RESEARCH REVIEW

PHILOSOPHY

2012–2017

De Onderzoekerij
Vondellaan 58
2332 AH Leiden

Phone: +31 6 24812176
Email: info@onderzoekerij.nl
Internet: www.onderzoekerij.nl

Contents

Preface

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

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

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

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

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

Frank Veltman, Chair of the Evaluation Committee

1. Introduction

1.1 Terms of reference for the assessment

The quality assessment of research in Philosophy is carried out in the context of the Standard Evaluation Protocol For Public Research Organisations by the Association of Universities in The Netherlands (VSNU), the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO), and the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW).

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

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

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

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

1.2 The Review Committee

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

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

More detailed information about the members of the Committee can be found in Appendix A. The Board of the participating universities appointed dr. Annemarie Venemans of De Onderzoekerij as the Committee secretary. All members of the Committee signed a declaration and disclosure form to ensure that the Committee members made their judgements without bias, personal preference or personal interest, and that the judgment was made without undue influence from the institutes or stakeholders.

1.3 Procedures followed by the Committee

Prior to the site visit, the Committee reviewed detailed documentation comprising: The Self-assessment report of the institutes including appendices, the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) 2015-2021 and the document "Quality indicators for Philosophy". In addition, the Committee studied previous assessment reports.

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

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

1.4 Application of the SEP scores

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. General observations and recommendations

2.1 Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

2.2 Research time

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

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

which also affects the time available for research, some give a bonus to supervisors when a PhD project is successfully completed[1].

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

2.3 External Funding

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

2.4 PhD programme

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

2.5 Diversity

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

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

---

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

4. Assessment of the Institute of Philosophy, Leiden

4.1 Quantitative assessment

The Committee assessed the quality, societal relevance and viability of the Institute both quantitatively and qualitatively. Its PhD programme, research integrity and diversity are assessed qualitatively. For the quantitative assessment a four-point scale is used, according to the standard evaluation protocol 2015-2021. The explanation of the criteria underlying the scores can be found in appendix D and section 1.4. The qualitative assessment of the institute can be found in the next sections.

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

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

4.2 Research quality

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

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

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

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

4.3 Societal relevance

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

4.4 Viability

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

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

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

4.5 PhD programme

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

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

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

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

4.6 Research integrity

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

4.7 Diversity

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

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

4.8 Recommendations

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

9. The Dutch Research School of Philosophy (OZSW)

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

9.1 Quality of the PhD and ReMa programme

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

9.3 Recommendations

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

Appendix A – Curricula Vitae

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

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix B - Programme of the site visit

Tuesday 15 January

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

Wednesday 16 January

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

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

UNIVERSITY OF GRONINGEN

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

Thursday 17 January

Time	Part	Collocutors
09.00 – 12.00	Meeting Committee	Committee
12.00 – 12.45	Lunch	Committee

UTRECHT UNIVERSITY

Time	Part	Collocutors
12.45 – 13.30	Management	Prof. dr. Keimpe Algra, Prof. dr. Ted Sanders, Prof. dr. Martha Frederiks, Dr. Mariëtte van

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

Friday 18 January

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

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

Saturday 19 January

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

Appendix C.2 – Quantitative data Leiden

Table 1 Research staff in fte Leiden

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

Table 2 Main categories of research output - Leiden

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

Table 3 Funding - Leiden

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

Table 4 PhD candidates Leiden

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

Appendix D – Meaning of the scores

Category	Meaning	Research quality	Relevance to society	Viability
1	World leading/ excellent	The research unit has been shown to be one of the few most influential research groups in the world in its particular field	The research unit makes an outstanding contribution to society	The research unit is excellently equipped for the future
2	Very good	The research unit conducts very good. internationally recognised research	The research unit makes a very good contribution to society	The research unit is very well equipped for the future
3	Good	The research unit conducts good research	The research unit makes a good contribution to society	The research unit makes responsible strategic decisions and is therefore well equipped for the future
4	Unsatisfactory	The research unit does not achieve satisfactory results in its field	The research unit does not make a satisfactory contribution to society	The research unit is not adequately equipped for the future