/remarks

Due to largely successful applications for external funding (including Veni, Vidi and Vici) the number of PhD candidates and postdoctoral researchers has grown significantly in recent years. Most candidates have a double background and participate in the Ethics and Technology graduate School programme and other networks (national and international). The institute has recently established two new tenure-track positions that will increase its research capacity. This is a clear sign of the positive reception of its work by the entire university. Hiring new staff members seemed necessary as the institute offers a two-year master's programme (unlike the two other technical universities), and does an important amount of service teaching in non-philosophy programmes. The institute and programme form a lively community of motivated and open-minded researchers.

4. Productivity

The number of refereed journal articles published rose from 9 in 2005 and 16 in 2007 to 27 in 2011. Numbers of books published vary between one and four per year, and refereed book chapters between 7 and 18. Professional publications vary between 6 and 25 per year.

In the seven years under review, a total of six PhD dissertations were finished. The self-evaluation report indicates that this is rather low compared to the overall research output of the department, but in recent years (due to securing larger funded projects) more PhD candidates have been hired, and this should be reflected in the output of PhDs for 2012 and 2013. The report also comments that the number of PhD candidates keeps the ratio of research output to research time (fte) at a modest level. However, the ratio research output to research time by permanent staff (fte) is high: most of the output is produced by a small number of people.

Out of eleven PhD candidates hired between 2005 and 2011, two graduated within four years and one in five years. The others who were hired before 2010 are all expected to finish between 2012 and 2014. No data are given for candidates who started in 2003 and 2004.

According to the self-evaluation report, compared to most candidates hired in the first years of the 2005-2011 period, recent PhD candidates have a much better progress rate, and most of them are expected to graduate after four years or less.

The programme has been successful in placing its PhD candidates in academic positions. Since the current programme began in 2007, six PhD candidates received their PhD within the Department. Of these six, five were able to continue immediately with a post-doc position (one within the programme), and one continued to an assistant professorship (tenure-track). One of the PhD candidates was able to secure a post-doc position at the University of Oxford.

Assessment/remarks

The output of publications has significantly increased both in quality and quantity. Publications are well spread over different kinds of publishing. They are often specialised, and yet many are very readable. The number of PhD theses defended was rather low, but can be expected to increase. Given the specialised aims of the programme, it will be important to ensure that PhDs are equipped for a range of academic and other professional lives.

5. Societal relevance

According to the self-evaluation report, much of the research conducted in the department has an explicit connection to technological practices, both within the UT and in other organisations. This connection makes a direct ‘valorisation’ of the research possible, since it can be used to improve the quality of these practices.

A second form of societal relevance in the programme’s work is its explicit outreach to a range of wider public audiences. The self-evaluation report states that many members of the department are highly visible in the media, and give talks to broad audiences. Such outreach activities typically take three forms: popularisation of research, interventions in public discussions, and contributions to ‘public philosophy’ and ‘public science’.

Popularisation and policy engagement activities range from public lectures to contributions to a ‘Stand-up Philosophy’ event, to a session at a course for top officials from Dutch ministries. Other important popularisation activities take place via the media. Members of the Department are interviewed about their work in, and contribute to, national quality newspapers and radio and television.

Assessment/remarks

Twente has been successful in reaching out to wider audiences, taking part in public debates, reaching official, professional and business audiences, and contributing to policy debates. The wide range of their interests and their common concern for a reformulation of fundamental philosophical questions in the context of our technological society allowed its members to reach many different sections of the public.

6. Viability/strategy for the future

According to the self-evaluation report, all parameters for determining the programme’s viability – external developments, the immediate institutional context of the programme, and developments within the programme itself – are encouraging. Firstly, the field of philosophy of technology as a philosophical sub-discipline is growing at a rapid rate and is establishing itself both within philosophy and in other fields as a recognised speciality.

The self-evaluation report states that funding opportunities are developing better than they are in many related fields or specialties, in part because of the growing emphasis on applied and interdisciplinary research taken by many public-funding agencies. Ethics of technology and innovation, in particular, is increasingly recognized as an important funding area both within NWO (Socially Responsible Innovation) and in the European funding scheme (Responsible Research & Innovation). 3TU.Ethics, to which most members of the programme belong, is considered a success by the Dutch federation of technical universities and is receiving continued funding.

The department's strategy for the future is to strengthen its role in the philosophy of technology, in particular in ethics of technology, philosophical anthropology of technology and the philosophy of engineering science. It aims to become a major partner in multidisciplinary research projects within the Netherlands and at the European level. This strategy fits well within the newly developed identity of the university, which focuses on multidisciplinary collaboration between engineering and social sciences & humanities, and on developing and implementing technology guided by an adequate understanding of its social context. Its new motto is 'high tech, human touch'. The self-evaluation report holds that university officials consider the programme as one of those which best reflect the new mission.

Within the programme itself in recent years, the quality of research and research staff has benefited from policies that emphasise rigorous selection, tenure-track procedures, grant application processes, and refereed academic publications. The programme is selective in recruiting new researchers and wants to continue its policy of building an international staff. There will be a continued and increasing emphasis on output in refereed international journals, grant acquisition (especially Veni, Vidi and Vici grants and their European equivalents), international exchange, and taking on leadership positions in the field.

The programme is also striving to increase its visibility and influence in philosophy at large. In addition, programme members aim to put more effort into applying their approaches to other fields, especially engineering and policy, and to expand into new territory with their research. Expansions are planned into the areas of energy and environment, technology and security, and the philosophy of applied (design-oriented) social science.

To ensure continued funding for research, the programme will have to adapt to new funding realities. Shrinking research budgets worldwide and an increasing emphasis on applied and multidisciplinary research and 'valorisation' have to be reckoned with. The latter emphasis may actually provide new opportunities for the programme, as it is better positioned to take advantage of it than some more traditional research programmes in philosophy. 3TU.Ethics is also expected to continue to be a major agent for attracting funding.

Assessment/remarks

The institute and programme are well embedded in the university and have a good capacity to react to new developments in its field of research, and recent research involves new interdisciplinary collaboration with biomedical sciences and law. Links with other institutions in and beyond the Netherlands are strong. Although continued expansion may be less easy in the future than it has been in the recent past, the programme has every prospect of future success, and has the capacity to equip students for a broad range of careers in philosophy and other professions. The prospects are not merely viable, but exciting.

7. PhD training and supervision

Within the Department of Philosophy of the UT, most PhD candidates participate in the Ethics and Technology Graduate School programme. Those who do not either follow the programme of the national Research School in Science, Technology and Modern Culture (WTMC) or courses and seminars of the Dutch-Flemish Network in Philosophy of Science and Technology. In addition to these programmes, PhD candidates are encouraged to take general skills courses offered by the UT. Candidates may also take courses from the master's programme in Philosophy of Science, Technology and Society (PSTS).

All PhD candidates are assigned a daily supervisor who meets with them regularly to discuss their progress. Often, one or more university-external supervisory committee members are appointed to monitor progress. PhD candidates are expected to publish in peer-refereed journals and to present results of their research at international conferences. The thesis, however, is written as a monograph. PhD candidates are also encouraged to spend time abroad.

Assessment/ remarks

The response to internationally advertised PhD positions is positive and allows the institute to be selective in its recruitment. Proper philosophical training is given due attention. Most candidates have a dual background and participate in the Ethics and Technology Graduate School programme and other networks (national and international). Supervision is thorough, and placement rates are high. The Committee suggests that the rule of accepting only monographs as the doctoral dissertation might be reconsidered in the future.

Conclusion

The institute and programmes have coherent and distinctive aims, have embedded themselves well within the work of a technological institute, and have taken advantage of the potential for international cooperation. The selection and training of PhD candidates is particularly worthy of noting. If there is increased competition for funds, for talented researchers, and for PhD candidates, the institute and programme will be able to adjust to any changes from a position of strength.

9. UTRECHT UNIVERSITY

A. Institute level

1. The institute

At Utrecht University (UU), philosophy research takes place in the ZENO Institute, which is part of the Faculty of Humanities. This is a considerable change from the previous situation, as at the time of the 1999-2004 review, philosophical research still took place within a separate faculty. ZENO was at that time a joint research institute for philosophy of the Universities of Utrecht and Leiden. In 2008 an external mid-term review committee advised discontinuing this structure because it was perceived to yield little added value.

The current Faculty of Humanities has three kinds of organisational units: departments, schools, and research institutes. The Department of Philosophy is responsible for financing and employment matters; the Undergraduate School of Philosophy and Artificial Intelligence is responsible for the undergraduate teaching in philosophy and cognitive artificial intelligence.

The mission of the ZENO Institute is to contribute to the international academic debate in philosophy through its publications, to support academic exchange between researchers, and to educate the next generation by organising a research master's programme in philosophy and supervising PhD candidates. At the same time it is ZENO's objective to foster contributions to public debates and to fulfil advisory roles for governments and other partners in society.

ZENO comprises three research programmes:

1. History of Philosophy (UU 1);
2. Theoretical Philosophy (UU 2);
3. Practical Philosophy (which includes the Ethics Institute of Utrecht University) (UU 3).

Research within UU as a whole is structured via 15 interdisciplinary (and cross-faculty) focus areas. Members of ZENO participate in the focus areas of 'History and Philosophy of Sciences and the Humanities' (organised by the Descartes Centre for the History and Philosophy of the Sciences and the Humanities) and 'Conflicts and Human Rights'. In addition, the Board of UU has recently designated four strategic themes: 'Institutions', 'Sustainability', 'Life Sciences', and 'Youth and Identity'. Members of ZENO are thoroughly involved in the strategic theme 'Institutions', and the Ethics Institute has additional links to the themes 'Sustainability' and 'Life Sciences'.

2. Quality and academic reputation

The self-evaluation report states that within the Faculty of Humanities and specifically within ZENO, qualitative and quantitative publication standards apply for all members. Individual staff members' research results, teaching efforts and administrative duties are evaluated in a yearly assessment. On the basis of these personal assessments, various coaching measures are taken. The Faculty Board ruled that, as of 2013, assessments will also have consequences for the distribution of research time. In cases where researchers have been insufficiently productive over a number of years, research time may be reduced from the standard 0.5 fte (full professors and associate professors) or 0.4 fte (assistant professors) to a minimum of 0.2 fte.

Further information on quality is given in the programme sections of the self-evaluation report. Indicators of the academic esteem of the research staff mentioned here include editorships of international journals and book series, participation in and organisation of international workshops and conferences, and memberships of scientific academies, committees and juries. Several of the staff members have received prizes and awards. Finally, the self-evaluation report points out that several foreign guest researchers have chosen to work in Utrecht.

Assessment/remarks

Although not all staff members are performing at the same level, the Committee notes that much of the research of the Institute is outstanding and published in top-ranked outlets. The programmes aim to publish research of the highest quality rather than to maximise productivity. The visibility in citations is high.

Many ZENO researchers are members of international networks, and many collaborate with researchers from other universities (Dutch and foreign). Quite a few of them are members of boards of international scientific organisations and international committees.

ZENO has an active policy for attracting visiting scholars and regularly invites international lecturers. The impressive list of visitors included in the self-evaluation report sufficiently illustrates the Institute's international relations. The Committee sees the international reputation of the Institute and of several of its members as exceptional. It will elaborate on this in its assessment of the three individual research programmes.

3. Resources

The self-evaluation report indicates that tenured staff employed by ZENO varied between 7.63 and 9.24 fte during the period under review. Total staff has grown from 11.07 fte in 2005 to 16.79 fte in 2011.

The percentage of funding from research grants has grown from 15% in 2005 to 38% in 2011, while the percentage of contract research reported in the self-evaluation report fluctuates between 1% and 15%.

Following the advice of the mid-term review in 2008, ZENO formulated targets for obtaining external funding. The aim is that each of the three research groups should obtain at least two big research grants. To reach this goal, all proposals written within ZENO are supported by a coaching procedure; they have to pass through committees consisting of senior researchers from ZENO. This also attracts competent external candidates. Additionally, at the level of the Faculty of Humanities, several multidisciplinary coaching teams are in place to help staff members with applications for major NWO or ERC grants. According to the self-evaluation report, this policy is quite successful. Between 2008 and 2011, ZENO researchers submitted 84 applications, of which 36 have been accepted, 44 have been rejected, and 4 applications are still under review. Currently, the success rate is 46%.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee is of the opinion that staff positions, facilities, and resources provided by the university are adequate for the Institute to meet its purposes. A degree of stability is guaranteed by student numbers as well as by the prominence of its research. In the past (2005, but also in 2006-2008), there was an obvious problem with earning capacity. The Committee is pleased to find that this situation has changed: in 2010 and 2011 the nationally obtained grants are about triple those of 2005 (in absolute figures).

4. Productivity

ZENO researchers published between 16 and 47 refereed articles per year in the period under review. The number of refereed books varied between two and seven per year, and the number of refereed book chapters between 16 and 32.

Based on the data in the self-evaluation report, the ratio of publications to research time is high for the programmes UU2 and especially UU3. However, when only refereed academic publications are considered, all three programmes have a rather lower output to input ratio. The Committee was not entirely sure what was classified as a refereed conference paper, but since it regards the computation of productivity ratios with small numbers as something that provides limited insight, this did not seem an issue.

In the period under review, the number of PhD candidates has remained more or less constant, although in the course of this period funding for PhD projects became completely dependent on obtaining external funding. The aim of the institute is to keep the numbers at their present level, or even to achieve a slight increase, while maintaining a more or less even spread over the three programmes.

Of the 19 PhD candidates who started between 2002 and 2007, five graduated within four years, three took five years, two took six years, two took seven years and two took more than seven years to graduate. Four have not yet finished, but they are all expected to graduate in 2012, and one dropped out. Rates of progress are said to be increasing in recent years. According to the self-evaluation report, some of the PhD candidates have received awards and prizes for their dissertations or for an essay. Most PhD candidates find employment within academia after graduation. Of 17 persons who graduated in 2005-2011, 11 found academic positions (as postdoc or assistant professor), three are in non-scientific positions in academia, and another three are employed at commercial companies or self-employed.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee noted that publication has not been as high as one might hope in the evaluation period, given the distinction of the leading researchers. One of the reasons for this is that key researchers had heavy administrative duties and were active in the Dutch Academy of Science (KNAW) and could therefore not be as active in the programmes. Since this changed from 2012, the Committee expects the general prospect for the future to improve.

They noted that the number of completed doctorates had been low across the entire evaluation period, particularly in UU2, and that although the other two programmes were training a larger number of doctoral candidates, the number of completions per fte in both programmes was low as well.

5. Societal relevance

The possibilities for making research societally relevant differ for the three research groups within ZENO, and each group has accordingly developed its own strategies. According to the self-evaluation report, the societal relevance of philosophical research can be located, roughly, in two areas:

- contributions to the public debate on moral and political issues, and;
- attempts to make the results of philosophical research available in various forms to the general public.

The self-evaluation report states that the Ethics Institute plays a large part in making research socially relevant; including undertaking research projects commissioned by external partners who want to clarify contested moral and political issues. Such requests may issue from political or public discussions or from problems encountered by practitioners in various fields (e.g. physicians and veterinarians). The Ethics Institute also produces reports commissioned by, for example, the Rathenau Institute or directly by the government.

Various ZENO researchers give lectures for broader audiences on a regular basis. The ZENO Institute itself also organises workshops that are geared towards a broader public. Several members of the institute contribute to journals and publish books and articles for a broader audience.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee endorses the claim that the Ethics Institute in particular is prominent in public debates on moral and political matters and plays an energetic role in providing advice, both nationally and internationally. However the other programmes, and in particular UU2, undertook a more limited range of popularisation of philosophical research, that included some work for the philosophically interested (e.g. encyclopaedia articles) and some for the general public (e.g. popularising books and lectures). Although researchers in Theoretical Philosophy publish work for the general public, some of them frequently, they did not generally publish on the results achieved in their own research.

6. Strategy for the future

The self-evaluation report claims that ZENO brings together a group of excellent and committed researchers. Together, the three research groups cover a broad spectrum of research activities and provide interesting opportunities for cross-group research collaborations. The breadth of the range of research topics dealt with in each of the programmes is simultaneously identified as somewhat of a weakness. The diversity of the three groups requires efforts to ensure that the common identity of the entire institution is preserved.

The strategy for the future is largely to continue to pursue the research lines established over the last few years. Measures to ensure the coherence within groups and within the institute, to enhance PhD supervision, and to enable the staff in meeting publication targets will also be continued. In the near future, ZENO aims to strengthen its interdisciplinary research collaboration within the Descartes Centre and the Ethics Institute and within the new strategic themes of the university. Additionally, it plans to further reinforce its international position, partly through a stronger international publication strategy in the Ethics Institute.

With regard to its earning capacity, the self-evaluation report claims that ZENO is on the right track. The institute will continue the strategy of submitting proposals to a range of funding sources and will also more actively pursue European funding, particularly in cooperation with the partners within the university's strategic themes, such as 'Institutions' and 'Sustainability'. The interdisciplinary cooperation of the Ethics Institute with other disciplines is particularly promising, because it provides access to funding sources that would not normally be accessible to philosophers. The institute will continue and intensify its strategy of coaching its researchers in writing grant applications.

The merger of the Departments and the research institutes of Philosophy and of Religious Studies, which is planned for 2013, is presented as a mixed blessing. On the positive side, it may bring efficiency gains, much needed administrative relief and the possibility of interesting

collaborations. An obvious downside is the possible dilution of the visibility, identity, and profile of philosophy as a distinct discipline within the faculty and university. The ZENO board will have to take measures to ensure both the harmonious cooperation within the new institute and the integrity, continuity and quality of philosophical research.

Assessment/remarks

The strategy and policy of the institute are clearly described in the self-evaluation report. The Committee agrees that the challenges are being met with care. The attitude towards changes that are being forced upon the institute is admirably calm, and the members explained that they were more focused on opportunities than on potential disadvantages. They noted that recent reorganisations had been accompanied by financial costs for them, and that they are in the process of merging with Religious Studies. However, the staff regarded this merger mainly as an administrative matter. This was said to reflect the institute's decisions and appeared to be a matter of consensus.

The Committee was impressed by this attitude, but noted that the disciplinary demands of religious studies do not always dovetail well with those of philosophy. It suggests that the institute review the respects in which this merger might change the balance and context of philosophical work at Utrecht, and identify any measures that may be important for safeguarding and enhancing the philosophical research culture as circumstances change.

There is an obvious awareness of the high international reputation of the institute and of its safe position within UU, due in part to the relatively high student numbers – both were mentioned during the interview. Challenges mentioned in the 1999-2004 review were handled adequately, as was the transition from a faculty to an institute.

7. PhD training and supervision

In the mid-term review of 2008, the mid-term Committee advised the Institute to give more structure to PhD supervision. The institute has taken this seriously. Currently, the form and frequency of the supervision and the nature and extent of the additional training programme are determined at the start of every PhD project and formalised in a training and supervision plan. PhD candidates obtain an initial contract for 1.5 years. Eight months after the start of their project, a formal evaluation interview takes place. When the results of the assessments are positive, the supervisor(s) can decide to extend the contract to the full period of four years. After the first year, appraisal interviews are conducted on a yearly basis. Also, the director of ZENO has an annual monitoring interview with each PhD candidate.

Since a career in academia will normally involve teaching duties, candidates are encouraged to spend around 10% of their time on teaching. The PhD programme also offers the opportunity to develop skills (e.g. teaching, organisational skills) that are important for obtaining positions outside academia.

All PhD candidates are embedded in the larger context of the Graduate School of the Humanities, which monitors the quality of all PhD programmes. The Graduate School offers courses in general skills, e.g. academic English, teaching, and time management. PhD candidates and their supervisor(s) decide together in which of these courses the candidate will participate. ZENO has a small budget available to support PhD candidates participating in courses offered outside of the Graduate School. Candidates also participate in a National Research School. This can be the OZSE (National Research School for Practical Philosophy, which ZENO has hosted for the past seven years), OIKOS (National Research School in Classical Studies) or the National Research School for Logic. In the near future, PhD

candidates will also be able to register at the OZSW, the National Research School for Philosophy, whose establishment was strongly promoted by ZENO.

PhD candidates regularly attend international summer schools, workshops, and conferences; extended international research visits are also encouraged. A new development is the joint doctorate. Currently, a pilot project is being carried out to investigate the possibilities for joint PhD degrees in practical philosophy with international partner universities.

Assessment/ remarks

As in other Dutch universities, the supervision model has recently been modified: it is now more professional and provides co-supervision for each PhD candidate. Although it would be hard to prove the point, this is likely to be the factor that lies behind an improving graduation rate. The Committee was struck by the high commitment of the supervisors, their careful attitude towards the progress of graduates (also reflected in figures on their employment after graduation), and the enthusiasm of those candidates with whom it met.

B. Programme level

The Committee assessed the following programmes of the ZENO Research Institute at the Faculty of Humanities of Utrecht University:

	Quality	Productivity	Relevance	Viability
History of Philosophy	5	4	3.5	5
Theoretical Philosophy	5	4	3.5	5
Practical Philosophy	4	4	5	4

The detailed assessment of each programme follows in the next section of this report.

Programme UU 1:

Programme director:

Research input 2011 (tenured) :

Assessments:

History of Philosophy

Prof. P. Ziche, Prof. K. Algra

fte 2.2 tenured, 3.68 total fte

Quality: 5

Productivity: 4

Relevance: 3.5

Viability: 5

Brief description

This research programme approaches the history of philosophy in a strongly contextualising and interdisciplinary fashion, emphasising the relevance of a genuinely historical methodology. The programme's research strategy aims to go beyond the few authors and texts that continue to be quoted by modern philosophers, and to include a broader range of source material: new sources need to be discovered and made accessible in reliable editions; and in order to appreciate their importance, they have to be situated in their own historical, religious, and scientific context.

The programme comprises two sub-programmes, one devoted to the historiography of ancient philosophy, the other to that of modern philosophy, with Renaissance philosophy and research on Descartes and Spinoza as the connecting piece, in close connection with the Descartes Institute. The gap between these subunits is not as large as it may seem, because the specialists in ancient philosophy also work on the reception of ancient philosophy in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. A further connecting factor lies in the fact that all subgroups pay special attention to historical methodology and to the wider historical context. In addition, interest in science and its foundations is a common theme. These facts make possible fruitful collaboration with the members of the other programmes within the institute.

Quality

The group's scholarly output is of a very high quality. All its members publish in internationally renowned journals, and first-rate publishers publish their books. It is to be expected its productivity will continue at the same high level. The members of both subgroups enjoy an unusually high reputation worldwide, and are well connected; all three key researchers are also active in international organisations and cooperative activities that contribute significantly to the UU's continued high reputation in philosophy. The success in applications for external funding is a further mark of the programme's high standards in research.

Productivity

The quantity of academic publications has been somewhat hampered in recent years, because of the heavy administrative and academic duties of the key researcher in ancient philosophy outside the university, and by the fact that the key researcher in German philosophy had to restructure the focus of his subgroup after joining the Department in 2008. The Committee noted that a number of researchers had limited time for research; seven tenured staff provide a total of 2.2 fte, and five non-tenured a total of 1.48 fte. However the Committee understands that this unusual proportion of part-time research posts was due to those external activities, which will not continue in the future. In addition, old projects have been finished but will be replaced by new ones in ancient philosophy and modern philosophy. This reorganisation of the research focus also accounts for the fact that the number of PhD candidates in this programme has been low. The members of the group are aware of these facts. They expect to improve the number of publications soon, and to be more successful in

recruiting PhD candidates. Given that History of Philosophy at Utrecht has in the past attracted candidates in the history of philosophy both nationally and internationally, this expectation looks reasonable.

Societal relevance

The Committee noted that this group's engagement with wider publics had a distinctive pattern, with an emphasis on producing accessible translations, on lecture tours and on textbooks, but less participation in public debate communication. It notes that this pattern of public engagement is appropriate for a programme with this focus.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

The viability of the programme is assured by the excellence of the faculty, by the key researchers' contacts and reputation in their respective international scholarly communities, as well as by newly hired faculty. The members of the programme have been successful in obtaining outside funding in the past and can reasonably expect to continue to do so in the future.

Conclusion

In principle, the programme's prospects for the future are bright, given the high profile of the faculty and the fact that several of the key researchers are now free from administrative duties that have been an impediment to their scholarly work in recent years. It is likely that new projects will need to be developed as current projects are finished. In this context competition for funding is likely to increase, and it may be hard to recruit new funded PhD candidates. Some coordination with other programmes to ensure that projects are not in direct competition may be useful for enhancing the chance of success. Such cooperation might be especially feasible with colleagues from Leiden, but also from Rotterdam and Amsterdam. The historians of philosophy at Utrecht have excellent contacts worldwide, and can use them to recruit outstanding PhD candidates with the highest chance of completing within the standard period.

Programme UU 2:	Theoretical Philosophy	
Programme director:	Prof. A. Visser	
Research input 2011 (tenured) :	fte	2.85 tenured, 6.38 total fte
Assessments:	Quality:	5
	Productivity:	4
	Relevance:	3.5
	Viability:	5

Brief description

The group's research focuses strongly on questions around reasoning, particularly on the foundations of scientific reasoning. It values historical insights into the formation of discipline-specific standards of scientific reasoning and practical reflection on the political dimension of science.

Its leading question is: What does good scientific reasoning look like, and what accounts for its correctness? A useful answer to this question must take seriously the fact that scientific reasoning takes place in an open environment that is under-determined both epistemically (we always lack some information and operate with bounded resources) and metaphysically (our environment is not fixed once and for all, and we play an active role in determining it).

Quality

The work of several researchers in this programme is of the highest quality within their domain, and is recognised as such by their peers. This work covers several specialities and approaches that are at the international frontier. There are two particularly interesting features:

- The practice of integrating formal methods on the one hand and epistemology and philosophy of science on the other avoids superficial clarity and merely apparent precision.
- The present subgroups strive towards a medium-term integration that is expected to result in a fundamentally novel approach. In other words, subgroups have the opportunity to develop and grow in strength independently, but at the same time to see their results as part of a more embracing projected theory.

The publication strategy is obviously directed towards the top international publication places. It is striking that nearly all 'refereed articles' appeared in journals that are included in the so-called web of science. The prominence of the main researchers is not only illustrated by their publication output, but also by their membership of editorial boards and the diversity of scientific committees to which they contribute and the prestigious international lectures they give.

Productivity

Productivity does not match quality, which is a reason for some moderate concern. The level of publication may reflect the time needed for excellent scientific work, which may require a lot of time. However, researchers need to ensure that their work is not only outstanding but timely, and that it contributes to on-going international debates. The number of PhDs is also particularly low. This point was raised in the previous research review and has not convincingly been answered. Supervising an excellent PhD need take only three to four years. However, the Committee noted that the other, less technical programmes, were not doing much better in absolute figures.

Societal relevance

The programme as an entity does not seek to engage with the general public, although individual researchers have written numerous articles for the general public. Some of this publication for wider audiences does not popularise the programme's research, and some of it popularises work that is quite separate from that done in the programme, including research in philosophical theology. This shows that those researchers have a genuine concern for wider public audiences, it does not show the societal relevance of the programme's research. While a portion of anyone's research may be unsuitable for professional publications, and even more unsuitable for a wider public, it is important not to exaggerate the esoteric character of the research done, or its lack of relevance to various wider audiences. A more explicit focus on preparing work for specific audiences can indeed be demining, but it may lead to a better public understanding of the work and its importance. The Committee suggests that a more explicit focus on this task would be useful.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

The group is definitely above the critical size. This, combined with its quality and diversity, shows that it is viable. Anticipation of foreseeable changes and flexibility appear to be exemplary. Other parameters (visitors, visits, other international contacts) also seem to be excellent. The group does not have a unitary research plan, and given its size, it can afford to have a set of research plans. However, in the interview an intention to link and integrate its several lines of research was mentioned. Doing so would be ambitious and would secure the highest reputation for the group. The Committee applauds the ambition, while recognising that integration of different specialties may not prove achievable, even if they are all in one domain (here logic).

Conclusion

The group does excellent work and has clear plans. It could aim to improve its PhD output and its societal relevance, especially in selecting work that could be made available in forms suitable for wider audiences.

Programme UU 3:	Practical Philosophy	
Programme director:	Prof. M. Düwell	
Research input 2011 (tenured) :	fte	3.33 tenured, 6.73 total fte
Assessments:	Quality:	4
	Productivity:	4
	Relevance:	5
	Viability:	4

Brief description

This programme brings together the research of the group of practical philosophy with the interdisciplinary research of the Ethics Institute, which was founded to coordinate and promote ethical reflection throughout Utrecht University in teaching and research. The focus of this research is on the normative aspects of modern societies, particularly in the sciences. More specifically, this entails research about concrete, actual, moral and political challenges – specifically in the contexts of the life sciences, sustainable development, and political institutions – against the background of more fundamental research in moral and political philosophy.

Furthermore, the group combines work in moral and political philosophy and philosophical anthropology, often (though not exclusively) in discussion with modern Kantian moral theory and contemporary critical theory.

Quality

Since the Ethics Institute was founded in 2006, it has become a strong group, with a wide range of research in ethics, political philosophy and applied ethics, collaborations with the Faculty of Law and other relevant faculties, a range of well-defined research themes and a particular focus on issues of Human Rights. The programme provides a rich environment for work in practical philosophy, to which the ‘Horizon 2020’ themes and visiting scholars contribute. It is now a highly competitive graduate programme and has contributed to national philosophical work by running NSRPP. At this point, handing on NSRPP to EUR should free up time for enhancing research quality yet further. If the programme is to progress from being highly competitive – as it is – towards being world leading, it will be important to focus clearly on achieving a profile of publication in leading journals and/or with leading publishers of monographs, as well as continuing the high standards of supervision of PhD candidates and wide variety of work of societal relevance.

Productivity

It is hard to estimate the research productivity of this programme on the basis of the information provided about different types of publication. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that overall productivity across the various types of work is good, and that some of the programme’s work is published by leading international journals and leading publishers.

The number of PhD candidates graduating within the programme since 2005 has been low for such an active and varied programme (9 over 6 years), although the total is marginally larger than in UU1 and considerably larger than in UU2. However, when the total number of active research candidates in the programme and connected with this programme is considered, including international and external candidates, it becomes clear that the critical number of researchers at the doctoral and postdoctoral level is of adequate size. It would be reasonable to expect the production of PhDs to rise in the coming years, and the Committee does not see the record of recent years as a lasting cause for concern.

Societal relevance

As one might expect in practical philosophy, a lot of the work done has societal relevance for various audiences. However, the programme's achievements go considerably beyond what might be expected both in their range and in their variety. The programme has made substantial contributions, much of it funded by specific grants, to public policy, to civic and social debate, to professional and business ethics, to the ethics of science and technology, to wider debates in bioethics (including both medical and veterinary ethics), and to issues of sustainable development including climate change. The work has ranged from public lectures to international, national and institutional advisory work, and has reached a remarkable range of stakeholders. The total portfolio of activities amounts to exemplary policy and public engagement.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

It is evident that the university, which has a particular commitment to research in ethics, has recognised that it has something viable and valuable in this programme and supports its broad and varied research portfolio, its growing PhD programme and its wide-ranging societal activities. The programme has an energetic and productive director, and the Committee identified no worrying weaknesses. However, there are a lot of research programmes in practical philosophy, and strengthening the profile of this programme will need constant judgement and adjustment of activities, and attention to ensure that the work in applied ethics (frequently grant-funded) does not squeeze the philosophically more fundamental work in practical philosophy. In the long run the programme's reputation will depend more on the underlying philosophical strength of its work than on the number of its projects in applied ethics.

Conclusion

The programme in Practical Philosophy is in good shape, and should aim high. It will be particularly important for it to maintain its identity in the face of the new links with religious studies which may seem to some less separate from ethics than from the other programmes of research in philosophy at UU, and to ensure that its work remains anchored in the core issues of ethics and political philosophy and is not fragmented by taking on too many commitments within applied ethics.

10. VU UNIVERSITY AMSTERDAM

A. Institute level

1. The institute

At VU University Amsterdam (VU), philosophical research is situated in an independent faculty. According to the self-evaluation report, this embedment in the university offers opportunities to pursue philosophy's classic role and to contribute to the university's identity, as staff members teach *all* candidates at undergraduate level. The faculty's research is said to examine topics in philosophy proper (systematic and historical) and to investigate philosophical questions that arise in interdisciplinary and socio-cultural contexts.

The main areas of research are ancient and medieval philosophy, history of modern philosophy and modern Jewish philosophy, epistemology, ontology, philosophy of science and technology, philosophy of management and organisation, ethics, social philosophy, and philosophy of culture.

In the light of the previous assessment of research quality (1999-2004), the faculty reorganised its research units into three programmes:

1. Human Life, Culture, and Organization (VU 1);
2. Theoretical Philosophy (VU 2);
3. Philosophy in Historical Context (VU 3).

2. Quality and academic reputation

To underline the quality and scientific relevance of the institute's research, the programme sections of the self-evaluation report list the most significant publications, conferences and workshops attended and organised by staff members, research grants (including grants from KNAW, NWO, ERC, EU, NIAS, Humboldt), awards and prizes received by individual researchers, and the invited lectures and prestigious editorships or membership of editorial boards. Joint research programmes and student exchange programmes are also cited as evidence of the international visibility of the institute.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee agrees to a considerable extent with the positive self-evaluation of the institute. Being an independent faculty with members teaching in other faculties at the VU has both advantages and disadvantages. On the positive side, it creates opportunities for interdisciplinary research; on the negative side, it can limit the time available for research. This situation is addressed by the Board of the institute, which is responsible for organisational and strategic issues.

However, while the positive picture painted in the self-evaluation report is broadly true for the institute taken as a whole, the situation of the individual programmes is uneven. The Committee thinks the institute's stated aims and approach are appropriate and well thought out, but finds that it is not evenly implemented in the three programmes. The issues will be set out below in the discussion of the programmes.

3. Resources

Staff numbers at the Faculty of Philosophy have decreased slowly since 2005. However, the total of tenured staff has increased slightly, from 7.15 fte in 2005 to 8.46 fte in 2011.

Due to a decrease in direct funding, the faculty adopted a policy of encouraging its staff to apply for external research funding, and according to the seven-year averages (2005-2011), 44% of research funding was covered by external funds. This result was achieved mainly by the programmes Theoretical Philosophy (VU2) and Philosophy in Historical Context (VU3), which both covered 55% of their budgets by external funding. Most applications made by Human Life, Culture, and Organization (VU1) were turned down, which was described as a matter for concern during the site visit. Contract research apparently plays only a small role at the Philosophy faculty.

The self-evaluation report sees the earning capacity of the faculty's research over the years under review as successful, and it includes the Templeton World Charity Foundation award of the substantial sum of €2.4 million to Van Woudenberg et al. in 2012.

Assessment/remarks

The institute has paid proper attention to seeking external funding for most of its research and has been successful. However, its human resources are not in a stable state, and the institute needs to replace some of its former prominent members, in particular in the Human Life, Culture and Organization programme (VU1). It was not clear in the discussion with the institute management what the strategy of replacement will be. The Committee concluded that the institute needs to pay the strategy and staffing of this programme additional attention. It makes some further comments about this in the programme section below.

4. Productivity

Taken as a whole, the institute's research output during the period under evaluation shows a substantial increase in terms of quantity and quality, although this varies between the programmes. It was not easy for the Committee to reach conclusions about the relative productivity of the programmes because of differences in the ways in which publications were reported in the self-evaluation report. However, it noted that a commendably large number of seminars, symposia, workshops, and conferences were organised and hosted by the faculty's members during the period under review, including a large number for wider public audiences.

Due to financial constraints, direct funding of PhD positions by the faculty has stopped. This has had a direct impact on the number of PhD candidates.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee judged the output of scientific publications of the institute good as a whole and in part excellent. There has been clear progress in this regard. This is also true (if to a lesser degree) of the quality of the journals and publishers. Understandably, the strategy of the different programmes varies in this respect. The institute is very active in organising different kinds of scientific meetings.

Although the number of PhD theses defended is on the low side (average 3 per year), the institute is clearly concerned for the placement of its candidates and claims that their employability has been rather good, although no figures are given in the report for the numbers of PhD candidates who enrolled between 2003 and 2007, or for the time they took to graduate. During the site visit, the Committee learned that recently a new 'hybrid' type of PhD contract has been introduced: researcher-lecturers ('docent-promovendi') spend half of their six-year contract on teaching and the other half on research. This enhances their employability after graduation, but may also have consequences for the time it takes candidates to complete their projects.

5. Societal relevance

According to the self-evaluation report, it is part of the mission of all three programmes to disseminate their research results beyond academia. This was stated to be most evident in the Human Life, Culture, and Organization programme (VU1), which published a substantial amount of work for non-scholarly audiences. Members of this programme participated in and contributed to public and political discussions, e.g., by writing articles for newspapers and magazines, addressing meetings of professional and political groups, supplying philosophical expertise to (future) government officials, and serving as members of advisory committees for government, churches, and other civil society actors, and giving lectures to institutes of vocational training and adult education and to cultural institutions as well as contributions to the media.

Assessment/remarks

The different programmes, unsurprisingly, vary in their active contribution in this respect. Human Life, Culture and Organization (VU1) does a great deal of work for the wider public, but less for specific professional or policy audiences. Philosophy in Historical Context (VU3) addresses some specific audiences but does less to disseminate its work to the general public. The Committee believes that there are often ways in which programmes in specific areas of philosophy can address a range of general and specialised audiences in appropriate ways.

6. Strategy for the future

The faculty has recently introduced a publication strategy plan, including a ranking system for publications, in order to further increase and maintain the quality of its research. Researchers are expected to focus on the publication of articles in peer-reviewed journals and of books and chapters of books with high-ranking international publishers that use peer review. In addition, the research policy aims to encourage staff in applying for external research funding. It intends to pay special attention to obtaining funds from agencies like NWO, the EU and ERC, in consultation with advisors from the university's technology transfer desk. According to the self-evaluation report, the new structure of three research programmes has proved successful in implementing the faculty's research policy.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee noted and endorses the overall strategy of the institute, but also remarks that the success of the individual programmes in following this strategy has been variable; this will be discussed further in the individual programme assessments. It also noted that while the strategy of seeking greater external funding is desirable for all the programmes, it is not guaranteed to succeed because funding is increasingly competitive. In addition, if the institute is to benefit from its smaller size and from its research-oriented teaching, it will need to focus not only on obtaining funds, but on raising its profile, its international visibility and on recruiting PhD candidates of the highest quality.

7. PhD training and supervision

The education and training of PhD candidates in the present three programmes consists of training meetings with the supervisor(s) at the individual level, joint meetings and seminars with junior and senior scholars in the field, regular participation at national and international conferences, and participation in Graduate Schools at the national and international level, as well as sustained stays abroad.

It is anticipated that in the near future PhD candidates will participate in the training programme of the newly founded National Research School in Philosophy (OZSW). This

programme will constitute a substantial contribution to the education and training of the next generations of researchers in philosophy.

As a rule, PhD candidates have two supervisors, one of which acts as a daily supervisor. After one year, the performance of the candidates is evaluated, and a formal go/no go decision is taken on the project.

The VU Faculty of Philosophy has a formal doctoral dissertation agreement with the Institute for Christian Studies (ICS) in Toronto, Canada. Around half of the PhD candidates are foreign.

Assessment/remarks

In the PhD programme the half of the candidates that are Dutch typically has both a bachelor and a master in philosophy, hence a general background in the field. Monitoring of their progress is regular: and a 'go/no go' decision is made after a year. Those continuing have two supervisors as a rule, and the Research School is a resource for all PhD candidates, whether in theoretical philosophy or pursuing practical or historical philosophical studies. Commonly, the PhD takes six years, which is rather long in the Netherlands.

The Committee was impressed by the institute's aims for PhD training and supervision, but raises some questions about their implementation. Such questions concern the protocol for the meetings of doctoral candidates with their supervisors, their international mobility and the linguistic skills of foreign PhD candidates.

B. Programme level

The Committee assessed the following programmes of the Faculty of Philosophy of VU University Amsterdam:

	Quality	Productivity	Relevance	Viability
Human Life, Culture, and Organization	2.5	3	4	2.5
Theoretical Philosophy	4.5	5	4	4.5
Philosophy in Historical Context	4	4	2.5	4

The detailed assessment of each programme follows in the next section of this report.

Programme VU 1:	Human Life, Culture, and Organization	
Programme director:	Prof. A.W. Musschenga	
Research input 2011 (tenured) :	fte	2.53 tenured, 2.62 total fte
Assessments:	Quality:	2.5
	Productivity:	3
	Relevance:	4
	Viability:	2.5

Brief description

The programme seeks to offer a thorough understanding and high-quality philosophical description of contemporary culture, its institutions, and commercial and non-commercial organisations – especially in relation to the concrete life of individual people, their moral judgments, gender, and behaviour.

The programme has three research areas:

- the role of cultural and moral factors for establishing unity and integrity at the level of society;
- the issue of moral unity and integrity within modern pluralist societies at the individual level;
- the specific sphere within modern society related to managing business firms and not-for-profit organisations.

Quality

Across the period of the review, this programme produced a variety of interesting work on a wide range of topics running from globalisation to psychiatry, from phenomenology to banking, as well as some work on questions of ethical and political philosophy. However, the quality was at times uneven. On the one hand, there was impressive work by the programme's director (whom the Committee did not meet), including in particular his role as editor in chief of *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, which rose swiftly to become a leading international journal. On the other hand, a high proportion of the most recent publications of the programme were not refereed; much that was refereed was not in leading journals; and little of it was in journals that are widely read in departments of philosophy. The programme has also lost the sustained contribution to all categories of publication with the death of one of its key researchers in 2011.

The Committee noted that at present there do not appear to be well-defined clusters or themes within the overall mission that focus on or link different strands of work. The programme's very broad focus on social and cultural philosophy enables it to undertake a range of work for wider audiences, and in particular for the general public, that is reflected in its very good score for societal relevance. But this very breadth of the mission makes it harder to identify specific research themes. This is relevant not only to programme's profile of research publications, but to its attractiveness to PhD candidates. The programme could benefit from developing a profile that could be a magnet for more, highly qualified and funded PhD candidates. The Committee asked at both the institute and programme level about future plans, particularly in relation to staffing, but understands that forward planning was still incomplete during the site visit.

Productivity

The programme published a reasonable amount and produced a lot of work intended for wider audiences. Its production of PhDs was very low, averaging only one a year, with only

two completions in the last four years. The suggestions made under the heading of Quality are also relevant to improving productivity, and to ensuring that a reasonable proportion of publications appears with leading journals or publishers. The Committee suggests that it might also be useful to adopt a version of the approaches to supervision used by the programme in Theoretical Philosophy to support the quality of work by PhD candidates.

Societal relevance

As might be expected from its aims, the programme works in areas with wide social and cultural relevance, and these are reflected in a range of interaction with civil society and the general public. Members of the programme also have an unusually broad teaching role, since they teach many non-philosophy candidates. Both the quantity and the diversity of this engagement with the wider public are impressive, but there is currently less engagement with professional or policy audiences.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

The Committee is concerned that this programme needs strengthening if it is to retain its earlier profile. It is at present rather small, and the teaching demands are high and range widely. After the visit, the Committee was informed of a decision to replace the partially retired programme director by a full professor in Ethics. Furthermore, the Faculty Board has reportedly committed itself to appointing an associate professor for Philosophy of Management and Organisation. This consolidation, if achieved, should go a considerable way to remedying the concerns about viability with which the Committee finished the interview. It is to be hoped that the new appointments will enable the programme to develop a set of themes that provide a focus for future work and will attract high-quality, funded PhD candidates, and note that it could be useful to rethink the SWOT analysis at the same time.

Conclusion

The Committee concluded that this programme urgently needs attention if it is to live up to the aims of the institute. What is needed is not complicated, but it is needed now and should not be postponed.

Programme VU 2:	Theoretical Philosophy	
Programme director:	Prof. R. van Woudenberg	
Research input 2011 (tenured) :	fte	3.58 tenured, 6.73 total fte
Assessments:	Quality:	4.5
	Productivity:	5
	Relevance:	4
	Viability:	4.5

Brief description

This programme consists of researchers working in the fields of ontology, epistemology, philosophy of science and technology, and history and philosophy of logic, axiomatics, and semantics.

Research interests include:

- *Ontology and Epistemology*, covering the philosophy of Thomas Reid, analytic epistemology, analytic ontology (materialism, mereology, constitution theory), naturalistic epistemology and empirical studies of cognition (on perception and categorization), and the doctrines of doxastic responsibility in the ethics of belief tradition.
- *Philosophy of Science and Technology*, including research in neighbouring disciplines, such as history of science, science and technology studies, cognitive sciences, philosophy of mind, social philosophy, and ethics. The projects cover a broad range of ‘sciences’.
- *History and Philosophy of Logic, Axiomatics, and Semantics*, covering scientific philosophy in Central Europe from Bolzano to Tarski, the history of axiomatics from Wolff to Tarski, history and philosophy of language and semantics, logic as the methodology of deductive sciences, history of analytic philosophy, as well as computational and empirical data-driven methods applied to the study of philosophical texts.

Quality

This programme belongs to the Faculty of Philosophy, which, as an administrative framework for the programme, is apparently a positive factor in enhancing its distinctive philosophical work and its visibility. In any case, this programme has achieved both very high quality and considerable breadth combined with a clear focus in its research. A significant portion of the publications is co-authored, but the faculty benefits from the interactions. The programme emphasises intellectual exchanges among faculty members and between faculty and candidates, and so far as the Committee could see, this is positive for both quality and quantity. Works that are rejected (at least those by PhD candidates) as well as those sent back for revision are discussed, and PhD candidates are encouraged to submit papers for publication in the course of their studies, though not before achieving a high level of quality. The programme reflects philosophical engagements with the history of philosophy more than most programmes in theoretical philosophy. Major figures studied include Reid, Bolzano, Frege and Carnap. The history of philosophy is an internationally respected branch of philosophy, through which contemporary problems can often be better approached, and this focus of the programme merits continuing emphasis.

Productivity

The programme has produced an unusual quantity of published philosophical writing – with 113 refereed articles listed for the seven years in question and many other professional publications. All articles listed are in internationally recognised journals. Eight completed PhD theses are listed, which is a comparatively small number, but not out of line with norms for the field in the Netherlands. Grant applications have been frequent, though of course not

always successful. As of 2013 (so outside of the review period) a four-year Templeton project, *Beyond Scientism*, will fund four PhD candidates as well as postdoctoral researchers, conferences, and associated publication projects.

Societal relevance

The publications addressed to general readers are numerous, and the programme's interest in science and technology is topically appropriate to social concerns. Staff members lectured to audiences consisting of professionals in the medical or legal professions, professional scientists, candidates, and members of cultural societies throughout the Netherlands. They also gave interviews in programmes on radio and television and in less specialist magazines such as *Eos*, *C2W Life Sciences*, *CV Koers*, *Volzin*, and *Nederlands Dagblad*, and created videos for a larger audience. The Committee also notes the programme director's newspaper contributions (over 70), later yielding two books. Such activity is consistent with the scholarly aims of the programme and is to be encouraged.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

Given the quality, enormous productivity, and success in obtaining grant funding of the programme, its viability is certainly not in question. It should also be noted that the eight PhD graduates listed have found employment in universities or organisations in which they can well represent the programme and make constructive contributions to society. Moreover, the programme is rightly enhancing its efforts to achieve even higher quality in its publications and a still stronger record of outside funding. Momentum here should be assisted by the large number of appointments possible under the project exploring 'scientism' and, of course, related questions in the philosophy of science and technology.

Conclusion

Much of what should be done in the programme is apparently under way. The Committee would encourage even greater emphasis on the already high quality of publication, continued stress on relevance – including maintaining the programme's role in the university's undergraduate curriculum – and enhanced efficiency in helping PhD candidates toward timely completion of their degrees.

Programme VU 3:	Philosophy in Historical Context	
Programme director:	Prof. W. Goris	
Research input 2011 (tenured) :	fte	2.35 tenured, 3.6 total fte
Assessments:	Quality:	4
	Productivity:	4
	Relevance:	2.5
	Viability:	4

Brief description

As described by its self-evaluation report, this programme comprises three research areas: (a) the former area of ancient and medieval philosophy that now has its main focus on medieval philosophy, with a medievalist as its leader, with a specialist in late ancient philosophy as the representative of ancient philosophy, and a specialist in Medieval Arabic philosophy; (b) modern philosophy focuses on classical German philosophy of the 18th and 19th century. The name of the third area (c) 'Jewish philosophy' is misleading, and so is perhaps its separate listing. For although the main permanent researcher of that area works on certain Jewish philosophers in 18th and 19th century Germany, on their contribution to Enlightenment and its aftermath, his work complements that of the researchers in subgroup (b) and should, perhaps, be united with that subgroup.

That the programme's focus seems to lie in medieval philosophy is in part due to the sudden death of one of the institute's main researchers, to a recent retirement, and to the temporary appointment of the key researcher in German idealism at another university. The Committee recommends that efforts should be made to secure his return, especially if no replacement is planned for the recent retirement.

Quality

The quality of the publications is overall high. As is often the case in the history of philosophy, it consists more of books than of refereed articles, but the monographs submitted are clearly substantial contributions to their respective areas, and the number of articles published in first-rate periodicals in recent years has increased, as has the organisation of internationally recognised conferences by the key researchers, as well as their participation in such conferences at both the national and the international level.

The relevance of the research to the scientific community is evident, and most of the members have working contacts with members of other universities, both nationally and internationally, and some of them are members of boards of important international periodicals.

Productivity

The output is respectable in quantity, and the success in obtaining research funds (55%) is impressive, as is the number of PhD candidates who finished their dissertations. The statistics are less than transparent about the time of their completion, however.

Societal relevance

The programme has taken a focused approach to this objective, and has been active in communicating its work through specific links, for example with the Islamic and Jewish communities, and with involvement in the national council for Greek and Latin education. The committee took the view that there may also be opportunities to engage fruitfully with the wider public and with other specific audiences.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

The programme is more than viable, and its prospects are very good. It has a unique concentration on medieval philosophy that extends from late antiquity and a concentration on Arabic philosophy. The latter's continuation is assured by the fact that the position of the researcher involved has recently been made permanent. The prospects are also good in the programme's second focus, German idealism and Neo-Kantianism, provided that the faculty fulfils its commitment both to replace the recent loss of a key member of the faculty and of another who is going to retire in the future. This will give more coherence to that focus and increase its attractiveness to candidates.

Conclusion

The programme has the potential and the resources to represent history of philosophy in antiquity, the Middle Ages and modern philosophy, with a particular emphasis on German philosophy from the 18th to the 20th century. Every effort should be made to ensure that a former key researcher in German metaphysics returns to the programme, in a tenured position. In addition, the programme may be well advised to unite subgroups (b) and (c) which complement each other and may lead to joint projects that attract extra funding; this should attract PhD candidates and enhance opportunities for international cooperation.

Appendices

Appendix A: Profiles of the committee members

Onora O'Neill (1941) combines writing on political philosophy and ethics with a range of public activities. She was born in Northern Ireland and has worked mainly in Britain and the US. She was Principal of Newnham College, Cambridge from 1992-2006, President of the British Academy from 2005-9, chaired the Nuffield Foundation from 1998-2010, has been a crossbench member of the House of Lords since 2000 (Baroness O'Neill of Bengarve). She currently chairs the UK's Equality and Human Rights Commission and is on the board of the Medical Research Council. She lectures and writes on, justice and ethics, on accountability and trust, on justice and borders, as well as on the future of universities, the quality of legislation and the ethics of communication, including media ethics.

Robert Audi (1941) is known for his writings in moral and political philosophy, epistemology, philosophy of action, and philosophy of religion. He also teaches and gives public lectures in these areas. His books include *Moral Perception* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013), *Democratic Authority and the Separation of Church and State* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), *Rationality and Religious Commitment* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 2011—ultimately deriving from the Wilde Lectures given in Oxford in 2001), *Practical Reasoning and Ethical Decision* (Routledge: London and New York, 2006), *The Good in the Right: A Theory of Intuition and Intrinsic Value* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), *The Architecture of Reason* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), *Religious Commitment and Secular Reason* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), *Epistemology: A Contemporary Introduction to the Theory of Knowledge* (London and New York: Routledge, 3rd ed. 2010), and *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy* (as Editor) (1995, 1999, 3rd ed. forthcoming). His papers spanning these areas are listed on Notre Dame's Philosophy website. He is a past president of the American Philosophical Association, a former editor of *The Journal of Philosophical Research*, a past director of five postdoctoral seminars and institutes under the National Endowment for the Humanities, and currently John A. O'Brien Professor of Philosophy and Professor of Management, University of Notre Dame. He received his BA from Colgate University (1963) and his PhD from the University of Michigan (1967).

Diderik Batens (1944) is Emeritus Professor of Philosophy at Ghent University, where he founded the Centre for Logic and Philosophy of Science; earlier he held positions at Limburgs Universitair Centrum and at Vrije Universiteit Brussel. He is a member of the Institut International de Philosophie and of the Royal Flemish Academy of Belgium for Science and the Arts. He directed several international research cooperations; he is or was a member of boards of international journals, of learned societies, and of programme committees and organising committees of international conferences; he was a keynote speaker or an invited speaker at many international meetings and lectured at more than 50 universities. His research is mainly in philosophy of science, epistemology and logic, most prominently paraconsistent logic and adaptive logics. He has published about 130 papers and three books and co-edited four books. At the moment he is completing a book on adaptive logic.

Rudolf Bernet (1946) is Emeritus Professor of Philosophy at the University of Leuven and President of the Husserl Archives. He is a member of the Institut International de Philosophie, a former president of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für phänomenologische Forschung, and has taught as visiting professor at the Universities of Nice, Copenhagen, Rome, Boston College, Stony Brook, Hong Kong (CUH) and Freiburg i. Br. In 2008 he was awarded the *Alexander von Humboldt-Forschungspreis*. He has prepared critical editions of

Husserl's posthumous writings on time (Meiner 1985 and 2013, Kluwer 2001) and has published widely on phenomenology, history of philosophy and philosophical anthropology. He is the co-editor of *Edmund Husserl: Critical Assessments of Leading Philosophers* (Routledge 2005, 5 volumes). His books include: *An Introduction to Husserlian Phenomenology* (with I. Kern and E. Marbach) (Northwestern University Press 1993), *La vie du sujet* (Presses universitaires de France, 1994), *Conscience et existence* (Presses universitaires de France, 2004) and *Force-Pulsion-Désir* (Vrin, 2013).

Dorothea Frede (1941) is Professor Emerita of Philosophy at Hamburg University and has recently retired as Mills Adjunct Professor at the University of California Berkeley. She is a regular member of the Göttingen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Foreign Fellow of the American Academy of Science, Honorary Professor at the Humboldt University of Berlin, and has been president of the Gesellschaft für antike Philosophie from 2004-2007. She has been editor of the *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie* for 10 years, and continues to act as member of the editorial board of several international periodicals. She has published widely in ancient philosophy, including philosophy of the Hellenistic age and late antiquity as well as medieval philosophy. As a sideline she has pursued phenomenology and the philosophy of Martin Heidegger. In recent years her publications have focussed on ethics and its methodology in late Plato and Aristotle. She is currently preparing a translation and commentary on Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* for the Berlin Akademie series.

Appendix B: Explanation of the SEP scores

<i>Excellent (5)</i>	Research is world leading. Researchers are working at the forefront of their field internationally and their research has an important and substantial impact in the field.
<i>Very Good (4)</i>	Research is nationally leading. Research is internationally competitive and makes a significant contribution to the field.
<i>Good (3)</i>	Research is internationally visible. Work is competitive at the national level and makes a valuable contribution in the international field.
<i>Satisfactory (2)</i>	Research is nationally visible. Work adds to our understanding and is solid, but not exciting.
<i>Unsatisfactory (1)</i>	Work is neither solid nor exciting, flawed in the scientific and/or technical approach, repetitions of other work, etc.

Quality is to be seen as a measure of excellence and excitement. It refers to the eminence of a group's research activities, its abilities to perform at the highest level and its achievements in the international scientific community. It rests on the proficiency and rigour of research concepts and conduct; it shows in the success of the group at the forefront of scientific development.

Productivity refers to the total output of the group; that is, the variegated ways in which results of research and knowledge development are publicised. The output needs to be reviewed in relation to the input in terms of human resources.

Societal relevance covers the social, economic and cultural relevance of the research. Aspects are:

- societal quality of the work. Efforts to interact in a productive way with stakeholders in society who are interested in input from scientific research, and contributions to important issues and debates in society.
- societal impact of the work. Research affects specific stakeholders or procedures in society.
- valorisation of the work. Activities aimed at making research results available and suitable for application in products, processes and services. This includes interaction with public and private organisations, as well as commercial or non-profit use of research results and expertise.

Vitality and feasibility. This dual criterion regards the Institute's ability to react adequately to important changes in the environment. It refers to both internal (personnel, research themes) and external (developments in the field, in society) dynamics of the group. On the one hand, this criterion measures the flexibility of a group, which appears in its ability to close research

lines that have no future and to initiate new venture projects. On the other hand, it measures the capacity of the management to run projects in a professional way. Policy decisions and project management are assessed, including cost-benefit analysis.

Appendix C: Programme of the site visit

Day 0: 4 November: arrival and preparatory meeting

14.30-15.30	Introduction by Meg van Bogaert (coordinator research assessments, QANU) + Prof Keimpe Algra + Prof Anthonie Meijers	Committee & Secretary, Meg van Bogaert, Keimpe Algra, Anthonie Meijers
15.30-18.00	Preparatory committee meeting	Committee & Secretary

Day 1: 5 November: Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR) + Tilburg University (TiU)

08.30-09.00	Committee meeting	Committee & Secretary
09.00-09.45	Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR): Institute <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prof W. van Bunge (dean Department of Philosophy) Dr F.A. Muller 	Dean, Vice-Dean Research, Research Director etc..., Committee & Secretary
09.45-10.30	P1: EUR1. <i>The Renaissance to the Early Enlightenment in the Dutch Republic</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prof W. van Bunge 	Frede (1 st reviewer), Bernet (2 nd reviewer) + other committee members & secretary
10.30-10.45	break	Committee & Secretary
10.45-11.30	P2: EUR2. <i>Institutions</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prof J. Vromen 	Audi (1 st reviewer), Batens (2 nd reviewer) + other committee members & secretary
11.30-12.15	P3: EUR3. <i>The Constitution of Normative Practices</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prof I. Robeyns 	O'Neill (1 st reviewer), Audi (2 nd reviewer) + other committee members & secretary
12.15-13.00	Lunch with PhD candidates EUR and TiU: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> D. Klein, MSc (TiU – <i>Theoretical Philosophy</i>) F. Daudeij (EUR - <i>The Renaissance to the Early Enlightenment in the Dutch Republic</i>) M. Vergara Fernandez (EUR – <i>Institutions</i>) E. Keymolen (EUR – <i>The Ontology of Mediation</i>) N. van Voorst-Vader (EUR – <i>The Constitution of Normative Practices</i>) J.L. Van Houdt, MA (TiU - <i>History of Philosophy</i>) Drs S.A. Voerman (TiU – <i>Practical Philosophy</i>) 	Committee & Secretary, PhD candidates
13.00-13.45	P4. EUR4. <i>The Ontology of Mediation</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prof J. de Mul 	Bernet (1 st reviewer), Frede (2 nd reviewer) + other committee members & secretary
13.45-14.30	Tilburg University (TiU). Institute: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prof A. de Ruijter (Dean TSH) Prof P.G.J. Post (Vice-Dean research TSH) Prof.dr. J.A.P. Hagens (Head of Philosophy Department TSH) 	Dean, Vice-Dean Research, Research Director etc..., Committee & Secretary
14.30-14.45	break	Committee & Secretary
14.45-15.30	P5. TiU1. <i>Theoretical Philosophy:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dr R.A. Muskens 	Batens (1 st reviewer) Audi (2 nd reviewer) + other committee members & secretary
15.30-16.15	P6. TiU2. <i>Practical Philosophy:</i>	O'Neill (1 st reviewer), Audi (2 nd reviewer) + other committee

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof H.K. Lindahl 	members & secretary
16.15-16.30	break	Committee & Secretary
16.30-17.15	P7. TiU3. <i>History of Philosophy:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof P.G. Cobben 	Bernet (1 st reviewer), Frede (2 nd reviewer) + other committee members & secretary
17.15-18.45	Evaluation EUR and UvT	Committee & Secretary

Day 2: 6 November: Leiden University (LEI) + Delft University of Technology (TUD) + Eindhoven University of Technology (TUE) + University of Twente (UT)

08.30-09.00	committee meeting	Committee & Secretary
09.00-09.45	Leiden University (LEI): Institute <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof H.W. van den Doel (dean Faculty of Humanities) • Prof F.A.J. de Haas (academic director Institute for Philosophy) 	Dean, Vice-Dean Research, Research Director etc..., Committee & Secretary
09.45-10.30	P8. LEI1. <i>Philosophy and History of the Sciences and Humanities</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr J.W. McAllister 	Audi (1 st reviewer), Batens (2 nd reviewer), Frede (3 rd reviewer) + other Committee members & Secretary
10.30-10.45	break	Committee & Secretary
10.45-11.30	P9. LEI2. <i>Agency and Interaction; Community and Rational Justification in a Globalizing World</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr H.W. Siemens • Dr B. Verbeek 	O'Neill (1 st reviewer), Audi (2 nd reviewer) + other Committee members & Secretary
11.30-12.15	Delft University of Technology (TUD): Institute <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof T.A.J. Toonen, dean faculty Technology, Policy and Management • Prof P.M. Herder, director education faculty Technology, Policy and Management • Prof M.J. van den Hoven, chair Department Values and Technology 	Dean, Vice-Dean Research, Research Director etc..., Committee & Secretary
12.15-13.00	Lunch with PhD candidates LEI, TUD, TUE, UT: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drs B. Karstens (LEI - <i>Philosophy and History of the Sciences and Humanities</i>) • H.L.J. Gaasterland MPhil (LEI - <i>Agency and Interaction</i>) • S.E. Mendritzki (TUE - <i>Philosophy and its Applications to Technology</i>) • L. Strikwerda, LL.M., MA. (UT - <i>Interpretive and Normative Investigations of Technology and Technological Culture</i>) • E.T. Oosterlaken (TUD, <i>Philosophy of Technology, Design and Values</i>) 	Committee & Secretary, PhD candidates
13.00-13.45	P10. TUD1. <i>Philosophy of Technology, Design and Values</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof ir P.A. Kroes • Prof M.J. van den Hoven • Dr Maarten Franssen 	O'Neill (1 st reviewer), Audi (2 nd reviewer) + other Committee members & Secretary
13.45-14.30	Eindhoven University of Technology (TUE): Institute <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof. A.W.M. Meijers (vice-dean Faculty IE&IS, head of School of Innovation Sciences, head of Philosophy Department) 	Dean, Vice-Dean Research, Research Director etc..., Committee & Secretary

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prof. K. Frenken (director Graduate School, School of Innovation Sciences) 	
14.30-14.45	break	Committee & Secretary
14.45-15.30	P11. TUE1. <i>Philosophy and its Applications to Technology</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prof A.W.M. Meijers, programme leader Dr W.N. Houkes (<i>philosophy of science and technology</i>) Dr M.B. Peterson (<i>ethics and technology</i>) 	Audi (1 st reviewer), O'Neill (2 nd reviewer) + other Committee members & Secretary
15.30-16.15	University of Twente (UT): Institute <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prof P.M.G. Apers (Scientific Director Research Institute CTIT) Prof P. A. E. Brey 	Dean, Vice-Dean Research, Research Director etc..., Committee & Secretary
16.15-17.00	P12. UT1. <i>Interpretive and Normative Investigations of Technology and Technological Culture</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prof P. A. E. Brey Prof P.P.C.C. Verbeek 	O'Neill (1 st reviewer), Bernet (2 nd reviewer) + other Committee members & Secretary
17.00-18.30	Evaluation LEI, TUD, TU/e, UT	Committee & Secretary

Day 3: 7 November: Utrecht University (UU) + VU University Amsterdam (VU)

08.30-09.00	committee meeting	Committee & Secretary
09.00-09.45	Utrecht University (UU): Institute <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prof M. Düwell (Head of Research Institute) Prof. K.A. Algra (Vice Dean) 	Dean, Vice-Dean Research, Research Director etc..., Committee & Secretary
09.45-10.30	P13. UU1. <i>Practical Philosophy</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prof M. Düwell 	O'Neill (1 st reviewer), Bernet (2 nd reviewer) + other Committee members & Secretary
10.30-10.45	break	Committee & Secretary
10.45-11.30	P14. UU2. <i>Theoretical Philosophy</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prof A. Visser 	Batens (1 st reviewer), Audi (2 nd reviewer) + other Committee members & Secretary
11.30-12.15	P15. UU3. <i>History of Philosophy</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prof P. Ziche Prof K.A. Algra 	Frede (1 st reviewer), Bernet (2 nd reviewer) + other Committee members & Secretary
12.15-13.00	Lunch with PhD candidates UU and VU: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> N. van Miltenburg (UU, <i>Theoretical Philosophy</i>) A. Krom (UU, <i>Practical Philosophy/Ethics Institute</i>) Dr. A. Joosse (UU, <i>History of Philosophy</i>) S.P. Roski, MA (VU, <i>Theoretical Philosophy</i>) J.J. van Baardewijk (VU, <i>Human Life, Culture and Organization</i>) H. van den Berg (VU, <i>History of Philosophy</i>) 	Committee & Secretary, PhD candidates
13.00-13.45	VU University Amsterdam (VU): Institute <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prof R. van Woudenberg, dean and research director Prof R. Munk, research director 	Dean, Vice-Dean Research, Research Director etc..., Committee & Secretary
13.45-14.30	P16. VU1. <i>Theoretical Philosophy</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prof R. van Woudenberg 	Audi (1 st reviewer), Batens (2 nd reviewer) + other Committee members & Secretary
14.30-14.45	break	Committee & Secretary
14.45-15.30	P17. VU2. <i>Human Life, Culture and Organization</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prof A. Verbrugge 	O'Neill (1 st reviewer), Audi (2 nd reviewer) + other Committee members & Secretary

15.30-16.15	P18. VU3. <i>History of Philosophy</i> • Prof W. Goris	Frede (1 st reviewer), Bernet (2 nd reviewer) + other Committee members & Secretary
16.15-16.30	break	Committee & Secretary
16.30-19.00	Evaluation UU and VU + end meeting	Committee & Secretary