

Faculty of Humanities – Utrecht University

Research evaluation report 2018-2023

24 March 2025



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Preface.....	3
2. Introduction	4
3. Organisational structure, mission, and strategic aims.....	5
4. Research quality	7
5. PhD policy and training	9
6. Societal relevance	11
7. Viability.....	13
8. Conclusion and recommendations.....	19
9. Appendices.....	21

1. PREFACE

Our committee of international experts had the honour and pleasure to evaluate a six-year period of research at the Faculty of Humanities at Utrecht University on the basis of written materials provided in advance and a site visit in November 2024. Our task was to assess how the Faculty had performed in the fulfilment of its own research ambitions over the past six years, and to act as a critical friend in helping the Faculty to optimise conditions for its future well-being and optimal performance.

As will be clear from this report, this committee found that past performance of the Faculty in terms of Research Quality and Societal Relevance was impressive. We encountered a large number of highly engaged and motivated members of the Faculty, at all different levels, involved in a dynamic and thriving research environment, which offered many opportunities for collaborative and individual excellence, and for disciplinary and interdisciplinary research and societal engagement. We also noted many positive aspects of other major indicators of quality, such as PhD Policy and Training. Full details can be found in this assessment report.

The committee's task also included an evaluation of the viability of this Faculty in the coming years. It so happened that the site visit took place at a critical junction in the history of the Faculty. Confronted with the prospect of major financial deficits, quite radical plans had been put together under great time pressure and without room for consultation of key players among senior Faculty leadership or the academic community at large. The Faculty had been made aware of these plans only in the week before the site visit.

While this state of affairs obviously impacted discussions during our site visit, the committee has taken great care not to let this overshadow the virtually ubiquitous positive qualities that we discerned. Nonetheless, we also had to acknowledge the dangers this unforeseen situation posed for the future of the Faculty, for the overall academic culture, and in particular for issues of trust and social well-being. Since the committee had been in the unique position of hearing the points of view of all stakeholders in the Faculty, we used part of our preliminary oral report (delivered to the whole Faculty community at the end of the site visit) to comment on the potential impact of these developments on viability and academic culture. We emphatically did so from the position of critical friendship. It is our hope that these comments have made a contribution to reestablishing the necessary dialogues and openness to alternative solutions to very real and serious problems. While we have repeated these comments in our report, it is our understanding that such dialogues are now underway. This is a necessary condition for this wonderful academic community to keep thriving. Which it deserves.

Ineke Sluiter
chair of the evaluation committee
December 2024

2. INTRODUCTION

Research evaluation committee

As part of the quality assurance cycle, research units are evaluated by an independent evaluation committee every six years. The Faculty of Humanities of Utrecht University appointed an evaluation committee of independent experts to perform an evaluation of the whole Faculty over the period 2018-2023. The committee was requested to assess the quality, societal relevance and viability of the research conducted by the Faculty, as well as to offer recommendations for improvement.

The committee for the evaluation of the Faculty of Humanities consisted of the following members:

- Prof. dr. Ineke Sluiter (chair), Leiden University;
- Prof. dr. Maaïke van Berckelaer, Radboud University,
- Prof. dr. Helen Brookman, King's College London;
- Dr. Piraye Hacigüzeller, University of Antwerp;
- Prof. dr. Emiel Krahmer, Tilburg University;
- Prof. dr. Birgit Krawietz, Freie Universität Berlin;
- Prof. dr. Nicholas Mirzoeff, New York University;
- Prof. dr. Thomas Müller, University of Konstanz;
- Marta Sienkiewicz (PhD candidate), Leiden University;
- Prof. dr. Marit Westergaard, UiT The Arctic University of Norway.

The evaluation committee was supported by independent secretaries, drs. Nikki Hoop and Elian Bogers MSc (Odion Onderzoek), who were responsible for the process coordination of the committee before and during the site visit, as well as the drafting of the committee's report.

To ensure a transparent and independent evaluation process, the secretaries and the members of the evaluation committee reflected on their interests that could influence their ability to conduct an independent and impartial assessment, and all evaluation committee members signed a statement of impartiality and confidentiality. It was concluded that the committee had no conflicts of interest.

Objectives of the research evaluation

The committee was requested to carry out the assessment according to the guidelines specified in the Strategy Evaluation Protocol 2021-2027 (SEP). The evaluation consisted of a backward-looking and a forward-looking component. Specifically, the committee was asked to assess the performance of the Faculty based on the following main assessment criteria: Research quality, Societal relevance, and Viability.

Moreover, the committee was asked to zoom in on four further aspects that are considered increasingly important in the current scientific context. These aspects are Open Science, PhD Policy and Training, Academic Culture, and Human Resources Policy.

In addition to the criteria specified in the SEP protocol, the Dean requested that the committee pay attention to an additional question (broadly: on the effective organisation of interdisciplinarity within the Faculty) as well as offer its assessment and recommendations for the four associated national research schools as specified in the Terms of Reference, enclosed in Appendix 1.

Procedures

The Faculty of Humanities prepared a self-evaluation report that formed the main source of information for the committee. This documentation was made available on September 20, 2024. At a later stage, additional background information was supplied to the committee via an online platform. Prior to the site visit, the committee members studied the self-evaluation reports and formulated first impressions and questions individually. First impressions were shared with the secretary and chair one week prior to the site visit and were shared and discussed in a closed preliminary meeting on November 10, 2024. The secretary and chair informed the committee extensively on the criteria of the SEP protocol and the Terms of Reference. In the preliminary meeting, the committee formulated the topics to be clarified and identified questions to be asked during the site visit. The site visit took place on November 11, 12 and 13, 2024, at two different locations. During the site visit, the committee also received information on newly proposed measures to implement structural changes in the Faculty, designed to remedy anticipated financial deficits. The programme of the site visit is included in Appendix 2.

The committee discussed their assessments and preliminary findings daily during breaks, dedicated discussions, and closed committee meetings. The chair shared the committee's preliminary conclusions immediately after the site visit. These were based on the findings of the site visit and the assessment of the Faculty's documents. The secretary, in close collaboration with the chair, wrote a draft version of the final report. The draft report was verified and complemented with additional remarks by the committee members, and the resulting version was presented to the Faculty with the invitation to identify any factual inaccuracies. The Faculty's comments were reviewed by the secretary and incorporated in the final report in close consultation with the chair. The final version of the report was then made available to the Faculty's board.

3. ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE, MISSION, AND STRATEGIC AIMS

Organisational structure

The Faculty of Humanities of Utrecht University is one of the institution's seven faculties, dedicated to providing education and conducting research across a wide array of disciplines, including history, art history, philosophy, religious studies, language sciences, literary studies, media and performance, gender studies, and musicology.

The Faculty consists of four departments: the Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, the Department of History and Art History, the Department of Languages, Literature and Communication,

and the Department of Media and Culture Studies. The Faculty's research activities are organised within four institutes, mostly co-extensive with these departments:

- The Research Institute for Philosophy and Religious Studies (OFR)
- The Research Institute for History and Art History (OGK)
- The Institute for Language Sciences (ILS)
- The Institute for Cultural Inquiry (ICON)

The latter Institute, ICON, spans two departments: Media and Culture Studies and Languages, Literature and Communication. Each institute consists of five to seven research groups. All researchers belong to at least one research group. The size of the research staff in FTE is included in Appendix 4.

The four research institutes serve as the base for all PhD candidates in the humanities, providing office space and integrating them into the research groups. At the Faculty level, PhD candidates are part of the Graduate School of Humanities, which offers a training programme focused on transferable skills. Additionally, national research schools provide specialised subject-area training. The Faculty of Humanities coordinates four of the research schools: the Huizinga Institute, the Netherlands Interuniversity School for Islamic Studies (NISIS), the Netherlands Research School of Gender Studies (NOG), and the N.W. Posthumus Institute (NWP).

Research is supported by an infrastructure consisting of the Centre for Digital Humanities (CDH), the Utrecht University Library, the Research Support Office, the Ethical Assessment Committee, the Data Management Support Office, the Research Integrity Committee, research coordinators, and lab facilities.

Mission and strategic aims

The Faculty of Humanities builds on a tradition of curiosity-driven research, generating disciplinary knowledge across diverse fields, while increasingly also fostering interdisciplinary collaboration. The Faculty aims to bring its research to bear on complex societal challenges such as sustainability, climate change, artificial intelligence, and ethical issues surrounding new technologies. By contextualising and publicly reflecting on these issues, the Faculty contributes to societal debates. The Faculty's ambition is to create a stimulating research community, deliver innovative contributions, tackle urgent societal questions, and prepare future generations of scholars.

Key objectives in the strategic period 2018-2023 include:

- Fostering a safe and inclusive research environment that values collaboration, individual strengths, and team science, while enabling researchers to feel recognised and appreciated.
- Producing high-quality, innovative research by exploring new disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches.
- Addressing societal questions through public engagement and collaborative projects, enhancing both societal impact and the research itself.
- Training PhD candidates to become independent researchers equipped for their role in and beyond academia.

4. RESEARCH QUALITY

Faculty-wide research indicators and case studies per institute were provided to the committee in the Faculty's self-evaluation report. The committee considered the research quality broadly in terms of research output, individual and collaborative grants, prizes and awards, networks and collaborations, academic and societal recognition, and societal impact (the latter is discussed in chapter 5). The panel conducted a review of the Faculty as a whole, rather than of one institute. Given that overarching level, the committee also focused on the quality control mechanisms in place at the Faculty and University level.

The committee commends the Faculty for its courageous decision to undergo evaluation at the Faculty level, acknowledging that this approach limits the in-depth assessment of research excellence at the level of research groups and individuals. Nevertheless, the Faculty showcased a selection of remarkable achievements in research excellence across all levels – the Faculty, institutes, research groups, and individuals. Instances where this report will highlight specific examples and achievements should in no way be taken to detract from the overall quality of other units.

Although the committee's approach was primarily qualitative, it noted a considerable quantitative output (1433 publications in 2023), including primarily peer-reviewed journal articles and book chapters, and to a lesser extent, books and book editorships. In 2023, the vast majority (86%) of journal publications were made open access. The Faculty has been successful in attracting national and international competitive funding in individual grant schemes (e.g., NWO Talent Programme and ERC grants) and in larger collaborative programmes (e.g., NWO Gravitation and Dutch Research Agenda (NWA) grants). Individual researchers have also demonstrated exceptional excellence, as evidenced by prestigious awards and their ability to inspire other scholars both nationally and internationally.

The Faculty covers a broad range of knowledge, approaches, and topics, with the intention 'to consolidate the diversity of disciplines by fostering interdisciplinary collaboration'. In particular, the Faculty seeks to consolidate the geographical diversity of its European expertise and to expand it into a global perspective by fully integrating the geographical diversity brought by new staff members and by 'enhancing collaboration and networks of exchange, particularly with the Global South'. The committee fully supports this ambition, while noting that the Faculty's current output is predominantly Eurocentric. However, it also noticed exemplary work in religious studies and Islam and Arabic studies, where over the past five years an entirely new and forward-looking research profile was developed, with a global (and hence less Eurocentric) perspective, which has successfully enriched the field of religious studies and cultural studies at large. Recent hires in these areas included scholars with a non-European expertise, including the Middle East and Central Asia. The committee encourages the Faculty to continue efforts to expand its European expertise into a global one, emphatically including the global South.

The committee is impressed by the exceptional academic leadership, especially at the level of the research directors. This also speaks to the level of internal quality control. Strong academic leadership is apparent in the excellent way in which research is organised and facilitated. This includes fostering new talents, building extended networks, and facilitating a productive and collaborative research

environment, all in evidence over the past five years. Research directors are strongly and effectively involved in supporting grant applications, organising mock interviews, and integrating new colleagues into existing projects and networks.

Strategic themes and focus areas

The Faculty strives for interdisciplinary research on multiple levels: within research institutes (micro), between institutes within the Faculty (meso), and across faculties at the university level (macro). This includes active engagement with the university-wide strategic themes and focus areas. The strategic themes (i.e., Dynamics of Youth, Institutions for Open Societies, Life Sciences, Pathways to Sustainability) are permanent and relatively broad. The Faculty coordinates the strategic theme Institutions for Open Societies. The focus areas have a fixed-term lifespan and serve as testing grounds for collaboration and innovation. The Faculty had requested that the committee pay special attention to these forms of structuring interdisciplinarity.

The committee found the organisational structure somewhat complex and anticipated potential confusion, but instead observed cheerful pragmatism among Faculty members, indicating that the structure in fact effectively supports interdisciplinary research. It provides ample opportunity for researchers across the Faculty to engage in (often multiple) multidisciplinary projects, enhancing the cross-fertilisation of the Faculty's wide-ranging expertise. However, the committee's interlocutors signalled that the current focus is more on within-Faculty collaborations, which might obscure the efficacy and potential of collaborations between different Faculties and broader collaborations that exceed the borders of Utrecht University. While nearly all researchers are actively involved in strategic themes and focus areas, most of them also have active wider networks. Given the necessity of creating a more efficient and interconnected academic landscape within the Netherlands and internationally, the committee recommends that the Faculty not undersell itself, but advertise their broader forms of (inter)national collaboration as part of their research profile.

Navigating the current complex system with multiple layers can be hard, especially for younger or new staff members. The themes and focus areas show a plurality of practices and platforms, which is a strength in catering to different research needs and groups. In the committee's conversations with the different panels, it became apparent that once researchers feel integrated into this ecosystem, they benefit from collaboration and opportunities for bottom-up initiatives. Notable positive examples are the Network for Environmental Humanities and the strategic theme Pathways to Sustainability, which have resulted in large networks of fruitful collaborations and various (societally) relevant outputs. However, introducing (early-career) scholars into these networks requires significant time and effort, and not all researchers find the themes and focus areas directly relevant to their work. The committee observed commendable efforts of research support staff, supervisors, and the directors of the research institutes to accommodate researchers in finding the right projects and networks. However, the committee recommends ensuring the system remains manageable. More specifically, avoid adding new elements to the structure, and where innovation is desirable, align new initiatives with existing units and

networks. The current structure works effectively but already requires substantial coordination, and additional complexity would increase the workload and should be avoided.

Last but not least, the committee underscores the critical importance of preserving robust disciplinary foundations as a cornerstone for interdisciplinary research. The latter relies on the depth and rigour of established knowledge and expertise within disciplines, which are often built over decades. An obvious example is the impressive and internationally renowned Utrecht University tradition of the study of Celtic languages and culture with its concomitant specialised knowledge. While team science and collaborative efforts are of great importance, they must not overshadow the contributions of individual scientists and scholars engaged in exceptional work within their specific fields of expertise. Acknowledging the tension between these priorities, the committee advocates for a flexible and inclusive approach, avoiding dogmatic solutions that favour one over the other. A successful Faculty requires both focused disciplinary expertise (of individuals or small groups) and team science that drives interdisciplinary research.

Technical and research support

The Faculty's technical and research support staff are highly valued by both the management team and academic staff for their essential contributions to high-quality, innovative research. The Research Support Office (RSO), which plays a pivotal role in identifying funding opportunities and drafting grant proposals, is recognised as essential in fostering a productive and collaborative research environment. Moreover, the university-level confidential advisors and Faculty-level contact persons are particularly important for fostering a healthy academic climate: they are well-known and approachable for addressing issues with scientific integrity or inappropriate behaviour. Key technical support includes the Centre for Digital Humanities (CDH), which empowers staff and students by enhancing their digital skills and promoting an ethically responsible and critical perspective on digital humanities. Researchers themselves stay responsible for their FAIR data management, open science practices, ethical assessment and research methods). Special facilities such as the ILS Lab for Language Sciences (part of CDH), the ArtLab, a multifunctional studio lab, and an audiovisual studio are highly valued by scientific staff and further enrich the Faculty's research environment.

The committee observed that technical and research support staff are highly skilled, engaged and motivated, and regarded as true partners by academic staff. Their contribution is in high demand and highly appreciated. The committee encourages leadership and management to further promote the integration of RSO, CDH and the labs with the activities within the institutes and Faculty, ensuring that their work continues to be recognised and valued.

5. PHD POLICY AND TRAINING

The Faculty demonstrates a strong commitment to the well-being and success of its PhD candidates. The key aspect of its PhD policy and training is the provision of diverse training opportunities, the "View on PhD supervision" document which formulates mutual expectations of PhD candidates and supervisors,

and the establishment of the four-eyes principle in supervision. During the site visit, the committee met with a group of enthusiastic PhD candidates (primarily employee, one self-funded, many involved in the Faculty's PhD Council). These candidates expressed their satisfaction with the Faculty's supportive and inclusive academic environment, extensive training opportunities, and substantial academic freedom and space for bottom-up initiatives. Relationships with supervisors were described as strong and supportive, and expectations were overall clear. The candidates particularly valued senior staff members' willingness to share their professional networks. In future evaluations, it would be useful for committees also to have information on the wider PhD community (e.g. results of any surveys or focus groups). Such sources of information could also generate actionable insights for the Faculty about the concerns of PhD candidates. The committee encourages the Faculty to continue efforts to integrate the various PhD groups more fully into the academic community.

A significant concern expressed by the PhD candidates is their future career prospects. Despite the Faculty's commitment to preparing candidates for their future careers, candidates remain deeply worried about their post-PhD opportunities. Training PhD candidates to become independent researchers in and beyond academia is one of the Faculty's key objectives. However, in preparing PhD candidates for possible alternative career paths, it is important that they are aware of the broad range of transferrable skills with which the PhD trajectory provides them. It is also possible to encourage them to engage in impact-driven activities and alternative outputs developed during their PhD trajectory. The Recognition & Rewards initiative can, in such cases, be particularly valuable in supporting the transition to the non-academic job market. However, as is noted below (under Human Resources policy), the application of Recognition & Rewards principles to PhD candidates and their implications for career options must be carefully considered and discussed with them.

The success rates for the 2014-2019 cohorts show that 30% of PhD candidates graduated within four years and 51% within five years (rates as reported according to instructions of the SEP-protocol). The Faculty considers these rates concerning and is committed to improving the overall rates of PhD candidates in the Humanities. The committee commends the Faculty's initiatives to improve success rates and agrees that a PhD should in principle be doable in four years. To better understand the causes of delays, the committee recommends distinguishing between problematic and acceptable delays. Delays due to e.g., maternity leave, limited availability of the defence room, and the impact of COVID-19 should be registered as such (this means the reporting scheme of the SEP-protocol needs annotation), and not included without comment in a general expression of concern. Notably, the committee's interlocutors on this topic worried that this could imply maternity leave was framed as a cause of (undesirable) delay. By identifying the underlying reasons for (truly) problematic delays, the Faculty can develop and implement more focused and effective strategies to address them.

National research schools

The Faculty of Humanities coordinates four national research schools in the Netherlands: the Huizinga Institute, NISIS, NOG, and NWP, which provide specialised training in specific subject areas. Based on the self-evaluation reports and a review of the school's courses and training programmes, the committee

assessed the quality of education highly positively. It noted, in line with the positive assessments of the external reviewers, an effective collaboration between the national research schools and the local graduate schools, with a clear division of responsibilities and focus. The national schools offer a wide range of training opportunities, from hands-on support in the writing process (such as writing retreats and external expert feedback on dissertation plans) to advanced methodological and theoretical courses that extend beyond what individual universities typically offer. The advanced philological training in Arabic offered by NISIS stands out as a notable example.

The interviewed PhD candidates shared this positive perspective, highlighting the complementary and flexible nature of the educational offerings and the schools' responsiveness to their needs. They particularly appreciated the opportunities for community building and (inter)national network building, including gaining conference experience in a supportive environment. This helps PhD candidates (and Research master students) transition smoothly into their roles as junior researchers and establish a sense of belonging within the academic community.

The committee commends the effectiveness of embedding the national research schools within the Faculty of Humanities at Utrecht University. The university demonstrates its support by offering administrative assistance and providing a clear policy to reward teaching efforts of staff in the programmes of the research schools. The committee also commends the way in which the research schools collaborate in LOGOS. The collaborative and open research culture across the Netherlands and the effective system of rotating host universities for the schools where feasible is also praiseworthy .

While the committee's findings were highly positive, it recommends further improvements in data collection and alumni engagement. Specifically, it encourages the schools to gather detailed data on course participation, evaluations, and PhD alumni outcomes and to strengthen alumni networks. The committee underscores the importance of protecting and nurturing these schools, given their critical role in advancing specialised disciplinary and interdisciplinary courses for which there would not be enough of an audience at the local institutions. Continued administrative and financial support remains essential to ensuring their viability and long-term impact.

6. SOCIETAL RELEVANCE

Impact

A clear strength of the Faculty is its commitment to societal relevance. One of the strategic aims of the Faculty is to deploy research to address urgent societal questions. Relevance to society is, therefore, part of the Faculty's mission, and its scientific output is paired with outreach activities.

The research institutes have strong connections with local government, education, and cultural institutions, positioning the Faculty as an essential partner. UU research contributes to public policy, cultural projects, and (high school) teaching methods, reinforcing its embeddedness in the community. Researchers actively disseminate their research beyond the academic community by writing for non-

academic audiences, appearing in the media, and contributing to debates, lectures, and podcasts. The committee noted with appreciation the Faculty's involvement in policy-making and agenda-setting at the governmental level. The quality, scale, and success of the Faculty's societal impact-oriented research are also clearly illustrated by the case studies studied by the committee. The examples of success in realising societal impact ambitions are strong. The committee is impressed by the fact that several examples are driven by early- to mid-career researchers. The Faculty established an impact fund for seed money proposals to support early-stage initiatives, aiming to foster impact-oriented research and expand networks for external funding opportunities. The committee appreciates the structural support for impact-related activities from communication & marketing, RSO (expertise on societal funding), and CDH (support of digital tools and portals). The committee finds it very interesting that the Faculty has created the role of 'impact developer', showing dedication to this topic.

Over the past years, the Faculty has developed a Faculty-wide research impact agenda (2023-2026), in which three main goals are distinguished: 1) public engagement and outreach, 2) consultancy and contract research, and 3) co-creation with stakeholders. The Faculty has created a budget for this impact agenda of €500,000 per year, which is mainly used to stimulate five impact areas: the Network for Environmental Humanities; the Ethics Institute; the Data School; Language, Communication, and Inclusion; as well as the Cultural, Heritage & Arts Impact Network. From our conversations with the impact-areas representatives, it became clear that these impact areas successfully accomplish the goal of public engagement and outreach. The areas also showed examples of co-creation with stakeholders. The committee noted that contract research seemed not easily achievable for all areas, although there do seem to be opportunities to work towards the goal of promoting more consultancy. According to the committee, the Faculty impact areas are good examples of ensuring that research is embedded in the community.

The Faculty strives to develop its societal relations even more, and to innovate research by further enhancing stakeholder engagement. The Faculty demonstrates reflexivity by recognising both its strengths in public engagement and areas needing improvement. The committee finds that this shows a mature understanding of impact as integral to research rather than an ancillary goal, and readiness for further advancement. The committee recommends fostering internal learning about attempts to advance societal impact. Unpacking successful processes of impact generation may be instructive and give recognition and visibility to staff who succeed in this. The impact steering group is a good start to facilitate such exchanges.

The committee concludes that in terms of societal relevance, the Faculty operates on a very strong basis. The Faculty has a dedicated impact agenda and provides highly valuable services to society in a large number of areas. The committee is impressed by the Faculty's strong commitment to this goal. Societal impact and responding to societal questions seem to be equally valued as scientific impact.

The committee notes that one important area of societal impact, central to any University, seems to be ignored: Faculty research informs its academic teaching, and thus its graduates. They form the most important contribution the Faculty makes to society.

Open Science

The Faculty demonstrates a strong commitment to open science, adopting it as a shared responsibility among all its members. FAIR data practices are a key focus and are considered a joint responsibility of individual researchers and the Faculty data manager. The Faculty Ethics Assessment Committee, the privacy officer, and the Faculty Open-Science Team each contribute to the broader Open Science Agenda, including the involvement of societal stakeholders and public outreach. Digital research support is provided by the CDH, which, amongst other support roles, facilitates the use of digital open data tools for data visualisation and research by faculty members. While the CDH is well-equipped for this role, the committee notes that heavy expectations are placed upon it and questions whether the CDH is fully integrated, adequately supported, and optimally organised to handle these responsibilities. This should be a point of attention.

The Faculty clearly recognises the importance of open science and is actively working to advance it. The Taverne Amendment allows researchers to make the published version of their publications available in open access after six months. However, the committee noted limited financial support for open-access publishing and recommends exploring alternative models of open publishing, such as self-organised publishing (UU Press) and pre-prints. Additionally, the committee sees an opportunity to broaden the current definition of open science utilised by the faculty. A broader definition could include, where appropriate, incorporating practices such as replication, open data publication and reuse, and the reuse and maintenance of free and open-source software, depending on the nature of research in particular domains of the Faculty. Adopting this broader perspective on open science would not only enhance academic research but might also increase the accessibility and reuse of scientific data and results by societal target groups, thus contributing to greater societal impact.

7. VIABILITY

Based on the documentation the committee received, the committee had come to the preliminary conclusion that the Faculty of Humanities is a strong and, hence, viable Faculty. The infrastructure of the Faculty is supportive of the core strategic ambitions. The Faculty PhD programme and the recent hiring of new assistant professors are strategically important. Workload remains a significant issue. While the committee noted with approval that this issue was extensively evaluated over the past period, acknowledged as a weakness, and addressed by a Faculty-wide task force preparing advice on workload reduction, it also recognises that prospective budget cuts may exacerbate the problem. The committee recommends further work on addressing workload concerns in light of these financial constraints. Overall, the committee found that the Faculty is already undertaking many initiatives to improve the issues identified as weaknesses or threats in the SWOT analysis of the documentation, and these measures should be continued.

However, several external and internal factors are impacting the viability of the Faculty in the near future. External factors such as the current political climate and societal challenges are having a negative impact

on the academic climate in general and specifically on humanities research. Shortly before the visit, the Faculty Board had taken some far-reaching decisions to address prospective financial deficits. A transition plan had been drawn up, with short-term measures and a vision for the Faculty for the longer term. The transition plan was not part of the initial documentation made available to the committee, but the committee received it at its own request during the site visit.

The most prominent short-term measure from the transition plan, highlighted extensively (and critically) in Dutch media in the weeks before the visit, was the intention to close six bachelor programmes on the basis of low enrolments of majors: Religious Studies, Islam & Arabic, French, German, Italian, and Celtic. Every group that the committee spoke to during the site visit raised well-argued objections to these proposals, on which they had not been consulted. Although the Faculty Board intended to subsume the teaching programmes in some form within other, more general ones, the committee shares the view of the Faculty community that the consequences for research and for the maintenance of strong disciplinary bases for interdisciplinarity of closing down these Bachelor programmes had not been considered thoroughly. Also, from the transition plan it would appear that closing these programmes contributes relatively little to the overall financial health of the Faculty.

For the European languages, the more sensible approach, in our view, would be to use the (already accepted) sector plan as a point of departure and ensure national coordination in maintaining both sufficient local expertise and national collaboration.

The committee also noted some highly undesirable consequences of the proposed measures for the ambitions of the Faculty. These consequences were also repeatedly and credibly pointed out to the committee by the committee's interlocutors. For instance, Religious Studies and Islam & Arabic are not only thriving research groups, supported by substantial grant funding, but their classrooms are full of first-generation students, many of whom have a migration background. While these students may not major in these disciplines, the training they receive is crucial. The committee is of the opinion that the current approach sends an inappropriate message regarding the relevance of their culture and background. This issue extends beyond students to impact younger Faculty members, prospective students, the broader academic community, and society at large. It is clear that this is leading to reputational harm for Utrecht University. In a political climate increasingly marked by hostility towards individuals with a migration background, these measures are particularly damaging. They undermine the Faculty's diversity ambitions, especially as this department, maybe more than any other in the Faculty, has developed a non-Eurocentric profile that includes perspectives from the Global South. In addition, they fly in the face of the Faculty's societal relevance ambition. These are the times in which the importance and the unique character and contributions of the Humanities need to be defended forcefully.

According to the committee closing down the programmes will also impact research quality directly, in particular because of the importance of the interrelationship of teaching and research. The committee observed that the entanglement and interaction of teaching and research was scarcely addressed in the documentation, although education could be seen as an ultimate form of societal impact (through

graduates), as noted above. The announced closure of programmes will obviously also directly affect the staff, as it will most likely lead to people leaving the Faculty. Naturally, this is expected to have consequences for (the quality of the) research.

Academic culture

The Faculty of Humanities claims as its core values professionalism, transparency, responsibility, connectedness, and safety. The four research institutes aim to provide a stimulating, safe, and inclusive environment for all researchers, irrespective of their rank or position. Fostering collaborations at different levels and building supportive infrastructures and services play a key role in achieving these goals. Working with a diverse team of researchers with mutual respect is described as essential to creating an organisation that is effective in performing creative, cutting-edge research and that forms an inspiring and safe working place.

In the conversations with staff members, the committee learned that the Faculty has indeed managed to create such a positive environment over the past years. The committee spoke with highly engaged groups of researchers, research directors, support staff, PhD candidates, assistant professors and postdocs, all with a positive attitude towards their work, the Faculty, and Utrecht University. It was notable that staff members are proud to be part of the UU. There is a strong sense of community and equality. The committee specifically noted the supportive reactions by the Dean, leadership, and colleagues to the disparagement of a senior researcher in the media and online: their reactions helped to restore a sense of social safety.

The Faculty has taken different concrete measures to enhance social safety and research integrity. These include the monitoring of the integrity of empirical research involving human subjects by the Faculty Ethics Assessment Committee of Humanities, the Code of Conduct with rules, guidelines, and agreements on (in)appropriate behaviour, and the training of all staff members in issues of Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) and social security, including active bystander proficiencies. Although the committee supports the measures taken by the Faculty, it also noted that the courses on research integrity, compulsory for PhD candidates only, may not be enough for a healthy research culture. The committee believes that this also requires that researchers regularly engage in discussions about everyday ethics on the work floor based on concrete examples from their actual work. This provides a natural opportunity to involve senior scholars—a recent evaluation of the National Code of Research Integrity suggests that research integrity training is rarely offered to senior scholars and that awareness of integrity issues could be stimulated more among this group.¹ The committee noted that PhD candidates involved in the interviews with the committee showed little interest in issues of research integrity; it is possible that confining the topic to the course insulates it too much from their actual research practice.

¹ [Adviesrapport-Evaluatie-Nederlandse-gedragcode-wetenschappelijke-integriteit-2024.pdf](#) (2024), evaluatiecommissie NGWI, p.44-45

At the time of the site visit, the positive sense of community had been severely impacted by the proposed financial measures. The committee observed that trust within the Faculty had been significantly affected, mainly due to a lack of proper consultation by the Dean and the Vice Dean, even of senior leadership. The committee shared the staff's concerns regarding both outcomes (as noted above) and process. None of the groups the committee spoke to was in denial about the fact that financial measures were necessary, but the lack of consultation and poor communication had led to frustration and a lack of confidence for the future of the Faculty. The committee respects the great dignity with which staff expressed their concerns and the insightful ways in which they brought their own expertise to bear on the problems; in their discussions with the committee, there were no personal recriminations against the Faculty Board. The committee took this as a positive sign that collaboration and trust could still be restored.

The committee realises that it is unusual to have to address matters of this interpersonal urgency in a research assessment. Nevertheless, it takes its responsibility as 'critical friends' seriously and recommends that the Faculty Board take immediate action on the following points:

- Restore trust; close the divide between the level of Dean/Vice Dean and the community, including senior leadership (directors of research institutes).
- Consult the community, listen to the staff, and make use of their expertise. The committee acknowledges that consultation will take time, but in order to keep a positive, safe and healthy community, this step must not be omitted.
- Improve communication; the committee notices that communication has not been effective. There is a lack of clarity about the plans, including possible layoffs.
- Do not take irreversible measures before the above steps have been taken.

At the same time, the academic community must realise the difficulty of the task that the Faculty Board is facing.

Human Resources policy

The Faculty actively employs a strategic personnel planning approach, which includes mobility and developments in staffing. In line with strategic personnel planning, annual staff assessments are conducted. The Faculty has recently aligned its assessment criteria with the national Recognition and Reward (R&R) programme. While R&R is not yet fully implemented, the committee is impressed with the progress made and regards the implementation as highly advanced. The Faculty successfully values and encourages multiple research profiles, fostering the development of both curiosity-driven and more societally engaged research. The challenges associated with implementation are shared across Dutch academia, stemming from the fact that the system has not yet been fully worked out. For example, the committee observes that despite attention to different research profiles, permanent staff experience a lack of clear and transparent promotion procedures. The committee encourages the Faculty's explicit

commitment to refining the criteria in the coming years and working towards a more transparent HR policy that recognises the diversity of researchers.

The committee finds it commendable that the Faculty encourages individual researchers to develop profiles that are not exclusively focused on (curiosity-driven) research. However, for those researchers planning to spend part of their careers abroad, maintaining a strong research record remains essential. Supervisors and line managers expressed full awareness of this challenge, and the current approach, which consists of engaging in open and honest conversations, is the only viable way to address the dilemma. We fully support this practice, which aims to ensure that R&R does not become a trap for early-career researchers in precarious positions.

Throughout the site visit, it became evident to the committee that the research and support staff are dealing with high workloads. Teaching within the Faculty is intensive, and the Faculty has (like other universities in the Netherlands) a long academic year. One of the measures the Faculty has in place is the option for a teaching-free block for all permanent staff. The committee learned, however, that this is not always feasible. Due to the high intensity of teaching, research time is under pressure. Over the last few years, the Faculty has initiated a taskforce working on this topic. The committee endorses the continuation of this initiative. The committee understood that the Faculty aims to protect research time, for example, by developing an HR policy that monitors the time staff members dedicate to management, by integrating teaching and research, and by guaranteeing teaching-free periods and supporting opportunities for sabbatical leaves. Given the current financial circumstances, the committee understands that it will be particularly hard to address the protection of research time.

Another challenge raised during the interviews relates to promotor rights. If a candidate's daily supervisor does not hold *ius promovendi* rights, they cannot formally act as the promotor. This situation raises (ethical) concerns regarding supervision and promotion rights, warranting further attention and action to address this issue effectively.

Diversity

The committee appreciates the Faculty's inclusivity and diversity efforts. The Faculty's ambition for diversity and inclusion is in line with the UU policy of Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI). The two main goals for the Faculty are gender balance at all levels of academic staff and stimulating diversification among the academic staff in terms of nationalities. Over the last period, half of all professorial appointments were female, which reduced the gender gap to some extent. Furthermore, international staff has expanded to 40% in 2023. Within the Faculty there have been numerous efforts to fully include international staff in the research communities.

Although an EDI humanities working group has been founded, which will further work on inclusivity and diversity, the committee recommends to broaden the perspective. Within the Faculty, diversity is often defined in terms of gender understood in a traditional binary way, rather than in keeping with current research and understanding, while the committee expected EDI to also include, among other things, disabilities, sexuality, neurodivergence, and minorities. The committee noticed that historically

underrepresented groups were virtually invisible during the site visit and in the documentation that the Faculty provided. For a more sophisticated understanding of diversity, the committee recommends a better use of in-house expertise on gender and intersectionality. The committee advises the Faculty to examine what measures can be taken to incorporate this broader view in the EDI programme.

8. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion

The Faculty of Humanities at Utrecht University has a track record of being a dynamic and stimulating research environment, characterised by a positive culture, strong academic leadership (especially at the level of the directors of the research institutes), and many opportunities for collaboration, interdisciplinarity, and societal engagement. It is home to excellent research on all levels: great disciplinary expertise as the basis for collaboration across disciplines, extraordinary individual scholars, strong research groups, and very good research institutes. It is dedicated to promoting a safe and inclusive work environment, providing excellent training to PhD candidates, Open Science, and progressive Human Resources policies.

Currently, the Faculty is going through a transition, necessitated by financial hardship, which requires the utmost of leadership and community alike. It tests the Faculty's ability to work together, to be open to each other's ideas and expertise, and to defend the core values of the Humanities, while simultaneously being realistic about financial parameters. Throughout the report, the assessment committee has made a number of concrete suggestions for the reinforcement of the Faculty, summarised in the next section. It wants to express its confidence that, based on a strong and positive academic culture of mutual trust built over the last six-year period, the Faculty will find a creative way forward and prove its continued viability over the next period.

Recommendations

In the report, the committee has made several proposals for improvement. These are grouped below.

Recommendations regarding Research Quality and Societal Impact:

- Keep implementing the ambition to expand the Faculty's still noticeably Eurocentric profile into a more globally inclusive one, including the global South, and, generally, traditionally underrepresented communities and geographies.
- In the presentation of the collaborations of the Faculty, do not forget to emphasise, in addition to intra-Faculty and intra-University collaborations, the extensive involvement of UU Humanities research staff in national and international research networks.
- Pay more attention to the fact that societal impact may be primarily realised through the Faculty's graduates, whose training is structurally informed by academic research. This has obvious consequences for the importance attached to the entanglement and interaction of research and teaching.
- Ensure that CDH is fully integrated with the activities within the Faculty, adequately supported, and optimally organised to handle its important responsibilities for supporting Open Science.

Recommendations regarding PhD candidates and national research schools:

- In monitoring the progress of PhD candidates, clearly distinguish between problematic and non-problematic forms of delay and get a better understanding of what causes the problematic delays. Notably, the issue of maternity leave deserves a nuanced treatment.
- Maintain administrative and financial support for the national research schools considering their crucial role in the national research infrastructure.
- Encourage the leadership of the national research schools to gather data on course participation, evaluations, and PhD alumni outcomes and to strengthen alumni networks.

Finally, recommendations regarding Viability:

- In terms of viability and its relation with a healthy and forward-looking academic culture, pay particular attention to restoring and maintaining mutual trust between the Faculty Board, senior leadership in the Faculty, and the academic community. Consult the community, listen to the staff, and make use of their expertise. Be transparent, and improve communication.
- In proposing and implementing financial measures, keep in mind academic principles: the entanglement and interaction of teaching and research, the necessity to maintain strong disciplinary bases for interdisciplinary work, and the relation between maintaining and supporting research expertise and teaching programmes on the one hand and the ambitions to maintain a global profile and to address societal challenges on the other. This would obviously affect how to deal with Islam & Arabic and Religious Studies. For the languages, use the sector plan as a point of departure and ensure national coordination in maintaining both local expertise and national collaboration.
- Keep working on the implementation of the Recognitions & Rewards programme; in particular, formulate clear and transparent promotion procedures. Consider the benefits or disadvantages of R&R to PhD candidates in the light of their (international) career perspectives; ensure that any resulting policies are co-developed with them as a group particularly vulnerable to such changes.
- Keep working on the reduction of the workload and on the protection of research time, the financial hardship notwithstanding.
- Broaden the perspective on EDI policy beyond binaries of gender as assigned at birth, include other axes of diversity, and make use of in-house expertise on gender and intersectionality.

9. APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference Faculty of Humanities

The committee is requested to assess the quality of research conducted by the Faculty of Humanities of Utrecht University (hereafter: Faculty of Humanities) in light of its own aims and strategy, as well as to offer recommendations in order to improve the quality of research and the strategy of the Faculty of Humanities. The committee is requested to carry out the assessment according to the guidelines specified in the Strategy Evaluation Protocol. The evaluation includes a backward-looking and a forward-looking component.

Specifically, the committee is asked to judge and provide feedback on the performance of the unit on the main assessment criteria and offer its written conclusions as well as recommendations based on considerations and arguments. The main assessment criteria are:

- 1) research quality;
- 2) societal relevance;
- 3) viability of the unit.

During the evaluation of these criteria, the assessment committee is asked to incorporate four specific aspects. These aspects are included, as they are becoming increasingly important in the current academic context and deserve special attention in the reflection on the past performance as well as on the future development of the research unit. These aspects are as follows:

- 1) Open Science: availability of research output, reuse of data, involvement of societal stakeholders;
- 2) PhD Policy and Training: supervision and instruction of PhD candidates;
- 3) Academic Culture: openness, (social) safety and inclusivity; and research integrity;
- 4) Human Resources Policy: diversity and talent management.

The main assessment criteria and the four specific aspects are described in detail within the Strategy Evaluation Protocol.

In addition to these criteria specified in the Strategy Evaluation Protocol, the Board requests the committee to pay attention to the following additional questions as well as to offer its assessment and recommendations:

The Faculty of Humanities covers a broad range of knowledge, approaches and topics. More and more, we strive for interdisciplinary research on micro- (within research institutes), meso- (between research institutes in the Faculty) and macro- (interfaculty, i.e. university) levels, including the strategic themes and focus areas. How does the existing organisational structure serve this interdisciplinary orientation, and how could the Faculty benefit even more from the interaction between disciplines?

Terms of reference National research schools

Adopted by the Disciplineoverleg Letteren en Geesteswetenschappen on 10 November 2023

The assessment of the research schools The Huizinga Institute, the Netherlands Interuniversity School for Islamic Studies (NISIS), the Netherlands Research School of Gender Studies (NOG), and the N.W. Posthumus Institute (NWP) (hereafter: national research schools) is embedded in the assessment of the Faculty of Humanities of Utrecht University. This assessment will have to be carried out according to the Dutch Standard Evaluation Protocol 2021-2027.

The committee's task

The committee is asked to assess:

- The quality of the education of PhD candidates provided by national research schools, and
- the added value of the national research schools as a national forum for the discipline in the period 2018 up and including 2023, against their own mission statements and formulated goals.

Documentation

The documents, added to those already distributed to all committee members of the local or national research assessment, will include at least the following:

- Self-evaluation report of the national research schools on the two issues indicated above, mainly in the form of a narrative
- These Terms of Reference

Site visit

The assessment of the national research schools will be part of the programme of the committee's site visit to the Faculty of Humanities of Utrecht University.

Independence

Beforehand the committee members will be asked to sign a statement of impartiality. In this statement, they declare that they have no direct relationship or connection with the research units represented within the national research schools.

Assessment report

The committee's report will have to contain an evaluation of past results, as well as recommendations that may help the national research schools to improve the quality of its programme of PhD education and its functioning as a national forum.

Addition to the assessment committee

In case the assessment committee of the local institute does not sufficiently cover the discipline of the national research schools, a committee member may be added or an external expert or panel may be asked to offer a written report (on the basis of the self-evaluation report and without a site visit), which the assessment committee can then use as a basis for its own overall assessment.

For the assessment of The Huizinga Institute, the Netherlands Research School of Gender Studies (NOG), and the N.W. Posthumus Institute (NWP), external experts have issued referee reports. For the Netherlands Interuniversity School for Islamic Studies (NISIS), one of the evaluation committee members has written a referee report. These reports are added to the combined self evaluation reports.

Appendix 2: Site visit programme

Day 1: 11 November, 2024

Location: University Hall, Kanunnikenzaal

Time	Activity	Representatives
09:00 - 09:15	Welcome	Vice-Dean Research & Impact and Dean
09:15 - 10:15	Committee deliberation	
10:15 - 10:45	Governance	Vice-Dean Research & Impact, Dean and Research policy advisor
10:45 - 11:15	Governance and quality assurance	Directors of research
11:15 - 11:30	Break	
11:30 - 12:30	PhD candidates	PhD candidates
12:30 - 13:00	Reflection committee	
13:00 - 14:00	Lunch	
14:00 - 15:00	Support Staff	Research coordinators, Grant advisor RSO, Team lead Research coordination, Head Research Management Services, Impact advisor RSO, and Research & impact policy advisor
15:00 - 15:15	Reflection committee	
15:15 - 16:15	Assistant professors & postdocs	Assistant professors and postdoctoral researchers
16:15 - 17:30	Reflection committee	

Day 2: 12 November, 2024

Location: Johanna Hudig building, Alex Brenninkmeijerzaal

Time	Activity	Representatives
08:30 - 09:00	Committee deliberation	
09:00 - 10:00	Research institute ICON	Representative researchers of the different research groups within the institute

Time	Activity	Representatives
10:00 -10:15	Reflection committee	
10:15 -11:15	Research institute ILS	Representative researchers of the different research groups within the institute
11:15 -11:30	Reflection committee	
11:30 -12:30	Research institute OFR	Representative researchers of the different research groups within the institute
12:30 - 12:45	Reflection committee	
12:45 -13:30	Lunch	
13:30 -13:50	Move to Drift 27	
13:50 -14:20	Visit University Library & Centre for Digital Humanities	
14:20 -14:30	Move to Janskerkhof 13	
14:30 -15:00	Visit ILS-labs	
15:00 -15:30	Move to Johanna Hudig building and break	
15:30 -16:30	Research institute OGK	Representative researchers of the different research groups within the institute
16:30 -17:00	Reflection committee	
17:00 - 17:30	Governance	Vice-Dean Research & Impact and Dean
17:30 - 18:00	Reflection committee	

Day 3: 13 November, 2024

Location: University Hall, Kanunnikenzaal

Time	Activity	Invitees
08:30 - 09:30	Committee deliberation	
09:00 - 09:45	National research schools	PhD candidates representing the four national research schools

Time	Activity	Invitees
09:45 - 10:30	National research schools	Academic directors of the four national research schools
10:30 - 11:30	Strategic themes (ST) & Focus areas (FA)	FA Human-centered Artificial Intelligence (chair of core team), FA Governing the Digital Society (member of core team), ST Dynamics of Youth (chair of community), ST Pathways to Sustainability (coordinator of community), ST Institutions for Open Societies (board member, affiliated researcher and member core team)
11:30 - 12:00	Reflection committee and break	
12:00 -12:45	Faculty impact areas	Representatives of impact areas
12:45 -13:45	Reflection committee and lunch	
13:45 -14:10	Move to Drift 13	
14:10 -14:40	Visit Data School	Representatives of Data School
14:40 -15:00	Move to University Hall	
15:00 -17:00	Conclusions committee	
17:00 -18:00	Final presentation committee	

Appendix 3: Documents shared with the evaluation committee

Self-evaluation reports

- Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) 2021-2027
- Self-evaluation report Faculty of Humanities
- Self-evaluation reports national research schools coordinated by the Faculty of Humanities, Utrecht University
- Terms of reference Faculty of Humanities
- Terms of reference national research schools

Digitally accessible documents

- Activities Centre for the Humanities
- Enrolment small BA programmes Faculty of Humanities
- Organisation Faculty support
- PhD courses Graduate School of Humanities
- View on PhD supervision

Additional information provided by email

- Letter to the evaluation committee (October)
- Letter to the evaluation committee (November)
- Transition plan Faculty HUM

Appendix 4: SEP tables

Research staff

	2018		2019		2020		2021		2022		2023	
Academic staff	fte	#										
Assistant professor	55,0	174	54,8	180	65,4	193	68,5	204	77,4	252	98,9	306
Associate professor	21,7	52	23,2	52	23,8	55	25,4	61	27,5	70	29,9	67
Full professor	43,3	91	42,1	92	42,5	92	43,3	90	40,4	88	37,6	81
Postdocs	46,5	75	56,5	99	57,0	93	48,3	85	40,1	78	31,9	60
PhD candidates	0,0	131	0,0	139	0,0	123	0,0	129	0,0	124	0,0	126
Total research staff	166,5	523	176,7	562	188,7	556	185,4	569	185,4	612	198,3	640
Other staff	fte	#										
Support staff*											44,4	71
Affiliated		28		28		2		0		0		6
Total staff	166,5	551	176,7	590	188,7	558	185,4	569	185,4	612	242,6	717

* Since part of the research support staff have recently been embedded differently, we only calculate the research support staff in 2023. Included in this calculation are e.g. research coordinators, grant officers, research assistants, and IT developers of the Centre for Digital Humanities.

Succes rates PhD candidates

Enrolment				Success rates													
Starting year	Male	Female	Total	Graduated in year 4 or earlier	Graduated in year 5 or earlier	Graduated in year 6 or earlier	Graduated in year 7 or earlier	Not yet finished	Discontinued	Graduated							
2014	31	23	54	29	54%	34	63%	41	76%	45	83%	3	6%	5	9%	46	85%
2015	22	26	48	22	46%	32	67%	36	75%	39	81%	7	15%	1	2%	40	83%
2016	33	41	74	20	27%	35	47%	48	65%	52	70%	19	26%	3	4%	52	70%
2017	23	34	57	15	26%	27	47%	37	65%			16	28%	3	5%	38	67%
2018	17	33	50	6	12%	15	30%					28	56%	4	8%	18	36%
2019	15	28	43	7	16%							29	67%	2	5%	12	28%
Total	141	185	326	99	30%	143	51%	162	70%	136	77%	102	31%	18	6%	206	63%

Research funding

	2018		2019		2020		2021		2022		2023	
Funding	fte	%										
Direct funding (1)	97,41	44%	97,72	41%	107,78	43%	113,77	46%	127,1	50%	145,43	55%
Research grants (2)	74,89	34%	82,53	35%	81,56	32%	73,36	29%	68,47	27%	69,47	26%
Contract research (3)	50,32	23%	57,91	24%	63,55	25%	62,14	25%	59,33	23%	48,12	18%
Other (4)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,83	1%
Total funding	222,62	100%	238,16	100%	252,89	100%	249,27	100%	254,9	100%	265,85	100%
Expenditure	€k	%										
Personnel costs	19.015	97%	20.284	97%	21.200	97%	23.520	98%	23.656	97%	26.178	97%
Material and other costs	614	3%	652	3%	616	3%	602	2%	672	3%	772	3%
Total expenditure	19.629	100%	20.936	100%	21.816	100%	24.122	100%	24.328	100%	26.950	100%

(1) Direct funding from the first stream.

(2) Research grants obtained from the 2nd stream in national scientific competition (mainly NWO).

(3) Research grants and contracts obtained from the 3rd stream, from external organisations, such as European organisations (e.g. ERC), industry, government ministries and charitable organisations.

(4) Funds that do not fit into the other categories.

Vondellaan 104
 3521 GH Utrecht
 m 06-42940059
 e info@odion-onderzoek.nl
 w www.odion-onderzoek.nl