

**RESEARCH REVIEW**

**ANTHROPOLOGY**

**2013-2018**

# ONDERZOEKERIJ

De Onderzoekerij  
Vondellaan 58  
2332 AH Leiden

Phone: +31 6 24812176  
Email: [info@onderzoekerij.nl](mailto:info@onderzoekerij.nl)  
Internet: [www.onderzoekerij.nl](http://www.onderzoekerij.nl)



# Contents

<b>Preface</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	<b>7</b>
1.1 Terms of reference for the assessment .....	7
1.2 The Review Committee .....	7
1.3 Procedures followed by the Committee .....	7
<b>2. General observations and recommendations</b> .....	<b>8</b>
2.1 Background .....	8
2.2 General recommendations .....	9
<b>3. Leiden Institute of Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology</b> .....	<b>13</b>
3.1 Quantitative assessment .....	13
3.2 Organisation, strategy and targets .....	13
3.3 Research quality .....	14
3.4 Societal relevance .....	15
3.5 Viability .....	15
3.6 PhD programme .....	16
3.7 Research integrity .....	17
3.8 Diversity .....	17
3.9 Recommendations .....	17
<b>4. Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology, VU Amsterdam</b> .....	<b>19</b>
4.1 Quantitative assessment .....	19
4.2 Organisation, strategy and targets .....	19
4.3 Research quality .....	19
4.4 Societal relevance .....	21
4.5 Viability .....	22
4.6 PhD programme .....	23
4.7 Research integrity .....	24
4.8 Diversity .....	24
4.9 Recommendations .....	25



<b>5. Anthropology Department, University of Amsterdam .....</b>	<b>26</b>
5.1 Quantitative assessment .....	26
5.2 Organisation, strategy and targets .....	26
5.3 Research quality.....	27
5.4 Societal relevance .....	29
5.5 Viability.....	29
5.6 PhD programme.....	30
5.7 Research integrity.....	31
5.8 Diversity .....	32
5.9 Recommendations.....	32
<b>6. Department of Anthropology and Development Studies, Radboud University .....</b>	<b>34</b>
6.1 Quantitative assessment .....	34
6.2 Organisation, strategy and targets .....	34
6.3 Research quality.....	35
6.4 Societal relevance.....	36
6.5 Viability.....	37
6.6 PhD programme.....	38
6.7 Research integrity.....	39
6.8 Diversity .....	39
6.9 Recommendations.....	39
<b>7. Department of Cultural Anthropology, Utrecht University .....</b>	<b>41</b>
7.1 Quantitative assessment .....	41
7.2 Organisation, strategy and targets.....	41
7.3 Research quality.....	42
7.4 Societal relevance.....	43
7.5 Viability.....	44
7.6 PhD programme.....	45
7.7 Research integrity.....	46
7.8 Diversity .....	46
7.9 Recommendations.....	47
<b>Appendix A - Programme of the site visit.....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Appendix B.1 - Quantitative data Leiden .....</b>	<b>51</b>



<b>Appendix B.2 – Quantitative data VU .....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Appendix B.3 – Quantitative data UvA .....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Appendix B.4 – Quantitative data Nijmegen .....</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>Appendix B.5 – Quantitative data Utrecht .....</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>Appendix C – Meaning of the scores .....</b>	<b>56</b>



## Preface

This research review was initially planned to be held in Amsterdam in April of this year, but instead took place online in September because of the Covid-19 pandemic, which continues to shape our world as I write these words. Meeting face-to-face would certainly have made a difference, both in relation to discussions with staff at the assessed departments and among the committee members themselves, who were not able to continue and contextualize discussions during breaks and meals. Despite these unfortunate circumstances, the committee agrees that the assessment process has worked out surprisingly well. We stand squarely behind the scores and recommendations presented in the report, which we hope will be helpful to the assessed departments as they work to improve their research strategies. We wish them every success in this endeavour. Last but not least, the committee would like to acknowledge the critical role of the committee secretary, dr. Annemarie Venemans of De Onderzoekerij, who skilfully guided us through the assessment.

Johan Lindquist, Chair of the Evaluation Committee



# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Terms of reference for the assessment

The quality assessment of research in Anthropology 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 five universities in the reference period 2013-2018, 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. This report describes findings, conclusions and recommendations of this external assessment of the research in Anthropology.

## 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. Johan Lindquist, Stockholm University
- Prof. dr. Steffen Jensen, Aalborg University Copenhagen
- Prof. (em.) dr. Trevor Marchand, University of London
- Prof. dr. Noel B. Salazar, KU Leuven
- Coco Kanters (PhD candidate), Universiteit Leiden, assessing RU, UvA and VU
- Willy Sier (postdoc), Universiteit van Amsterdam, assessing UL and UU

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, key publications and the previous assessment report.

The Committee proceeded according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP). The assessment was based on the documentation provided by the institutes and the interviews with their respective management, selections of senior and junior researchers, and PhD student representatives. The interviews took place between September 16 and September 23 (see Appendix A).

The Committee discussed its assessment during its final session of 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.



## 2. General observations and recommendations

### 2.1 Background

‘The biggest win from a SEP-style process rather than a REF-style one is that you end up with a forward-looking report and not a backward-looking score’.<sup>1</sup>

The above quote is from a recent comparison of the Dutch and British systems for assessing quality of research in higher education. The committee agrees with the claim and conducted its work in this spirit. The SEP (Standard Evaluation Protocol) format offered the mandate to support Dutch anthropology departments, and Dutch anthropology more broadly, in their work to develop strategies to improve research quality, relevance and viability in the coming years. The committee consists of fellow anthropologists from Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden and the UK. In the assessment process, which has been productive and often inspiring, the committee learned a great deal not only about Dutch anthropology and higher education but also about the commonalities and differences that shape national anthropologies across the European landscape.

In the reading of the documents and the conversations with staff that form the basis for the assessment, the committee was impressed by the general quality of all the departments and the commitment of their staff. All the departments took the previous SEP assessment seriously and made significant changes in response. The committee agrees that Dutch anthropology is doing very well and is on the right track. Furthermore, the committee’s work was characterised by a strong sentiment of being in a shared situation, in which the assessors and the assessed are working alongside one another in an attempt to strengthen anthropology in Europe, in diverse national contexts, and in different departments. Notwithstanding this sentiment and the quality of departments, the committee recognised as its primary task a critical engagement that aims to develop recommendations for change, where change appears necessary in addressing existing problems or as an opportunity to strengthen quality, relevance or viability.

The high standards of the assessed departments are most clearly reflected in the fact that one department, which is also by far the largest, scored a 1 (meaning excellent/world leading) and four departments a 2 (meaning very good) in all three categories: Research Quality, Societal Relevance, and Viability. With that clearly stated from the beginning, the committee hopes that the reader and indeed anyone concerned with this assessment will now turn their attention from the quantitative to the qualitative dimensions and focus on the different recommendations we have developed for Dutch anthropology in general and the individual departments in particular. In fact, the committee did not find the quantitative part of the assessment particularly helpful (beyond the fact that there is one department that stands out) and recommends that this type of scoring is discontinued in coming assessments. There are certainly significant differences among departments that scored a 2 on Viability, for instance, but the quantitative scores offered limited tools in expressing these differences.

The backdrop for the assessment is the transformations that have shaped higher education in Europe and beyond during the past decades. The committee will not rehearse the general discussions about

---

<sup>1</sup> Gadd, Elizabeth (2020) “Dear REF, please may we have a SEP.” <https://wonkhe.com/blogs/dear-ref-please-may-we-have-a-sep/>, accessed September 25, 2020.





these processes and the different ways of describing them in conceptual or ideological terms, but rather note that they affect the economic, political and social viability of all the academic departments being assessed. Indeed, this very assessment is part of these processes, as highlighted by discussions concerning audit culture or society within and beyond higher education.<sup>2</sup>

The committee attempted to work reflexively with regard to these processes—not least because they affect the various departments where the committee members themselves are based—and considered strategies that ideally will strengthen the autonomy of the different departments in relation to both the threats they face and opportunities they have. Through close readings of documents and staff interviews, the committee identified recommendations at the interface between the changing landscape of higher education, the specific form of Dutch anthropology, and the realities of the different departments being assessed.

While the different departments will be discussed qualitatively and graded quantitatively in accordance with the SEP guidelines, this chapter offers general observations and recommendations for Dutch anthropology as a whole. As a general background, the committee notes that, together, the Netherlands' geopolitical position at the centre of Europe, its largely bilingual educational system, and the relatively small size of the country offer powerful comparative advantages in the European landscape of higher education. Some of these advantages have been realised by the departments being assessed, while others remain as opportunities. To offer a number of examples, Dutch anthropology was highly successful during the assessment period in tapping into the European grants system, notably through the relatively large number of successful European Research Council grant applications. This trend appears to be continuing. There is also a turn among several departments to English-speaking undergraduate programmes, which appear to be strengthening primary funding streams for universities. More generally, the relationship between these primary and secondary funding streams is at the heart of the viability of all departments being assessed. Finally, the size of the country offers largely unrealised opportunities for inter-departmental collaborations.

Other trends that were initially noted in the previous assessment for 2007-2012 include the continuing decline of a historical division of labour in which departments focused largely on specific geographical regions. This change has taken place alongside ascendant concerns with globalisation since the 1990s, which is characteristic of anthropology more generally, and the development of departmental research programmes. The previous assessment promoted conceptually focused research programmes – a recommendation most departments have largely heeded. In this process, however, some of the distinctiveness that characterised departments during the “area studies era” has arguably been compromised. Finally, the previous assessment noted that the declining importance of research schools was related to the rise of forceful deans who attempted to create ‘more coherence and synergy *within* the universities.’<sup>3</sup> The consequences of this, the committee notes, has become increasingly evident, not least with regard to how PhD programmes are increasingly shaped on the Faculty level in relation to other social science disciplines.

## 2.2 General recommendations

---

<sup>2</sup> Cris Shore and Susan Wright (1999) “Audit Culture and Anthropology: Neo-Liberalism in British Higher Education,” *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute* 5(4): 557-575; Michael Power (1999) *The Audit Society: Rituals of Verification*, Oxford University Press; Marilyn Strathern, ed. (2000) *Audit Cultures: Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics and the Academy*, Routledge.

<sup>3</sup> Research Review Cultural Anthropology 2007-2012, p. 11.



With the above points in mind, and building on the documents and interviews, the assessment committee attempted to outline a series of general recommendations that can be considered by all departments and by Dutch anthropology as a whole:

- The self-assessments should have been more self-critical. The committee noted that, for most departments, the SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) analysis was a missed opportunity. The audit often calls for a particular mode of performance that is difficult to resist: namely, goals realised in relation to benchmarks. The SEP, however, offers a way of moving beyond a focus on achievements, and this should be kept in mind as the next assessment approaches. The cyclical self-assessment exercise should be reconceptualised as a tool for thinking deeply about opportunities in the short, medium and long term rather than heralding successes. It is an opportunity to reflect on existing weaknesses and vulnerabilities and the ways to own challenges and transform them into opportunities. Finally, the department can consider structural threats and how these might perhaps be collaboratively addressed with other departments within the university and fellow departments of anthropology across Netherlands (or the EU). In sum, the SEP should be approached as a mechanism to facilitate clearer research vision and relevance and the viability of not only the department but of the discipline of anthropology.
- Learn from each other and work together. All the departments in the assessment are dealing with similar problems and challenges, but in different ways. The committee recommends more collaboration between departments nationally. Work collaboratively across the Netherlands (and beyond) to shift the perspectives of university management and of national and EU funding bodies from emphases on quantitative metrics toward quality assessment of research, relevance and viability. Further examples follow below.
- Be more attentive to and engage with the potentially corrosive structure of grant proposals and work against the two-tier system of research and teaching. Dutch anthropology has been very successful and has gained substantially from the European grant landscape. But this has potentially negative effects on working conditions and community. The political economy of academia has been transformed. Junior staff feel compelled to acquire their own grants to secure their career trajectories. As one junior staff member put it, ‘Me getting a grant means me getting a job anywhere I want.’ The general distinction between the American “do-not-hire-your-own-PhD” and European “hire-your-own-PhD” systems has eroded. In its place, the committee noted the emergence of a grant-oriented hiring process.
- In light of this, departments have a duty to better manage the career and promotion expectations of their PhD students, junior and temporary staff, and to foster broader thinking about career trajectories for anthropologists that are rewarding and intellectually fulfilling, but not necessarily within the university. An invisible group in this assessment has been temporary teaching staff. Take care of this group. The viability of all departments arguably depends on this. The previous assessment was more optimistic with regard to this group. By contrast, the present committee noted a great deal of concern with regard to precarity in many discussions. The voices of temporary staff members were rarely present, and instead they were mainly spoken for. In the next assessment, there should be meetings between the committee and temporary staff at the different departments.
- Improve the PhD-training of PhD-students. PhD training is being transformed by the rise of grants such as the ERC. An increasing number of PhDs are project-financed. Projects are primary and, in an important sense, PhD students become instruments in relation to the projects. PhD programmes, primarily in smaller departments, are increasingly shaped on an ad hoc basis, with increasingly generic or general social science courses on the Faculty level. There is a risk that this process is weakening anthropological training. At the same time, all



departments need to consider more carefully the temporality of the PhD programme and take seriously the demand that students finish in four years. Programs need to be better managed and students supported more carefully from beginning to completion.

- In light of this, Dutch anthropology, and the smaller departments in particular, would have a great deal to gain from a national school of anthropology. The size of the Netherlands makes it ideal for these kinds of collaborations. Work collaboratively to create either shared training modules or forums for exchange, and work actively to build community among PhDs (and postdocs) across the Netherlands. This could function as a site for beneficially developing a future “Netherlands Anthropology.”
- In the race for interdisciplinary research, departments should carefully consider the impact on teaching and learning of core anthropology and on the viability of the discipline itself. In what ways might engagement in cross-disciplinary research serve to strengthen the position of anthropology within academia? Several departments noted the challenges of becoming relevant and playing a critical role in interdisciplinary projects within the social sciences and beyond.
- Departments should more fully recognise the importance of “slow research” and monographs for the conceptual development of anthropology, and thereby create more space for staff to write books and high-quality publications and outputs. These issues can be related directly to the “grants culture” and the management of career expectations of junior staff in particular. There is arguably real opportunity to create scholarly autonomy within this system and to engage forcefully with quality, however defined.
- All departments could develop stronger relevance strategies that reflect on societal relevance itself and develop strategic modes of engagement, ideally in connection to the departmental research programmes. Furthermore, communication to the public (e.g. websites, blogs, social media) could be improved across the board. The committee noted that new projects often lead to the creation of new websites and that a blog is seen as the answer to a problem. By contrast, the committee argues that it is not new communication *channels* that are primarily needed, but rather clearer communication *strategies*. Who is your audience? Who do you want to reach? What do you want them to take away with them in terms of learning and new understanding? Being able to answer these questions can allow for better communication and relevance strategies.
- All departments need to spend greater time thinking about and discussing diversity and why it is important. The committee’s discussions with staff concerning diversity were characterised by recognition that diversity should not be reduced to gender or ethnicity, but at the same time there were no concrete plans for taking action. Discussions about diversity should be aimed at creating guidelines for hiring, teaching and societal engagement.
- The research programmes of departments are quite similar in scope, with variable focus on issues of migration, mobility, globalisation and conflict. Only one programme continues to (meekly) underscore its regional strengths. It is recommended that departments better familiarise themselves with the scope of anthropological research themes across the Netherlands and more carefully consider what unique perspectives and contributions they make to these themes and how they might better distinguish themselves. At the same time, this could facilitate the broader collaborative questions: What might a future “Netherlands Anthropology” look like? And, what distinct contributions might it make to studies of and solutions to the most pressing issues of our time?
- Finally, it should be noted that this assessment took place at a particular historical moment, as the Covid-19 pandemic dramatically affected us all. It is worth considering carefully what effects Covid-19 will have not only on teaching and the sense of departmental community, but



also on the nature of ethnographic research itself over the long-term. Again, this is where a national collaboration may prove beneficial.



## 3. Leiden Institute of Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology

### 3.1 Quantitative assessment

The Committee assessed the quality, societal relevance and viability of the Leiden Institute of Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology (CADS) both quantitatively and qualitatively. Its PhD programme, research integrity and diversity are assessed qualitatively. For the quantitative assessment a four-point scale was used, according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021. The explanation of the criteria underlying the scores can be found in appendix C. 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:	2

### 3.2 Organisation, strategy and targets

CADS at Leiden University is organised through a unique structure of boards, committees and councils. Although this organisational form initially appeared overly complicated to the committee, conversations with staff reveal it as a strength, effectively distributing responsibility and including an advisory board of scholars and professionals offering advice to the Institute Board. At the end of 2018, CADS had 15 scientific staff, 10 PhD students with salaried appointments, nine teaching staff (“docenten”), but only one postdoctoral fellow, making it the second largest anthropology department in the Netherlands. In terms of research, CADS is organised through a multi-year strategic plan. The one presented for this assessment is *Global Vulnerabilities and Social Resilience*, and covers the period 2013-2018. The programme explicitly engages with various forms of global instability and local societal responses and is divided into three interconnected sub-themes: 1) Diversity, 2) Sustainability, and 3) Digitalization. In practice, these sub-themes are organised according to three corresponding clusters. Although ‘partly embraced, partly enforced,’ a key aim was to move from area studies—historically a strength at CADS—to specific themes in order to ‘modernise anthropology,’ as one staff member declared. It is clear that there is overlap between clusters and that they are evolving through a bottom-up process. Notably, two new clusters, Methodology and Ethics of Ethnography and one focused on Asia, have been created in response to staff research interests. As such, the research programme can best be understood as an umbrella, with the main intellectual innovations taking place in and between clusters.

As noted in the self-assessment, CADS plans to ‘further consolidate its new research agenda’ over the coming years, with emphases on publications—particularly better quality publications and more monographs supported by writing groups, workshops and performance reviews—, more sustainable collaborations with preferred partners rather than through ad hoc individual contacts, and impact work centred on engaging audiences and institutions outside of academia. It is the committee’s opinion that CADS is moving in the right direction with regard to these factors, though the specific strategies and opportunities should be more clearly defined. We will return to these points in coming sections.



### 3.3 Research quality

#### RESEARCH

Optimism and openness were pervasive in the committee's discussions with different groups of staff. Staff on all levels agree that the research clusters 'really work,' offering 'guidance' and 'focus' to researchers while 'creating new non-hierarchical relations.' Monday morning "write together" sessions and comparable meeting points are considered productive. A "taskforce" was established in 2017 to develop a strategy for CADS to produce more and better publications, with greater impact and visibility. The objective set was to focus greater efforts on the publication of monographs and journal articles (in "high profile" journals). PhD students would also be encouraged to publish an article before completing their dissertations. CADS reports a 14% increase in research outputs over the previous research review period, including a doubling of journal articles and greater number of books (both monographs and edited volumes).

At the heart of the research programme is what is termed the institute's "signature method," which ranges from qualitative and quantitative to audio-visual/multimodal methods. There is a lot of excitement about this "Leiden method" at CADS, but, beyond the stated range of methods being used, the committee judged this all-encompassing approach to be vague, and would urge the institute to clarify and communicate their approach in coming years, not least with regard to PhD training. In line with this, there is also considerable opportunity to develop cutting-edge forms of multimodal publications.

#### REPUTATION

A number of CADS staff have established strong international reputations in the field, and others are highly respected scholars within their communities of fellow regional scholars. The department also employs several "rising stars" whose work is becoming better known internationally. CADS enjoys established affiliations with a number of national research institutions; collaborations with European universities; and fellowships and research affiliations with some of the world's leading universities. CADS also enjoys a network of partner institutes around the globe, with which it engages in research (e.g. smart cities, sustainability and water management) and runs field schools and Policy-in-Practice internships. A number of staff members are on editorial boards of various journals, including seminal titles in the discipline. The department is strongly represented on advisory boards in the EU and beyond, and many staff participate on review and evaluation committees. CADS lists 14 important keynote addresses given by staff members during the review period, all of which were hosted by institutions outside the Netherlands, and around the world. CADS also hosts an impressive seminar series, encouraging exchange between its staff and students with an international and national line-up of guest speakers.

#### FUNDING

The department has been highly successful in securing competitive research grants, both large and small, over the review period. These include three Marie Curie grants, three ERC Consolidator grants, three NWO grants, a Norface grant, as well as a substantial contract-research grant with Leiden City. The importance of obtaining major grants was evident throughout the discussions, as was addressing the potentially corrosive effects of an emerging dual-track research-teaching system, which easily takes shape in the wake of large numbers of successful grants. It was clear that these issues are at the centre



of ongoing discussions at the institute, as there are attempts to explicitly value leadership, teaching and service in the face of the international “grants market” (discussed further in section 3.5).

### 3.4 Societal relevance

CADS critically engages with the concept of “impact”, correctly noting that much impact of anthropological research and outputs is difficult (if not impossible) to quantify and empirically measure. Public outreach is prioritised on the institute’s agenda, using a host of vehicles for communicating and engaging with wider audiences. Many users of CADS expertise are from the cultural industry. Outreach has taken the form of publications (including open access), films and screening events, radio broadcasts, sound installations, conferences, artistic collaborations, contributions to and curation of exhibitions, blogposts, policy briefs, participation in tribunals, and consultancies for private and public sector stakeholders, government ministries, NGOs and UNESCO World Heritage. Of particular note is the impressive outreach of the Leiden Anthropology Blog, founded at the start of the review period and attracting millions of views. Staff have made substantial numbers of media appearances, and several are on the boards of various civil society organisations related to their research specialisations. CADS rightly claims that new multimodal media outlets are pivotal to their outreach and to the dynamic diversity of their research outputs. The above description clearly illustrates the important cross-over effects and impact of the “signature method,” which facilitates engagements with non-academic audiences.

Involvement of CADS staff in Leiden University’s past and present Interdisciplinary Research Programmes has promoted cross-disciplinary research and attracted funding. During the review period, the CADS-centred Asian Modernities and Traditions project brought together a cross-disciplinary team of the university’s researchers. The project participated in Leiden’s 2017 Asia Year celebrations (which included a number of related academic and public events) and the opening of the new Asian Library, while the Global Interactions project included interdisciplinary research on heritage and migration. CADS claims involvement in a number of seemingly fascinating projects and initiatives—presumably with societal relevance. These include the Leiden Delft Erasmus-Rotterdam Alliance and its affiliated BOLD Cities, Global Heritage & Development, and Sustainability Centres, and the Port City Futures research programme.

In discussions with the committee, staff on all levels noted that outreach activities are widely supported and generally seen as inspiring not only for further outreach initiatives, but also for research. That said, the committee believes that CADS would do well to develop a more coherent strategy with regard to societal impact by more carefully considering the relationship between research clusters and outreach, continuing to create sustainable preferred partnerships with non-academic actors (perhaps in discussions with the institute’s advisory board), further developing multimodal forms of presentation, and attempting to gain a better understanding of its critical audiences (such as those who visit the Leiden anthropology blog). The blog could potentially garner an even broader audience, and an increased understanding of its various audiences, through more effective use of social media. The blog currently links to CADS social media pages, but a more efficient use of platforms such as Twitter, YouTube or Instagram (the latter two of which are driving the current visual turn) could prove beneficial.

### 3.5 Viability

CADS is optimistic about its viability, which has been better secured by the new framework of research clusters, seminars and workshops. The number of tenured and non-tenured staff has increased over the review period, including three new professors in alignment with the institute’s three research themes. The three professorships and other senior hires have better ensured leadership within the department;



and junior hires have fleshed out the three research clusters. The institute's financial position is strong and it has experienced a 60% increase in total funding between 2013 and 2018, much of that success due to the awarding of international grants (as opposed to national ones, for which the department was less successful). At the same time, fluctuations in direct funding as a direct consequence of fluctuations in student enrolment numbers poses a clear threat to the department's viability. The implementation of an English language international BA in 2019/2020, however, has drawn greater numbers of students.

While clearly offering great opportunity, an important threat discussed, and one faced by academics around the globe, is the "grants market" (grounded in an emphasis on "research excellence"), which, as staff at CADS repeatedly noted in varying terms, disregards leadership, teaching and service, thereby resulting in two streams: those who get loaded-down with teaching and administration and those who research and publish. The two-tier system negatively impacts the solidarity and resilience within the institute. There is increasing support from the management to write grant proposals and research time has been increased from 25% to 30%. At the same time, a new policy commits those with research grants to remain 30% available for teaching and departmental administration, thus allowing for a partial dismantling of the two-tier system instigated by grant culture.

A further threat is the arising competition (for grants, resources and students) from other disciplines that have adopted anthropological methods. Senior staff suggested how this might be turned into an opportunity, but a great deal more could be made of this situation to the institute's potential advantage. The fact that CADS was (until 2019) highly visible in two of the university's research priority areas (Asian Modernities & Traditions and Global Interactions), and is presently (post 2019) embedded in two others (Liveable Planet and Citizenship, Migration & Global Transformations) plays to the strengths and viability of the department. CADS traditional position between the social sciences and humanities has allowed it to benefit from the trend toward greater interdisciplinary collaboration and grant writing. In this process, however, there is the risk of anthropology being a subcontractor. It therefore appears critical for CADS to position itself and explain its disciplinary and methodological value. 'We want to become the must-haves' in these multidisciplinary collaborations, declared one senior member of staff. Collaborating with the large number of anthropologists working outside of CADS at Leiden University (80+) could be a major opportunity for strengthening the position of anthropology within the university, and beyond. A conference that brought many of them together in early 2020 appears to have been an important first step.

Although the committee appreciated the changes that the institute has made to address a number of problems, and the frankness of the discussions regarding this, more can be done to make explicit the processes that are already underway. This includes working to conceptualise and communicate the Leiden "signature method"—perhaps through a lab within the Methodology and Ethics of Ethnography cluster—which could be a means to highlight CADS' distinctiveness in the Netherlands and beyond, to develop a more explicit strategy that creates better balance between direct funding and external grants, and, following from this, to more clearly address the issue of staff precarity with regard to the "grants market."

### 3.6 PhD programme

In the period under review, 18 PhDs (co-)supervised by CADS staff defended their dissertations. Interviews suggest that CADS PhDs are generally happy with their programme. They particularly enjoy the "bring-your-thesis" seminars and find support in their community of peers. According to the self-assessment, CADS PhDs receive most of their training on the graduate school level. PhD-students expressed a desire for more anthropological training, in particular in relation to Leiden's "signature method."





PhDs attested to a strong feeling of community, which has also helped them in dealing with difficulties related to the Covid-19 outbreak. They nevertheless pointed out the divide between PhDs working within projects and those recruited by the faculty through individual trajectories. Whereas project PhDs may enjoy a highly-structured experience shaped by the timeline and needs of the project, individual PhDs sometimes experience a lack of structure. Particularly in the early stages of the PhD programme, it is advisable to provide guidance to these PhDs, for instance through sessions with the director of research, so that they may find their way in the institute and make necessary connections.

Overall, the committee was impressed with the level of satisfaction among CADS PhD students, both with their experience of supervision and the programme structure and content shaped on the level of the graduate school, and appreciated the enthusiasm and dedication with which staff spoke about their commitment to PhD training.

### **3.7 Research integrity**

CADS has engaged explicitly with ongoing debates about research ethics through the so-called Leiden Statement, which was a scholar-driven response to local data management policies, but which has also attracted international attention as an anthropological approach that argues that the co-production of knowledge is foundational to both science and ethics. With regard to ethnography, these questions are approached in processual terms, from the gathering of data from/with informants to writing and publication. CADS adheres more specifically to the Leiden University Research Data Management Regulations, which has formed the basis for a data management policy that includes confidentiality and safety for research participants, transparency about use and storage of data, and open access publishing. An impressive 64% of CADS's 2018 text publications are open access to general audiences. In the PhD programme, courses of scientific integrity are offered on the university level. The formal approval of the dissertation plan depends on explicit consideration of issues centred on consent and ethics. More generally, staff across different categories claim that discussions of research integrity are ongoing within the various clusters.

### **3.8 Diversity**

There is a balance of ages across positions within the department (with rising inclusion of members from younger age cohorts across the board over the 2013-2018 period). The gender balance stands at seven female to eight male. Inclusion of the female post-doc produces gender equivalence, whereas female PhDs presently outnumber males (8:2). There was clear strengthening of the proportion of female professors over the review period, though males continued to dominate (3:1) among associate professors. Representation among assistant professors was almost equal (the proportion of female staff at this level was consistently higher over the review period). CADS has consistently drawn a greater number of female PhD students. Despite the claim that diversity is key to 'who we are and what we do' and the fact that the committee had interesting discussions with staff on this issue, there is no explicit policy to increase socio-cultural diversity or the international composition of research staff.

### **3.9 Recommendations**

- Develop a strategy for structuring and capitalising on "societal relevance" across CADS;
- Develop preferred partnerships with regard to research and non-academic actors;



- Strengthen the position in the university through collaborations with other anthropologists outside of CADS;
- Strengthen the position of anthropology in PhD courses in the faculty;
- Increase student intake as an alternative and complement to the focus on grants;
- Strengthen processes for addressing and managing precarity within CADS;
- Further develop and consolidate the Leiden “signature method” that combines qualitative, quantitative, digital and visual approaches. This includes considering the development of a lab and new publishing formats. PhD students, in particular, should be involved in these processes in order to develop a distinct Leiden school of anthropology;
- Organise PhD-level courses with a disciplinary focus, possibly in cooperation with other universities.



## 4. Department of Social and Cultural Anthropology, VU Amsterdam

### 4.1 Quantitative assessment

The committee assessed the quality, societal relevance and viability of the department of Social and Cultural Anthropology both quantitatively and qualitatively. Its PhD programme, research integrity and diversity are assessed qualitatively. For the quantitative assessment a four-point scale was used, according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021. The explanation of the criteria underlying the scores can be found in appendix C. 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:	2

### 4.2 Organisation, strategy and targets

The department of Social and Cultural Anthropology (SCA) at the VU works with multi-year strategic plans. The one presented for this assessment is titled *Mobilities, Belonging and Beliefs: Confronting Global Inequalities and Insecurities* (MOBB) and covers the period 2013-2018. MOBB was a reaction to changed realities within academia (at the VU and beyond) and in the worlds studied by anthropologists. While MOBB gathers researchers around a common theme, this remains in practice limited to what one of the researchers interviewed called ‘loosely structured networks,’ which can be both an advantage and a disadvantage (particularly for a small department). The first attempt to do something with MOBB as an integrated whole is the planned edited volume *An Anthropology of Kinesis* (Dalakoglou and Sunier eds.). Apart from this, MOBB (as a “brand identity”) remains remarkably invisible to the outside world (i.e. it hardly appears in publications or elsewhere). The idea of the department is to continue developing MOBB, both along theoretical and empirical lines, for five to ten years beyond 2018. However, this long-term prospect, coupled with the external invisibility of MOBB, begs important strategic questions. The committee appreciates the fact that MOBB has grown organically and is a source of inspiration within the department, but the committee believes that it is equally important to be flexible and open to new approaches and opportunities that may present themselves.

### 4.3 Research quality

#### RESEARCH

The advantage of the current “loosely structured” MOBB network is that researchers are given more freedom to develop their interests in different directions. The various research topics are well chosen in that they are timely and relevant, both academically and societally. This puts MOBB researchers in an excellent position to contribute to knowledge creation and dissemination. The disadvantage is that this fragmentation makes it difficult to create a stronger visibility, both within the academic world and beyond.



In terms of scientific publications, MOBB researchers present an impressive publication record, all the more so when the limited time for dedicated research is taken into account. There were a total of 433 publications in the 2013-2018 period. There was a fluctuation in output between years, with a marked decrease in journal articles in 2018. Journal articles are spread nicely over disciplinary, interdisciplinary, area studies and thematic journals. A sizeable number of the publications are co-authored. MOBB researchers have taken the time to publish monographs, but fewer than would be expected within the discipline of anthropology. While the Faculty of Social Sciences (FSS) at the VU expects and mainly values peer-reviewed articles in highly-rated English-language journals, the department prefers to diversify research output. The question remains how this tension between the FSS and the department plays out when it comes to assessment criteria for researchers. Overall, the quality of the scientific publications is very good (and certainly exceeds the average for such a small research group).

### REPUTATION

Individual researchers are doing well in their respective fields of expertise. It is difficult for the committee to make general statements about MOBB because the programme, as it is defined, is not well known outside of the VU (as previously pointed out, that is due mainly to insufficient “branding” of the programme, in all its diversity, as “MOBB”). To a certain extent, this may also limit the extent of MOBB influence beyond the circles immediately surrounding individual researchers.

MOBB researchers are well connected nationally, at a European level and, to a lesser extent, globally. MOBB is particularly effective at providing ‘research products for peers’ (although it is hoped that the notable decrease in peer-reviewed articles of 2018 will not continue). The ‘use of research products by peers’ is good (citations for instance could go up if the shift from quantity to quality is more pronounced). On the other hand, the ‘marks of recognition by peers’ is very good (and this points to the importance of academic networking, primarily via conferences and other scholarly events and projects).

The Amsterdam Anthropology Lecture Series (AALS) displayed an impressive list of lectures, with a good mix of international and local (Dutch-based) presentations. Renewed attention to the quality of this series could also promote intellectual development within the Department. It is beneficial to have visiting scholars and distinguished guest professors, but these visits should be made part of a larger collaboration strategy (e.g. in terms of co-publishing or joint research projects).

### FUNDING

More than half of MOBB income comes from research grants and contract research. While sources of direct funding generally decreased over the review period (except 2015), funding from research grants generally increased, and contract research has generated a small proportion of funding since 2016. A total of €3.888M of external funding was secured during the review period, of which 3.239M was from academic grants and the remainder (515M) was from contract funding.

Most research grants come from the Dutch Research Council (NWO) and, to a far lesser extent, from European research programmes. EU funding streams could be sought in a more systematic way (but the downside is that the preparation of these proposals is far more labour-intensive). Obtaining ERC funding and the like would increase the international reputation of SCA (but this also has potentially negative effects on teaching and distribution of administrative responsibilities). There is a sound track record for obtaining internal seed funding from the Institute for Societal Resilience (ISR). In general, there is a downside to overdependence on external funding (almost 60% in 2018), which is becoming increasingly competitive. Given the limited amount of available research time within the department, time allotted



to writing research proposals (which have no guarantee of being funded) needs to be carefully managed.

During the interviews, it became clear that the funding situation has evolved since 2018. The department has organised itself, for instance, by contracting junior teachers so that there is more time for researchers to prepare research applications. Judging by the number of awarded grants, this strategy seems to be paying off, but one needs to be careful not to solve one problem by creating another here (precarisation of junior staff members).

#### 4.4 Societal relevance

The department's overall approach to societal relevance emphasises “applying anthropology” in an engaged way. This fits well with the VU's overall mission and strategy to seek topical issues that are relevant in current public debates.

In terms of ‘demonstrable output for external target groups,’ many of the listed outputs are still academic, including those classified as “professional”. Unsurprisingly, the same can be said for the ‘demonstrable recognition by external target groups.’ This is not necessarily problematic given that the production and dissemination of scientific knowledge should be the core business of any university research group. Perhaps, however, more could be done to reach the broader public, especially given that public opinion is raising more and more questions about the societal relevance of the social sciences and humanities in general.

When it comes to the ‘demonstrable utilisation by external target groups,’ MOBB scores very well. It has large numbers of external PhD students. Half of those who completed the doctoral programme during the review period found a postdoctoral position, while many others found their way into other research or teaching jobs. The MOBB-wide stress on methodologies of participation and collaboration automatically engages academic as well as societal stakeholders.

The blog *Standplaats Wereld* (SPW), which recently celebrated its 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary, is presented as the most active anthropology blog in the Netherlands. Its impact could be further increased by better communicating new posts through social media. This seems to work somewhat via Facebook (520 followers), but the Twitter account (146 followers) has been dormant since 2016. One of the strengths of the blog is that it is bilingual, but more could be done to visually differentiate between the two languages (in order not to confuse visitors who manage only in Dutch or English).

When it comes to policy measures for enhancing societal relevance, it would be advisable to link this to the ongoing development of networks such as the Faculty of Social Sciences Institute for Societal Resilience (ISR) and the Amsterdam Sustainability Institute (ASI).

The committee notes that teaching and other educational activities could have been more explicitly considered as a major way to create societal impact, even if it is not specifically the focus of this evaluation.

Societal relevance is related to the access that society has to the knowledge produced by universities. In this context, many scholars have adopted open access publishing as a means for reaching larger audiences. This is something to be taken on board for the next period. The committee was pleased to learn that there are conversations within the department about the San Francisco Declaration on Research Assessment (DORA), open science, and diverse career paths.

It is especially important that all staff members clearly know and understand how “societal relevance” is considered in their evaluations. According to the interviews conducted by the committee, this point of



“valorisation” of academic research is currently being worked on within the Department, but so far not all members of staff are in agreement.

#### 4.5 Viability

##### FUTURE STRATEGY

The meaning of societal impact and academic impact should be clear to all researchers within the department, as should the departmental strategy for achieving greatest impact. In other words, concepts such as “impact” need to be operationalised in more concrete ways. In terms of research, there is the key factor of decreasing research time. While teaching is important too (and teaching demands were reported to be increasing), the question becomes how administrative duties can be reduced. Research and teaching are better not approached as oppositional because both can reinforce one another positively. The committee was pleased to learn that the research staff is being “rejuvenated” (although there are apparent challenges to replacing retiring staff members). It is important to do this in phases so that there is a balanced spread of age and academic seniority. The plans for reaching out and engaging with both the private sector and not-for-profit organisations are more than adequate. The seeming contradiction between the department’s view that consultancy/contract research represents an opportunity and it being noted as a potential threat to “slow (and presumably quality) research” in the SWOT analysis needs to be internally discussed and clarified.

##### SWOT ANALYSIS

More could have been done with this analysis in the self-assessment report. A SWOT analysis is not only meant to dwell on a group’s strengths but can be strategically used for blue-sky thinking about future opportunities. In this case, the department could be more reflexive about its weaknesses, think more about threats, and identify where the department can take responsibility for improving and/or overcoming these, or what strategies can be taken in face of threats that are not directly in its control. For instance, the VU website has been problematic for many years (although a new system seems to be under construction and communications at the VU are being developed). In addition, there is a seeming lack of coherent strategy within the department for reaching various target audiences via social media. Instead of letting individual researchers set up their own remote web pages and social media accounts, it may be more strategic and effective to work out a self-managed solution at the level of the department. The same applies to the common complaint that there is insufficient time for research and administrative loads are far too heavy. While it is important to continue engaging in dialogue with the university administration about changing this, strategic departmental choices may go a long way in alleviating the current situation for researchers.

##### ROBUSTNESS & STABILITY

According to the self-assessment report, the financial viability of the department depends on ‘publications, number of completed PhDs, and successful grant applications.’ Each of these elements could be developed. The strategy of the department to create tight links with ISR is a wise move in the search for some more financial stability (particularly in the context of limited sources of direct funding). Grants are becoming increasingly important and they greatly affect the number of PhD students and postdocs that can be hired. The committee noted the declining numbers of PhD students. The decrease in official research time from 40% to 30% due to budget cuts can be partially compensated by grants



that allow researchers to “buy” research time (but never 100%), which is necessitated by the lack of a sabbatical system. At the same time, it appears important to reflect on how the size of grants is increasingly being used as an evaluation of the quality of researchers, which appears deplorable, particularly for a discipline such as anthropology where excellent research can be conducted with small amounts of money.

Also worth pursuing is the intended plan to ‘strengthen and expand structural alliances with societal stakeholders such as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the municipality of Amsterdam, in order to increase their involvement in research, for example through endowed professorships and collaborative co-created research projects.’ At the same time, a healthy balance should be kept between “chairs” (usually with a narrow focus) and the flexibility of changing research programmes.

Given the challenges in terms of the department’s viability and its research programme, the committee was pleased to hear many of the researchers interviewed affirm that they experience a community culture and appreciate the informal, multicultural and multilinguistic atmosphere within the department. Researchers clearly appreciate the horizontal leadership style and the fact that major decisions are taken in monthly staff meetings. A new university system of “buddy coaching” supplies mentoring for new junior staff during their first year (the mentors coming from other faculties). The strong departmental culture will certainly add strength to the department’s viability in coming years. The committee strongly feels, however, that early-career researchers in particular would benefit from more institutionalised and formal forms of mentorship and support.

#### **4.6 PhD programme**

Between 2010 and 2014, 38 PhD students started, some of them via the “Route talent-to-PhD” programme that ‘prepares excellent master graduates for successful PhD applications’. Although small in scale, the committee believes this is an example of a best practice.

In the period 2013 – 2018 a total of 36 PhD students graduated. About 25% of the projects stopped. The committee is of the opinion that this dropout rate needs to be lowered.

The committee interviewed current and former PhD students at various stages of development in their PhD research about their supervision, research facilities, the role of the Graduate school, career-planning and possible constraints of their research.

The committee spoke with an enthusiastic group of PhD students. They appreciate the highly informal and pleasant atmosphere in the department. PhD students are supervised by two supervisors. The committee believes that the decision to allow associate professors to supervise doctoral projects is commendable.

PhD students are encouraged to attend monthly research seminar meetings and the AALS lectures. Apart from a monthly PhD reading club, most of the support that students give to one another tends to be of a social nature. The department is encouraged to stimulate more peer-to-peer activities related to research.

The training programme is “tailored” to students’ individual needs (including courses outside the VU, which students sometimes have trouble negotiating accessing). Students see this as a plus, but the “anthropological” core of the programme should be better defined. At present, the only mandatory course is on research integrity. Students especially welcome thematic courses as well as courses tailored to qualitative research.



There is a shift from writing a monograph to graduating based on articles. While this may be a positive trend for the research output of the department, the committee encourages serious reflection on the implications this may have for the academic career opportunities of PhD students.

PhD students can negotiate to teach (although Dutch is often a limitation here) and, if interested, they may also work toward obtaining a basic teaching qualification. Teaching hours are compensated, for example, by extending the research contract. They can also be involved in Masters theses as a second reader. These opportunities should be made part of a broader career path strategy for PhD students.

The self-assessment report proposes to ‘make 4 years a realistic standard’ and to ‘reduce the maximum time to 5 years’ for the completion of a PhD. The externally imposed 4-year period within which a PhD needs to be finished is a huge challenge for sound anthropological research. This entails making strategic choices (e.g. concerning the weight of preparation and mandatory coursework) while at the same time safeguarding the quality of anthropological training and research. The committee expects the department to take more concrete steps in this direction.

The graduate school provides information with respect to careers after the PhD. It remains unclear to the committee the extent to which the PhD programme prepares students for jobs outside of academia, which increasingly is becoming today’s reality.

#### **4.7 Research integrity**

The self-assessment report nicely outlines the measures foreseen at the university level in terms of research integrity. The committee is of the opinion, however, that the department itself should be doing more about research integrity than merely ‘following’ the Dutch Anthropological Association (ABv) Code of Ethics (2018). According to interviewees, researchers are discussing issues such as data management, but in an informal manner. The committee was glad to hear that the department is raising awareness in the FSS about the “anthropological” way of doing research.

The attention given to research integrity in the various educational programmes, at Bachelor’s, Master’s, and PhD level, is sufficient.

The self-assessment report makes no mention of the issue of plagiarism, an important topic in a discipline such as anthropology that relies so heavily on writing as research output. The committee appreciated that this topic arose briefly during the interviews (particularly given the fact that there has been a major plagiarism scandal at the VU). Plagiarism is certainly a topic for attention in the future.

#### **4.8 Diversity**

In 2018, all four MOBB full professors were male while 50% of the research staff was female. Moreover, 33% of the research staff were over 55 years of age. In other words, this is certainly not a balanced situation. Interestingly, there is no mention in the self-assessment report of ethnic diversity (except when referring to the student population), something that is even more important given the subject matter of anthropology and given that this is one of the research topics of MOBB. The committee recommends that the department take further action to promote a more gender-balanced environment, and to raise greater awareness and improve knowledge of discriminatory mechanisms in academic environments, and ways to consciously counteract these. In addition, the department should more clearly differentiate between “diversity” and “internationalization”.

The committee is of the opinion that the department should develop a “diversity plan” (on paper) at the level of the department (although there seems to be some strategy at the level of the university). The





fact that the department already has all kinds of diversity (particularly among students) should be no excuse.

#### 4.9 Recommendations

- The committee encourages the department not to take its current MOBB research programme as a given but to regularly reflect on whether it needs to be updated and/or rethought. The bringing in of innovative thinkers (as used to be the case when MOBB started) can be helpful here. This goes hand in hand with a more strategic and explicit positioning vis-à-vis other Dutch anthropology departments and research programmes. Giving more visibility (on multiple platforms and media) to what makes the MOBB programme distinct from others carries the potential to better attract the students and researchers who are genuinely interested in the work done at the department.
- The department is encouraged to actively look for ways to communicate the message that obtaining a grant is not a goal, just a means to be able to do research.
- The committee would urge the department to operationalise how it understands, measures and evaluates “impact” in much more concrete ways. This will help its researchers to think of impact in the various aspects of their research endeavour.
- The department needs to be more transparent towards PhD students, postdocs, and junior staff when it comes to academic career opportunities, promotion, employment security and hierarchy. This involves an explicit recognition of the growing precarity of temporary staff and a more active role in supporting career development (also outside academia). Inequalities need to be properly acknowledged and addressed. The department could also think about better ways to support PhDs as well as research staff to focus on research and writing. All staff members, but especially PhD students and junior staff, would benefit from periodic “grant-writing” strategy workshops.
- The department is encouraged to seriously reflect on what exactly is needed to improve PhD completion and how the changes can be operationalised and implemented. A change of culture is not enough. It is vital to think about innovative ways to enable smooth PhD trajectories that do justice to the characteristics of anthropological research.
- The PhD training programme needs to have a healthy balance between an anthropological core and an elective part that is more tailored to the specificities of each research project. This is clearly not the case now. If there are not enough in-house resources to realise this, collaboration with other Dutch anthropology programmes is advisable. The idea of a national research school in anthropology is one possibility. Moreover, the PhD training programme should pay sufficient attention to knowledge and skills training that are also of use outside of academia. All of this requires a much better mediation between the department and the graduate school.
- The department is encouraged to address the seeming incongruity between its aim to secure endowed chairs from external cooperative ventures and the perceived threat that consultancy-driven research poses to the quality of “slow research”. The department must proactively devise strategies to safeguard not just their research projects and interests but anthropology as a valuable contributor to contemporary problems. The stress of the department on “engaged anthropology” offers plenty of opportunities in this respect. At the same time, the department is encouraged to consider the potential benefits of closer interdisciplinary collaboration with other FSS departments, including increased capacity for securing research funding.



## 5. Anthropology Department, University of Amsterdam

### 5.1 Quantitative assessment

The committee assessed the quality, societal relevance and viability of the Anthropology department of the University of Amsterdam both quantitatively and qualitatively. Its PhD programme, research integrity and diversity are assessed qualitatively. For the quantitative assessment a four-point scale was used, according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021. The explanation of the criteria underlying the scores can be found in appendix C. The qualitative assessment of the Institute can be found in the next sections.

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

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

### 5.2 Organisation, strategy and targets

The UvA Department of Anthropology is part of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences (FMG), which is the largest educational and research institution in the social and behavioural sciences in Europe. Research is embedded in the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research (AISSR), which also hosts research in Sociology, Political Science, Human Geography, Planning & International Development Studies. AISSR appears to be well structured, supplying robust managerial and administrative support to the directors of the three main research programmes in anthropology. Like other UvA academic departments, anthropology is responsible for its human resource management and the development of its disciplinary foci.

The guiding objectives during the 2013-2018 review period were to: embrace and explore the breadth of anthropology while retaining focus on the department's traditional specialisations, with emphasis on the political dimension; engage with the most pressing current developments in society; disseminate research results and findings to audiences in academia and beyond; and collaborate with academic and non-academic partners in a variety of international settings, with special mention of the "global south."

The department hosts three programme groups, which organise general lines of research: Health, Care and the Body; Moving Matters; and Globalising Cultures and the Quest for Belonging. These operate as working units led by one or two programme directors responsible for research management and a number of human-resource tasks. Reportedly, research also takes place across these programmes through informal channels. All academic members of staff (and PhD students) belong to one of the three programme groups, and there is flexibility for movement between them. Many academic staff members are also involved in one or more university or Faculty-sponsored "research priority areas" or multidisciplinary centres. Given the bold emphasis on interdisciplinarity in much of the research undertaken by staff, the review committee encourages the department to reflect carefully on the weighting and position of "anthropology" in its work as well as in its teaching, and the possible impact this might have for the future of the discipline.

During the review period, the department implemented a more horizontal style of leadership and management. It was claimed during the interviews that this has increased the spirit of inclusivity and



improved communication links in the department, but, as yet, has not alleviated the workload for the Head of Department. The directors of the three programmes and the Head of Department are democratically selected. Regular staff meetings are convened and retreats are taken by the staff to develop the departmental vision. There are lingering challenges, however, posed by the absenteeism of some “international” staff members.

In its clear vision and mission statement, the department declares that it is ‘committed to grounded, in-depth ethnographic research and to the development of cutting-edge theories and methodological insights based upon this empirical work.’ It ambitiously aims to ‘advance research and theory within socio-cultural anthropology, but also in interdisciplinary endeavours.’

### 5.3 Research quality

Anthropology at UvA continues to enjoy the reputation of being a world-class department. Productivity in terms of both quality and quantity is high, aided perhaps by the greater proportion of contracted research time that staff enjoy in comparison to anthropologists in other departments in the country. In the 2018 QS World University Rankings, the department was ranked 14<sup>th</sup> (and 1<sup>st</sup> among departments of “non-Anglo-Saxon” nations). Several members of staff are internationally-recognised leaders in their respective fields of research; a steady stream of funding grants from national, European and international sources was secured over the six-year review period; academic manuscripts were published by internationally renowned presses and in top-ranked journals (within and outside the discipline); the scope of outputs was broadened, with greater inclusion of film, exhibitions and performance; several outputs earned esteem markers; and the department reached a variety of audiences (academic, governmental, NGOs, and the public and private sectors) with its outputs and via popular/social media sources, public talks, workshops, keynote addresses, policy papers, and attendance at and the convening of academic forums.

The number of staff and direct funding streams were fairly consistent across the six-year period (averaging approx. 20%). In the face of mounting pressures on government and university sources of funding, the department consistently acquired impressive streams of financial support from research grants (ranging annually 50.8% - 58.9%) and contract grants (19.7% - 30.6%). The variety of funding sources is noteworthy, including large grants from the ERC (6) and NWO (4), and numerous smaller but significant ones secured from international bodies (e.g. UNICEF), national funding bodies and foreign governments. The full list of grants reveals that a broad spectrum of staff members (and PhDs) had been successful in their funding bids in the face of the fierce competition for these resources. It also displays diversity in research subjects and world regions, aptly reflecting the department’s three thematic programmes, and more.

The impressive list of 921 publications (not including postdocs and PhDs) for the period includes 375 refereed and 33 non-refereed articles; 134 refereed and 38 non-refereed book chapters; 14 monographs, and 54 edited volumes/special journal issues. Citation ratings for publications by the department are strong, reflecting the influential, innovative and highly relevant nature of much of UvA’s research and methodological developments. Notably, citation ratings and impact factors for UvA are amplified by its specialisation in medical anthropology, whereby publications in health-care sector journals are subject to a considerably different and more vibrant citation culture.

A significant 110 publications were produced for professionals in the public and private sectors; and a further 90 were aimed at various general public audiences. Additional outputs from the department included documentary films (two of which were award-winning), two exhibitions, and a theatre piece created for the researcher’s subject audience (i.e. hearing-impaired in the Netherlands) – all of which



reached the attention of a broad public. Of the 73 PhD dissertations completed between 2013 and 2018, an impressive 10 were awarded with *cum laude*, which attests to the quality of recruitment, teaching, supervision and support at the doctoral level.

With specific reference to the refereed journal articles, these appeared in a wide range of subject and regional-focussed publications that reach academic and professional audiences well beyond anthropology (i.e. public health, medical [including *The Lancet*], pharmacology, psychiatry, disability, childhood and family studies, sexuality, religion [notably Islam], sport, language and communication, maritime studies, science & technology, migration studies, criminology, conflict & security, ecology). Publications in regional-focussed journals were strongly representative of the department's established regional foci. A considerable number of publications appeared in the most widely read journals in anthropology. Non-refereed journal articles also made important academic contributions, and many appeared in top-quality publications that reach diverse readerships. Notably, 32% of peer-reviewed journal essays were co-authored with international partners, underscoring the strength of the department's international networks.

UvA continues to emphasise the importance of monographs (and “slow research”) in face of the “tyranny of metrics” and in spite of the fact that book writing is more onerous than producing journal articles. Output of monographs, however, represents just 2% of publications during the review period. The committee supports without reservation the view that monographs make unique and important contributions to the advancement and quality of scholarship in anthropology. The panel therefore strongly encourages growth in the proportion of monographs in the coming years. The general quality of the books produced evinces the intellectual rigour and academic leadership within the UvA department. Regardless, directives from university management to satisfy bibliometric demands contrasted sharply with the discipline's esteem for the monograph, thereby generating considerable anxiety and uncertainty among many individual anthropologists and departments over their publishing priorities.

Two of the 14 monographs produced over the period were shortlisted for book prizes. Ten monographs were published in English, and by internationally renowned university and academic presses. Others were published in the countries of research or translated into non-European languages, thereby extending reach and impact.

Of the 54 edited volumes, 24 were edited books and an impressive 30 were edited special journal issues (including in high-ranking journals). The editorships of the special journal issues, in particular, indicate robust leadership by department members in shaping discourses within the discipline. The edited books were published by an array of publishers, including internationally renowned university and academic presses; and the often-impressive lists of contributing authors to these volumes demonstrate the extensive international academic networks that UvA researchers have cultivated and the worldwide respect they have earned in their fields of study.

The listing of “professional publications” and “publications aimed at a general public” includes journal, newspaper and magazine articles, book chapters, book reviews, reports, web publications and inaugural lectures. The two lists include many publications in Dutch, evidently reaching local and national public, government, non-governmental and private sector audiences.

Staff members have served on influential (national and international) academic boards and committees and as editors for top-/high-ranking journals and a regional book series. Two PhDs earned awards; and one professor was honoured by SOAS (University of London) for his dedication and outstanding work.



## 5.4 Societal relevance

The self-assessment report supplies a detailed account of how relevance came to be defined and how it was given shape to include different kinds of “demonstrable products.” The department claims to have prioritised efforts to make its research relevant to society and to reach wider audiences. In addition to its collaboration with national and international non-academic bodies (e.g. UNICEF, European Centre for Disease Control, Dutch water boards, etc.), which has impact on policy, the department also reached a wider general public through its engagement with media, filmmaking and exhibitions and through participation in and organisation of public events. Nine thematic Special Professorial Chairs have been established in the department with financing from partnering foundations.

Department members participate in/organise workshops for professionals and activists (e.g. healthcare, mobility, and religious and minority groups), thereby having impact on public and political debates regarding a wide range of pressing topical issues. Users in the health care sector include professional societies, patient organisations, insurance companies, health care providers such as hospital groups, nursing home organisations, and also individual professionals as well as a wide variety of interest groups.

Evidence of research relevance is further supported by the impressive number of grants received by department members: 50-59% of the department’s funding was derived from research grants and 20-30% from contract research (i.e. commissioned research projects). Competition for ERC, NWO and other European grants (i.e. Marie-Curie) is fierce, and selection committees of these funding bodies typically put significant weighting on societal relevance or “impact.” The Horizon 2020 scheme, for instance, specifically identifies “societal challenges” as one of its key themes, funding projects that ‘tackle the biggest challenges facing modern society;’ the remit of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (USA) is to improve public health; and UNICEF grants (for department work Burundi) are earmarked for projects with a strong element of public partnership.

Supervision within the Applied Track of the department’s Masters programme included preparing students to conduct research in collaboration with commissioning organisations and to communicate findings and policy recommendations. Again, the point was made in the self-assessment that equipping students with anthropological thinking and methods constitutes a salient impact factor. Evidence of this should have been more squarely included in the self-assessment.

## 5.5 Viability

UvA’s SWOT analysis offers a detailed snapshot of the department’s key achievements and aspirations balanced by reflections on its areas for development and perceived obstacles, all of which have been elaborated in the other sections of the internal self-assessment.

During the review period, FTE staff numbers remained fairly consistent, though there was a significant drop in 2018 compared to previous years – largely due to the sudden decrease in the number of non-tenured researchers, including postdocs. A number of retirements were/are expected in the coming years. This entails both a loss of expertise and experience and an opportunity to recruit new talent who will pursue innovative research in the fields of the anthropology of ecology and climate change, visual anthropology, and the anthropology of diversity, migration and the state. The department is also encouraged to seize the opportunity to retain promising existing junior members of staff, thereby providing them with greater employment security and a promising academic career route. Relatedly, the department might also explore with the university (and particularly the HR department) ways to restructure the UvA system of promotion in order to facilitate promotion, improve career trajectories and retain talent.



The self-assessment highlights in several instances the fact that the department was successful in bringing in steady funding streams from grants and for contract research, as previously mentioned. The department would be encouraged, however, to devise a clear strategy for minimising the negative impact that ERC-funded research has on the department's core activities, sense of community and the distribution of teaching and administrative loads to other staff members, and in particular junior staff.

It appears that the research focus of most, if not all, research-active members of the department slotted into one (or more) of the three main programmes. At several points in the self-assessment, however, the ambition to broaden the scope of research topics with emerging “socially urgent” issues is highlighted. This initiative is ongoing. New potential topics include green futures, multi-modal approaches and decoloniality, not all of which appear to have an obvious home within the existing programmes. Going forward, it may therefore be necessary (and beneficial) for the department to collaboratively adjust or redefine its research programmes. The department will also need to carefully consider how it will make distinct and valuable contributions to newly selected research issues (such as decoloniality).

The department's strategy for the coming five years is guided by that of the AISSR, which (unsurprisingly) strives ‘to generate social science research that is world leading.’ The department's three listed objectives are to encourage & expand multimodal research; foster a healthier and “slower” research community and ‘prioritise quality over quantity;’ and nurture the “research-education nexus” by integrating the communication of staff research in the existing teaching programmes and generating research synergies with Masters students. All objectives are highly commendable, but, evidently, each will confront a unique set of challenges – and perhaps most especially the second (which, it is hoped, will yield a greater proportion of monographs in the department's future outputs). Because the second objective concerns structural issues that affect a broad spectrum of social science and arts & humanities disciplines (and anthropology departments across the Netherlands), the department (and AISSR) will likely need to engage in coordinated collaborative efforts to affect the structural and cultural transformations required within university management, funding institutions and national government.

Indeed, the “threats” identified in the SWOT analysis resonate worldwide with academics in the social sciences and the arts & humanities. They are therefore not UvA-specific, but may nevertheless merit careful consideration by the department. Among the threats, it is noted that ethical protocol from the life sciences is being imposed on ethnographic methods. It is also noted that the “post-truth” era has exacerbated political polarisation between groups in society, which in turn is yielding a more hostile environment for critical academic work. In addition to the “pressing social issues” already identified for inclusion in the department's future research agenda, perhaps the prevailing malaise in academia, the “tyranny of life science research ethics,” and the “post-truth era” might, too, be considered as candidates.

Despite the challenges ahead, the self-assessment asserts that the department is ‘extremely confident’ of its viability over the next five years, and the review committee perceives no reason to query that judgement.

## 5.6 PhD programme

During the six-year period, 73 PhDs were completed (average of 12/year), and notably ten of which were awarded with *cum laude* honours (approx. 14% compared with the national average of about 5%). As members of the AISSR (and having representation on the AISSR board), PhD students have access to practical/logistical support as well as to training courses/modules. They are supervised by a supervisory committee.



Like the number of postdocs, the number of PhD students was at its lowest level in 2018.

In the period from 2010-14, just 4% of 56 new PhDs completed within the allotted 4-year time period. The majority were taking 5 years and longer (but apparently only 3 left the programme without completing). That only 52% had graduated before the end of their seventh year of enrolment demands pause for reflection. A long list of possible reasons for delayed completion is offered in the self-assessment.

Most reasons (including the distinct nature of anthropology, which requires long fieldwork, often language training, and writing-up a monograph-style dissertation) will be familiar to directors of PhD programmes in anthropology everywhere. Noteworthy, however, is that a large proportion (25% in 2016) of AISSR PhD students were overwhelmed by high workload and stress levels, and suffering burn-out as a consequence – an issue that merits careful consideration at departmental and faculty level.

Another reason included in the list was inadequate quality of supervision in some cases. A number of remedial actions in relation to this issue were enumerated, including annual reviews between individual students and staff who were not included in their dissertation committee (which allows for more frank discussions); an increase in staff members eligible to supervise, and the introduction of a three-day course on supervision, which staff were “encouraged” to attend. During the interviews, however, it became clear that staff members prefer informal peer-to-peer learning and have not (yet) attended this course. There is an ombudsman system in place where PhD students can report supervisory issues.

There is a PhD representative in each programme group who also organises social events. PhD students report experiencing a sense of community – although it was noted that the department can at times feel ‘too big’ in the sense of both (not) knowing one’s colleagues and not knowing where to find the correct information. A to-be-appointed PhD mentor at the departmental level will contribute to making information more centrally available and will serve as a link between PhD students and the faculty.

Career training is provided by the AISSR and PhD students report that they discuss career paths informally as well as during the annual review meetings. It was noted that nearly all PhDs find employment in academia after completing. This is an impressive fact and reflects the quality of both the candidates and the supervision they receive. A detailed list of individuals and post-PhD career trajectories was included in the self-assessment report. The panel members were delighted to learn that this data is collected and kept by the department.

### **5.7 Research integrity**

During the review period, all new research projects, including PhD research proposals, were submitted to the AISSR ethics committee for review before proceeding. The committee, which includes two anthropologists, subjected proposals and their investigators to a rigorous and, reportedly, ‘thought-provoking’ review process. The ethics committee was popularly viewed by department academics as a ‘trusted partner,’ offering opportunity for deeper learning about and reflection on anthropological methods and relationships with the subjects who partake in research.

Reflection on ethics was integrated in PhD training and supervision – and, correctly, the department noted that, especially in the cases of anthropology and field-based research, ‘ethics is a process, not a form.’

Discussion of “integrity” in the self-assessment is cursory, but does highlight dedication to the welfare and well-being of PhD students and junior colleagues.



Finally, it is claimed that the department took a leading role in discussions of research transparency, and that it assisted with setting up new Research Data Management standards in the AISSR as well as in the Dutch Anthropological Society.

### 5.8 Diversity

65% of researchers (including PhDs, research associates and postdocs) in the department were female. 57% of full professors and 67% of assistant professors were female, but just 40% of associate professors were female. The department was therefore included in the Faculty positive action programme to increase the number of its female associate professors. Three of the five management positions within the department were held by women. Of the 56 PhDs recruited between 2010 and 2014, 75% were female (this gender imbalance might merit further reflection); and increasing numbers were coming from outside Europe – namely Asia, Africa and North America.

The majority of the academic staff was Dutch, but the department also comprised members from other European and non-European countries. The PhD population was especially diverse in terms of nationality. Reportedly, the department does not keep record of other diversity factors such as ethnicity, race, sexuality, religion, disabilities, etc. The panel urges the department to formulate its position on the nature and scope of diversity, and to integrate this with guidance on hiring.

### 5.9 Recommendations

The review committee judged the department's performance over the review period to be strong, its viability sound, and its strategies for moving forward commendable. During the interviews with management and staff, the committee was impressed by the department's willingness to accommodate new research interests within its research programmes, the variety of strategies implemented for reaching diverse audiences and users, and the prioritisation of making UvA anthropological research relevant to societal concerns. The committee was also struck by the importance that senior staff and management placed on caring for and supporting fellow colleagues, fostering communication channels, and nurturing grassroots involvement in the departmental vision. The latter is effectively achieved by the horizontal style of management, "away days" and regular staff meetings. It is therefore in the spirit of the department's existing achievements and its future objectives that the committee makes the following recommendations:

- Carefully consider the department's growth model. What impact does the large size of the department have on consolidating research strategy? What threats or weaknesses does it generate? Given the large number of staff and students, how might the sense of community/ies be strengthened?;
- Constructively grapple with the impact that absent international scholars have on the workloads of other staff, as well as on the sense of community and cohesion within the department;
- Formalise a collegial mentoring/support structure (which can be formally accounted within the department's workload model);
- Make space as a department to carefully consider forthcoming vulnerabilities and arising threats (e.g. the impact of the pandemic on anthropological fieldwork, student enrolment figures and working relations; diminishing funding streams for social sciences; growing competition for grants, etc.);





- Actively explore with the university management and the faculty ways to restructure the UvA system of promotion in order to facilitate promotion of existing staff, improve career trajectories and retain talent. The department (and AISSR) are also encouraged to creatively recognise variation in pathways for career mobility and academic promotion as a means to incentivize staff. Relatedly, it is recommended that management and senior staff better manage the career expectations of PhDs, postdocs and junior staff. This might be achieved by making promotion criteria clearer and by encouraging broader thinking and active planning for taking up rewarding and intellectually fulfilling careers beyond academia;
- Relatedly, explore alternative ways to valorise staff achievements and make the impact of non-publishing activities (i.e. film making, exhibitions, public outreach events, etc.) more visible within the department and the university;
- Make the university management better aware of the competition within the social sciences and the arts & humanities for second-stream research funding and solicit more seed funding from the university to nurture innovative research initiatives;
- Consider methods for more evenly distributing teaching and alleviating the heavy workloads of junior staff. Explore possibilities for instituting sabbaticals, rolling grants or greater time within the contracted working schedule in order for staff to develop research ideas and grant proposals;
- Explore ways to formally integrate teaching experience into the programme of study (for those who want it) in order to improve the employability of PhDs who elect to remain in academia and, importantly, for developing key skills in communication and organisation;
- Establish with the AISSR a “bridging” position (i.e. PhD coordinator) for PhD mentorship;
- Considering its position as the largest anthropology department in the Netherlands, explore opportunities for UvA to play a central role in creating nation-wide PhD training modules (i.e. in methodology) or to organise activities/forums that promote a nation-wide doctoral student community and the sharing of best practice;
- Formulate a departmental position on the nature and scope of diversity, and integrate this with guidance on hiring.



## 6. Department of Anthropology and Development Studies, Radboud University

### 6.1 Quantitative assessment

The committee assessed the quality, societal relevance and viability of the Department of Anthropology and Development Studies both quantitatively and qualitatively. Its PhD programme, research integrity and diversity are assessed qualitatively. For the quantitative assessment a four-point scale was used, according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021. The explanation of the criteria underlying the scores can be found in appendix C. 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:	2

### 6.2 Organisation, strategy and targets

The Department of Anthropology and Development Studies is part of the larger Radboud Social Cultural Research (RSCR) with a total of 40 staff members at different levels of seniority and around 30 PhD students. RSCR comprises two research groups in Sociology and Anthropology and Development Studies, respectively, with the interdisciplinary group on Gender and Diversity straddling them both. This makes RSCR a highly interdisciplinary group with a unique and broad set of competences. This assessment only concerns the Anthropology and Development Studies group. While the interdisciplinarity is clearly a strength, the assessment committee questions how anthropological competence will be preserved and suggests that this be addressed by anthropologists in the department during the coming years. Furthermore, the assessment committee's general recommendations concerning PhD training in anthropology can strengthen the disciplinary focus without compromising the interdisciplinary core of the department. The general impression from the self-assessment and the interviews with all staff groups was one of generosity and assistance from senior to junior staff. Throughout the interviews, however, concerns about informalised structures around such issues as PhD-supervision and promotions emerged repeatedly. While informality might not be a problem in the light of the evident collegiality, the committee wishes to flag the necessity to continually review the formal mechanisms in place for assessing their appropriateness in dealing with various organisational issues. The committee returns to discussion of this below in relation to viability.

Research at the Department of Anthropology and Development Studies is organised within a research programme on *Diversity and Inequality*, with two research programme leaders. Two corresponding subthemes have been identified: Inequality and Relatedness in Multicultural Societies and Diversity, Markets and Natural Resources. The research strategy was a response to the previous assessment, which recommended that the Research Group (RG) focus on fewer regions and to work towards an integration of anthropology and development studies. While this strategic change was a response to external recommendations, the committee notes that the RG has been successful in integrating the two strands of research, as individual staff members are often present in both or move between them. The



interviews confirmed the initial impression of a healthy strategic development towards a combined strategy focusing on the intersections between inequality and diversity. One example of such future aspirations is the creation of a theme that draws from both strands of research, namely Mobilizing Change. While some staff suggested that it was a daily struggle, all levels of the department agreed that the strategic reorientation to crosscutting themes had been productive and helped to consolidate collaboration. Some initial resistance had also disappeared as new staff had been hired to strengthen the strategic orientation. Importantly, the re-orientation facilitated a productive rethinking of North-South divides along postcolonial lines (i.e. conceptualizing from the south). More generally, there is a growing turn to Europe in terms of geographical focus, as well as development focus.

In summary, the committee was impressed by the strategic reorientation that had been achieved during the assessment period and which appears to have deepened since. The initial division between anthropology and development studies seems to have been overcome and new crosscutting themes are emerging, not least through the input from different levels of staff. The department has successfully shifted research focus to include Dutch society through a broader postcolonial approach, which is in turn contributing to a deeper understanding of the national context. The committee notes that there is opportunity to further transcend the North-South divide by asserting the relevance of this research agenda to climate change, global health and global development.

### 6.3 Research quality

#### RESEARCH

All levels of staff expressed optimism regarding the research agenda and the transcending of old divisions. The sense that the strategic reorientation has been productive is also confirmed by the department's publications. The previous assessment recommended that the department focus on publishing in high-profile journals. The turn to journal articles is clear. Articles make up nearly 40% of the publications during the assessment period, followed by professional reports. During the same period, the number of book chapters decreased. Although there are some publications in high-ranking anthropology journals, most appear in the broad field of development and sustainability studies and a considerable number in geography and related interdisciplinary fields. Notably, more than 60% of listed publications are multi-authored, many with international scholars. This may also be indicative of different publishing traditions in anthropology and development studies, a division that may become less relevant as the crosscutting themes are further developed. In this way, and confirming the self-assessment, the academic output is sound and competent. There are good prospects for further developing the research quality at the cross-section between anthropology and development studies in ways that transcend divisions between the global North and South. The diversity theme's focus on relatedness, for instance, demonstrates this originality, as does the interesting application of ideas emanating from the global South to understanding phenomena in the global North, for instance those dealing with informality and brokerage. The inequality theme's focus on natural resources is also promising and illustrates the fertile analytical ground between anthropology, science studies and development studies.

#### REPUTATION

The department features a number of recognised scholars within anthropology, serving on editorial boards and in different associations. Department members have also been invited to speak at a significant number of conferences, possibly explaining why staff members have co-authored many publications with international collaborators. Reading through the self-assessment, the committee



notes that junior staff and PhD students have also received awards and appointments and are active in a number of different bodies. This is encouraging and illustrates the department's ability to attract talented staff, while recognising that the department has also lost important staff members to other universities. As management asserts, however, this may be an indication of strength of the department and its staff, as well as an opportunity to recruit new staff members who fit the shifts in research focus.

#### FUNDING

The department has acquired two ERC starting grants that also support PhD students and postdocs. Staff members have also been successful in securing funding from the Dutch Society for Arts and Sciences (KNAW) for several projects, and some have participated in projects on development cooperation and civil society funded by NWO-WOTRO Science for Global Development programmes. Furthermore, a number of smaller grants have been acquired from civil society and governments for contract research. In recent years, the department has prioritised its participation in contract research in ways that strengthen the strategic direction of the department. This suggests a healthy development in funding streams, which is also supported by what appears to be increasing intake of students in a revamped study programme aligned with the new research strategy, thus promising stable direct funding development. While management wished for improved support for grant proposals, staff were generally satisfied with the support they received from the university. Some junior staff, however, mentioned that the support and the recognition from the university varied according to which grants staff applied for, with high-profile ERC grants privileged over smaller grants.

#### 6.4 Societal relevance

The department emphasises that societal relevance is as important as more traditional research output. In no small measure, this focus emanates from a form of development studies that often has an elaborate relation to the non-academic world of development. Interviews confirm that the entire RG is on board with regard to these often-impressive forms of engagement; from municipalities, to education diversity, environment and development. Importantly, the RG emphasises co-creation as a central principle and many projects are directly connected to NGOs and civil society organisations, with a shared focus on relationships between the state and local communities. In similar terms, development studies scholars regularly engage with government agencies, policy makers and evaluation specialists in the applied development field. In line with this, and in comparison with other departments, the RU department produces a large number of professional and policy reports, but fewer publications aimed at the general public.

The interviews confirmed the focus on societal relevance as an important part of the department's activities, which led to the valorising of staff engagement in outreach activities. However, the interviews also confirmed that the department might pursue opportunities for more strategic communications with a broader Dutch and international public. One dimension of this would be to create and communicate a stronger narrative about the research theme on Inequality and Diversity and to then tie individual projects to this overarching narrative. This might also include the development of a consolidated language of anthropology and development studies as a point of departure for a renewed relevance strategy. As it stands, the narrative within the department regarding the salience of the research focus on inequality and diversity became strong over the assessment period among all levels of staff. This internal understanding may be consolidated further to form the point of departure for external outreach to stakeholders in funding agencies, professional organisations, the general public, and the academic world within and outside the Netherlands. In this way, the committee recommends



that the department develop a communication and outreach strategy that will maximise benefits from this very strong conceptual and empirical narrative. Such a narrative may also strengthen the department's position more broadly within the university, where funds are available and the department has already been able to tap into and direct strategies. This would entail working systematically with stakeholder analyses of threats and opportunities for the diverse set of potential collaborators and recipients of the department's research output. It might also entail the further development of new kinds of output, for instance online, audio or visual products tailored to different outreach, and communication platforms beyond the already impressive professional report writing.

### 6.5 Viability

In terms of its future orientation and viability, the department stresses the need to increase diversity, focus more research on natural resources, and further integrate research themes. These are clearly important objectives in terms of viability. The department has good cause for optimism. Funding seems stable, research production is high and competent, and societal relevance is obvious. However, more consideration and reflection could be useful for mitigating the impact of transformations within the academic world on the department.

The department has lost two key researchers in the main two sub-themes (both to Leiden). Viability of the research programme depends on recruiting replacements. The aim is to hire one senior professor in development studies to strengthen the research programme and department. This is a critical issue. The committee recommends a cutting-edge scholar, who perhaps engages with the new directions within development studies, which problematises North-South divides, or who works both in the global North and South. During the interviews, management noted that problems with staff retention related to pull rather than push factors and, indeed, that the openings had enabled the hiring of staff committed to the new strategic orientation. Nonetheless, smaller departments are vulnerable and their continued development is dependent upon successful grant writing. What will be done to ensure this? Grant-writing workshops? As previously mentioned, there might be need to also prioritise smaller grants, not least because these are sometimes more accessible to younger staff.

Organisationally, senior and junior staff, as well as PhDs, appeared to be included in some of the decision-making processes. The interviews also revealed, however, that it may be necessary to address issues around formal and informal hierarchies, as well as discrepancies between the formal and the informal. Some staff noted, for example, that while there are formal requirements for promotion, these were seldom the only requirements in practice. Another issue that arose during interviews were inequalities on different staff levels between those who carry a heavy and sometimes debilitating teaching burden and those with grants who have less teaching; and, on the junior level, between those who could teach and those whose contracts precluded teaching, thereby excluding them from that important experience. There was also variation among staff regarding research time. While the recent assistant professor hires enjoyed 50% research time, there were cases of staff who had been in the department longer but had less research time. There was also a perception that management and the university valued some grants more than others, with ERCs at the top. Hence, while the collegiality and sense of community were obvious during the interviews, the existing issues of inequality and lack of transparency need to be addressed. The department has several structures in place to address issues around precarity, burn-out, teaching loads and PhD completion rates. Interviews suggested, however, that these structures might not be widely used or understood. Clearly, as also suggested by management, many of these issues relate to larger structural issues within Dutch and global academia. The committee nevertheless notes that there are mitigating actions that the department can take. This may be in the form of a departmental forum with representation from all groups, including temporary



teaching staff, in which frank and safe discussions can be conducted on issues such as expectations, aspirations, hierarchies, precarity, informality and diversity. It is up to management to create such safe spaces.

The communication and outreach strategy that the committee proposes above is also central for viability and relates to the general recommendation concerning distinctiveness. The department has an opportunity to position itself as a significant player in the anthropology of development studies, and perhaps in global development. This includes a stronger strategy for researching development within the Netherlands. Addressing the combination of different methodologies—there is a mixed methods potential—is critical in this process. The interviews conveyed awareness of these opportunities, and it was noted that the crosscutting theme of Mobilizing Change within the research programme could be further consolidated as a way to bring perspectives together. The recruiting of a new professor, as noted, should therefore be executed with great care. Finally, apart from the development of distinctive characteristics of the department, it may be worth exploring the possibilities of creating consortia. The department already engages in consortia-building within Radboud University, where it influences a range of thematic developments across the university. Clearly, this should be further explored beyond the university. Furthermore, there are apparent opportunities for developing cross-departmental collaborations between anthropology departments in the Netherlands. A possible first step here could be the development of a research school for anthropology, as suggested in the general recommendations of this report.

## 6.6 PhD programme

Twenty-six PhD students received their doctorate during the assessment period. Currently, there are nine PhDs on contract with 21 external PhDs. According to the self-assessment, the PhD programme is quite elaborate and expansive with a healthy mix of students from Europe and the global South. The PhD students enter the programme through a range of routes and have diverse backgrounds, and many of those from the global South gain access through project grants. This appears to make sustainable graduate training difficult. The role of CERES Research School for International Development is critical in this process, as well as extensive preparation and formal inclusion of external PhD students when they are present at the department.

The description of the PhD programme in the self-assessment report is relatively short. Interviews revealed that there is a formal, university-based system for tracking progress and delays, which is part of the efforts to address completion rates. The self-evaluation report notes that the delay experienced by many PhDs is connected to the nature of anthropological fieldwork as well as to a lack of training. The department states that training through CERES provides (part of) the support PhD students need for finishing their dissertations on time. Training and supervision plans are completed at the start of each PhD trajectory. During the interviews, PhD students reported that they were generally happy with these courses, although those offered by CERES do not cover in-depth anthropological methods, theory or ethics. In addition to existing coursework and PhD seminars, the PhDs noted that they would appreciate better preparation for fieldwork, as well as post-fieldwork discussions on ethics. During the interviews, management noted that the university has systems for addressing mental health issues related to burn out, stress and anxiety. It seems, however, that there is no formal guidance structure in place at the departmental level that focuses on PhD well-being.

PhD students are supervised by two members of staff, including a full professor. In interviews, PhD students were quite appreciative of the support they receive, especially from their supervisors. The supervisors, including junior staff, expressed pride and satisfaction in their dealings with PhD students. However, the committee noted a certain level of informality in the relationship between students and



supervisors. There is nothing inherently wrong with this, unless it is revelatory of other systems of inequality. The discrepancy between supervisory and management/university reactions appeared especially in relation to the Covid-19 crisis, which affected PhD-students (and other project staff) disproportionately. The bureaucratic structures imposed by grants sometimes conflict with interpersonal agreements.

Furthermore, many of the issues around unequal access to research time *and* teaching experience were also relevant among PhD students who were trying to prepare themselves for the academic market. In this light, PhDs and junior scholars suggested that measured teaching obligation could be built into contracts. Finally, although there is a career guidance team at the faculty level, discussions about career paths and preparation for the job market happened mostly informally. Given that there are rarely enough academic jobs for all PhD students, it is important that expectations are discussed and other career trajectories are part of an ongoing discussion with PhD students.

### 6.7 Research integrity

In the self-assessment, the question of research integrity—data management and ethics—is dealt with in quite a formalistic manner, possibly suggesting that there is limited discussion of these issues in the department. In interviews with all groups, this topic was discussed and it appears that there are indeed quite substantive discussions around ethics and research integrity. According to the management, the ERC's focus on ethics has routinised such discussions in the department as a whole. It may be necessary, however, to further formalise some of these discussions, and to embed them in seminars and supervision.

### 6.8 Diversity

The self-assessment report shows that the department is relatively diverse in terms of gender and age. Over the assessment period, 52% men and 48% women were tenured, whereas women were in majority in untenured positions (58 over 42%). Due to retirements, the department has been able to hire new and younger staff. The self-assessment report also explicitly highlights the lack of national and ethnic diversity. The main strategy for diversifying in these regards seems to be the hiring of PhD students and postdocs from different backgrounds. As noted, however, many of these scholars, and in particular PhD students from the global South, tend to return to their home countries after completing, and thus the question remains as to whether there are strategies for creating greater diversity among tenured staff. The interviews illustrated that there is awareness and discussions about diversity within the department, not least prompted by new staff who are engaging in relevant discussions about what constitutes diversity and why diversity is important.

### 6.9 Recommendations

Based on the discussions and the self-assessment, the committee proposes the following overarching recommendations:

- Develop a stronger narrative for external consumption and build this narrative into a strategy for outreach and communication;
- Further develop the global dimension of research in order to transcend the North-South divide;



- Build new strategic alliances while developing the distinctive characteristic of the department at the intersection between North and South and between anthropology and development studies;
- Recruit a cutting-edge development studies professor who can bridge the global North and South;
- Develop organisational structures that allow for ongoing reflections and greater transparency across all staff groups, including temporary staff, to mitigate problems of burn-out, precarity, promotion and diverse expectations;
- Develop grant-writing skills and support structures;
- Develop formalised systems of research tutoring for PhD students and monitor their effectiveness;
- Prepare PhD students for non-academic careers to offset the problem of a limited number of academic posts.





## 7. Department of Cultural Anthropology, Utrecht University

### 7.1 Quantitative assessment

The committee assessed the quality, societal relevance and viability of the Department of Cultural Anthropology both quantitatively and qualitatively. Its PhD programme, research integrity and diversity are assessed qualitatively. For the quantitative assessment a four-point scale was used, according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021. The explanation of the criteria underlying the scores can be found in appendix C. 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:	2

### 7.2 Organisation, strategy and targets

The Department of Cultural Anthropology at the University of Utrecht is part of the larger Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences. The research in the department is organised around a common research programme on *Sovereignty and Social Contestation* (SoSCo). The department also organises three teaching programmes, including the awarding-winning Research Master, Castor from which PhD-candidates have been recruited, thus allowing for better synergies between teaching and the research programmes. Given the relatively small size of the department, this is no small accomplishment. Hence, in 2018, there were just over six full-time employed (FTE) tenured staff, no postdoctoral fellows and just less than four FTE PhD students. In the self-assessment, the department appears relatively flat in its organisation with quite substantial departmental activities. The interviews confirmed this, listing monthly research meetings, research seminars, on-demand reading and drafting seminars, as well as a conference every three years. All staff, including PhD and sometimes Masters students, can and are expected to participate in these activities. Across the different staff groups, these activities were appreciated and the general atmosphere in the department was described as both collegial and generous. Management meets monthly with the senior staff to deal with ongoing issues, but most decisions are taken collaboratively in the department. Junior staff and PhD students appreciated the collegiality and care of management. For example, during the Covid-19 crisis, management was in regular contact with staff to enquire about well-being. Covid-19, however, also revealed vulnerabilities that arise with being a small department and faculty assistance can be necessary in such times.

The research programme SoSCo followed from and emerged out of the previous research programme on political conflict, cultural trauma and social reconstruction, which had positioned the department internationally in anthropological research on war, violence and conflict. SoSCo promises to maintain that position while developing new lines of research. The programme is organised into three dimensions: the cultural and symbolic, the political and coercive, and the legal and moral constitution and contestation of sovereignty. These dimensions constitute sources of inspiration rather than organisational forms, and therefore individual research projects can and do include more than one of each. Parallel to these dimensions, there are two research chairs, but these are described primarily as



functional and often related to teaching contracts. All staff members describe SoSCo as enabling rather than confining, with ample opportunity for junior staff as well to have an impact. For example, one junior staff had begun working on resources and sustainability, which was a new topic for her as well as for SoSCo, but one that had grown out of SoSCo discussions. The department supported the development of this topic by offering teaching relief to further develop her idea. In this way, SoSCo tends to grow out of internal discussions in a bottom-up fashion.

The committee was impressed by the scope of the research and the department's ability to build and develop a new research agenda without compromising the department's internationally acclaimed research agenda. Through recruiting new staff, the previous regional focus on especially Latin America has been broadened to include both Africa and Southern and Eastern Europe, while the thematic focus has developed as collaborations between different staff has been enabled. The committee notes that there are opportunities for further strengthening the department internally at Utrecht University and in relation to other stakeholders by consolidating the shared narrative centred on SoSCo.

### 7.3 Research quality

#### RESEARCH

All staff appreciated the supportive atmosphere of the department, which had enabled higher rates of publication in high-profile journals, as was recommended by the previous assessment. Hence, productivity had almost doubled per FTE in the period under review. Monographs and edited volumes, counted under one in the self-assessment, remained relatively stable at a high level. New staff promise to maintain the high quality. The three dimensions have also been productive and the self-assessment outlines a number of important contributions to academic debates. Both junior and senior staff produced important work together, testifying to the collegial and collaborative work environment. The committee notes with satisfaction that monographs are still important, as these tend to be drivers of conceptual innovation. In line with this, the committee recommends that the department should continue its focus on producing high-quality and high-impact publications rather than prioritize quantity.

#### REPUTATION

The department has long had a strong reputation within Latin American studies, not least around violence and conflict. In the period under review, the assessment committee notes that this focus has been maintained and developed, not least through the analysis of the relation between religion and sovereignty. New staff hires have enabled a broadening of the perspectives of sovereignty into, for instance, resource management, corporate anthropology and sustainability. While this has yet to be fully realised, this bodes well for the reputation of the department. Several external professorships in Dutch and European universities also testify to the reputation of the department and its embedding in important international academic debates. Department researchers are also involved in several academic associations concerned with conflict, bereavement, memory, sports and criminology, as well as in regional academic bodies around the world. Furthermore, some of the younger staff have received award nominations for their work. While the range of different research areas is impressive, given the relatively small staff, the question is whether this dilutes the department's influence on specific and strategically chosen areas. Furthermore, the engagements seem to be primarily individual rather than departmental. Reflections on more strategic prioritisation of areas of influence at the departmental level may increase the quality and the influence of the department at university, national and international levels.



## FUNDING

The department has been successful in attracting several high-profile grants during and after the assessment period from both the ERC and the national research foundation, NWO. These include consolidator grants as well as grants for younger staff and applied research. During the assessment period, the relative distribution of funding from direct (teaching-related) funding and external funding has been generally equal. Furthermore, the department, again in spite of its small size, has been able to attract internal university funding for several interdisciplinary focus areas on culture, citizenship and human rights, as well as pathways to sustainability. The department seems well positioned to further develop these cross-university collaborations. Staff expressed general satisfaction with support from both department management and the university in seeking funds. It was noted, however, that grants that are perceived as high profile received more attention, at least from the university and the faculty. This may create unhealthy hierarchies in the department and steer application efforts towards high-profile grants, over which competition is increasingly fierce. The assessment committee further notes the almost non-existence of contract research, as well as the fact that European application drives are strictly focused on the ERC. The department may want to reflect on whether this is the appropriate way forward for securing the viability of the department (see also below).

#### 7.4 Societal relevance

The self-assessment report notes that the level of contract research remained lower than in the previous period. Contract research, however, is just one indicator of societal relevance. Hence, the department engages in dissemination to the wider public through interviews and other media appearances. Some staff also engage in direct collaboration with external stakeholders, both inside the Netherlands and beyond. Through the university-based projects, the department is also supplying input into urgent societal matters.

As also noted in the self-assessment report, however, social relevance may be the area with greatest opportunity for improvement, including influencing debates on what constitutes societal relevance, despite the obvious strengths of the department in this regard. As noted by some senior staff members, societal relevance is often reduced to national forms of relevance, often through the media. For a department with a strong international profile, this may prove difficult. Nonetheless, the committee proposes that there are opportunities that may be pursued if the department would engage more strategically with societal relevance in ways that build on the strengths of the department, but that do not compromise academic and anthropological quality.

The discussions with senior staff revealed one such avenue, as it was suggested that SoSCo researchers, as a collective, should be much better at consolidating the research programme into a compelling and convincing narrative. Individual research projects would then be able to associate their projects with the overall narrative. This would make communication of relevance easier to understand, while turning it into a departmental issue rather than one of individual responsibility. Another way would be to conduct a more thorough stakeholder analysis of who would be interested in the research as formulated in the narrative and how to more effectively address these audiences, be they civil society groups, the general public, policy makers, funding agencies or the rest of the university. Clearly, this does not strictly target the Netherlands. As staff suggest, they are making contributions in the places where they conduct research. With strong regional networks, there are real opportunities to further develop this in ways that also begin generating new understandings of societal relevance - if it is described and promoted. As revealed in the interviews, communication is understood in relatively traditional terms, as when



journalists contact researchers for expert statements and analysis. However, this may be developed further to allow researchers to think about how and where to act proactively. With decreasing journalistic space and increasingly diverse media outlets, there are major opportunities to influence public debates. This cannot be the responsibility of individual researchers but demands support from the department and the university, not least communication departments, which includes translation to allow international staff to participate. This suggests that the department, along with university support systems, must consider existing platforms, as well as think about new relevant ones. These suggestions must all be seen in the light of available staff resources. Hence, the committee recommends that the department engages in strategic prioritisations around societal relevance that may take into account some of the suggestions above.

### 7.5 Viability

In terms of most indicators, the SoSCo research group has seen a healthy development during and after the period under review. There is a strong research focus, building on past strength yet theoretically innovative. Funding and academic output appear to be stable. Over the past years, the department has employed a number of new junior and senior staff, who have clearly strengthened and added value to the department and expanded the research focus in strategic ways. Rather than a rapid expansion, there has been a slow and gradual replacement of staff. The new hires are the result of both new externally-funded research projects, as well as staff turnover following a number of retirements. The department has recruited a mix of international and national staff to allow for an increased internationalization, while at the same time taking care that the teaching, mainly in Dutch, remains sustainable. At the same time, due to the collegial and collaborative culture in the department, the new staff members have been invited to feed into the ongoing direction of research rather than shape their own. One way of addressing this is to add a new research dimension on ‘the economic and sustainable constitution and contestation of sovereignty.’

The department is aware of the potentially corrosive effects of “grant culture” and the threat of creating a two-tier hierarchy among those with grants and those with heavy teaching loads. Together with the university more broadly, the department has tried to address these issues in three ways. First, regardless of grants, all staff must continue to teach at a reduced percentage. Second, the Faculty tries to create better contracts for temporary teaching staff by employing them to teach in more programmes, thereby ensuring that temporary staff members receive a living wage from the university. Third, the department reduces teaching loads in order to enable staff to develop grant proposals (it is unclear whether this also applies to temporary staff). The committee welcomes these initiatives and recommends that issues of precarity be addressed and continually monitored at all staff levels. Special care should be given to temporary staff because the health and the viability of the department depend on them. This is especially the case given that the department has extensive teaching obligations for a relatively small staff. As indicated in interviews, Covid-19 exposed these departmental vulnerabilities when teaching had to be reformatted to online platforms.

While the department appears balanced in its staff composition, one group stands out through its absence. During the assessment period, the department had very few postdoctoral scholars employed. In the period under review, the department tried to increase their numbers by creating three posts. However, after the end of the assessment period with the awarding of ERC consolidator grants, the dearth of postdocs has been addressed. While research foundations in the Netherlands privilege PhD students, the possibilities for recruiting postdocs are largely dependent on ERC grants, which potentially creates barriers in career opportunities for talented PhDs. The committee recommends that the department continues testing ways to increase the number of postdocs and not rely solely on large ERC



grants that tend to work best for the grant holders, often leaving staff as instruments for the implementation of the project. One option here would be to work with smaller grants, as mentioned earlier, to create opportunities for junior, untenured staff.

In all interviews, as well as in the self-assessment, the flat structure of the department is highlighted as positive and generative of a collegial and supportive institutional culture. This structure seems to be working on the basis of collegial generosity and informal relations. While this is no doubt central for the wellbeing of the department, the committee wishes to caution against relying on informality in all matters. Informality works in some circumstances, but in others it can be exclusionary and damaging to work environments. The committee is certain that the department is aware of the dangers of informality and recommends more formalized ways of managing informality, for instance, through the establishment of a departmental forum with representation from all groups of staff, including temporary teaching staff.

A final point relating to viability concerns interdisciplinarity. The department has correctly identified the need for and opportunity of interdisciplinarity. The department seems well placed to engage in interdisciplinary projects at the university level. This is clearly important for the continued viability of the department. While interdisciplinarity is central, it clearly comes with the risk of compromising the anthropological core of the department's work and the source of its success. Hence, the committee recommends that the department maintain its strong anthropological focus, resisting being reduced to the "ethnographic element" in large interdisciplinary projects, but without retreating from such collaborations. One possible avenue in this regard would be to engage in national collaboration with other anthropology departments, for instance through the proposed national research school for anthropology.

## 7.6 PhD programme

The self-assessment shows that ten new PhD-researchers joined SoSCo with 0.8/1.0 appointments between 2012 and 2018 and that the completion of PhDs projects is often delayed by two to three years. It is noteworthy that PhDs who join SoSCo with external funding are not considered in these numbers. Management and senior staff were aware of the problems of delays and noted this in the self-assessment report. One strategy to improve completion rates has been to draw the PhD students closer to the research group and not distinguish between PhD students and tenured staff in the daily life of the department. While this is clearly a strategy to improve the quality of work and the life of students, it is debatable whether working on departmental activities facilitates quicker completion rates. During the interviews, for their part, PhDs expressed a general sense of satisfaction about their experiences at SoSCo. They were particularly happy about the SoSCo-seminars, as well as their own PhD writing seminars. Yet, on several occasions, students noted that informality, albeit pleasant and academically productive, may also contribute to PhDs' extended completion rates. Students suggested that a better system of "checks and balances" that can promote a sense of shared accountability, involving more staff than the student and the supervisor, would help them navigate their trajectories more efficiently. Additionally, students suggested that such a system might also improve student well-being through early detection of possible problems. PhD students stated that while their career paths are the topic of discussions, particularly in the later part of their programmes, more could be done to support them after finishing their PhDs in terms of creating or imagining new opportunities.

In the self-assessment, PhD courses are described as being organised by CERES and other universities. During the interviews, it was also noted that PhD students can take part in upper-level Bachelor and Masters courses, if considered beneficial. Moreover, both in the self-assessment and in the interviews, attention was brought to the excellently evaluated CASTOR Master programme. Yet, in spite of



recognising that PhD students can certainly benefit from the flexibility with which course work is organised, staff members and PhDs also indicated that the “looseness” of the PhD programme can constitute threats. The lack of PhD courses within the department, particularly those with a disciplinary focus, was also apparent in the self-assessment and brought up in the interviews. While recognising the difficulties of organising these courses in a relatively small department, they might be important for the cohesion of the PhD community and the fieldwork preparations of PhDs. A national research school for anthropology, as recommended in the general section, may constitute a way forward in this regard.

In summary, while the department has clearly created an environment for PhD students that is generous and conducive for work, the committee would recommend a number of initiatives that might improve the quality of the programme. First, to enhance uniformity and cohesion in the SoSCo PhD programme the committee recommends that a research tutor is appointed who can complement the supervision team to keep track of PhD progress; be the contact point for PhDs who might experience problems, and organise small-scale course work with a disciplinary focus. Second, in line with the comments under “viability”, the department could develop a postdoc vision to create a sense of opportunity for the SoSCo PhDs, and to help with the recruitment of “young, vibrant staff” who can – as recent PhD-graduates – also function as a support system for active PhDs, as one junior staff suggested. Third, the Department should continue to involve PhDs – internal and external – in SoSCo-seminars and activities, as these are highly appreciated by PhDs, while keeping check that these do not take too much time away from the PhD project. Finally, the department may keep cohorts in mind when planning PhD trajectories. Whenever it is possible, it is advantageous for PhDs to start at the same time, so that they can support each other as they go through the various stages of the PhD trajectory.

### **7.7 Research integrity**

The University of Utrecht has the necessary tools and procedures in place to deal with the various aspects of research integrity. However, since these are located mostly at Faculty level, the question is how well these more general tools and procedures are attuned to the specificities of anthropological research. In discussions with management the committee was satisfied with the discussions that are ongoing since 2013. These discussions take place in seminars and are integral to supervision. The department is finalising additions to protocols in relation to data packages and informed consent. Many of these initiatives happen at the Faculty level as well. The management of the department suggested during the review that there is need to improve the training of PhD’s in relation to research ethics. Most of the discussions concerned data and the production of data and less about power relations in research and inside research teams. The committee recommends that such discussions become part of discussions around research integrity.

### **7.8 Diversity**

Discussions concerning diversity are not prominent in the self-assessment, which briefly rehearses some of the more classical notions of diversity, especially the composition of staff in terms of age, gender and nationality. In terms of these parameters, the department is doing relatively well, not least as a result of the recent hires. The discussions with different groups of staff testified to the complicated nature of the issue as well as the extent to which it is being discussed within the department. It is clear that the main issue relates to whether ethnicity or race is a more important than, for instance, representation of sexual minorities or people with disabilities. A group of PhD students had in fact worked on a toolbox for diversity that could be used in recruitment drives, at least for PhD students, to increase diversity. The committee recommends that the department and the Faculty support such local initiatives to



strengthen the actual implementation of diversity policies to complement the formalisation of guidelines.

### **7.9 Recommendations**

Based on the discussions and the self-assessment, the committee proposes the following recommendations:

- Develop a stronger narrative for the SoSCo research programme for external audiences and build this narrative into a strategy for outreach and communication;
- Develop organisational structures that allow for continual reflection and greater transparency across all staff groups, including temporary staff, in order to mitigate problems of burn-out, precarity, promotion and diverse expectations;
- Develop strategies to increase the number of postdoctoral scholars;
- Develop formalised systems of research tutoring for PhD students and monitor their effectiveness;
- Prepare PhD students for non-academic careers to off-set the problem of limited numbers of academic posts;
- Develop formalised guidelines and toolboxes for diversity and test them in practice.



## Appendix A - Programme of the site visit

### Tuesday September 15

Time	Part
13.00 – 17.30	General preparation

### Wednesday September 16

Time	Part
<b>VU UNIVERSITY</b>	
13.00 – 13.30	Preparatory meeting
13.30 – 14.10	Management
14.10 – 14.20	evaluation
14.20 – 14.50	Junior staff
14.50 – 15.15	Evaluation and break
15.15 – 15.45	PhD students
15.45 – 15.50	Evaluation
15.50 – 16.30	Senior staff
16.30 – 17.00	Break
17.00 – 17.20	Reflections and preparing questions for the management
17.20 – 17.50	Management
17.50 – 19.00	Evaluation

### Thursday September 17

Time	Part
<b>LEIDEN UNIVERSITY</b>	
13.00 – 13.30	Preparatory meeting
13.30 – 14.10	Management
14.10 – 14.20	evaluation
14.20 – 14.50	Junior staff
14.50 – 15.15	Evaluation and break
15.15 – 15.45	PhD students
15.45 – 15.50	Evaluation
15.50 – 16.30	Senior staff
16.30 – 17.00	Break
17.00 – 17.20	Reflections and preparing questions for the management
17.20 – 17.50	Management
17.50 – 19.00	Evaluation





**Friday September 18**

Time	Part
<b>RADBOD UNIVERSITY</b>	
13.00 – 13.30	Preparatory meeting
13.30 – 14.10	Management
14.10 – 14.20	evaluation
14.20 – 14.50	Junior staff
14.50 – 15.15	Evaluation and break
15.15 – 15.45	PhD students
15.45 – 15.50	Evaluation
15.50 – 16.30	Senior staff
16.30 – 17.00	Break
17.00 – 17.20	Reflections and preparing questions for the management
17.20 – 17.50	Management
17.50 – 19.00	Evaluation

**Monday September 21**

Time	Part
<b>UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM</b>	
13.00 – 13.30	Preparatory meeting
13.30 – 14.10	Management
14.10 – 14.20	evaluation
14.20 – 14.50	Junior staff
14.50 – 15.15	Evaluation and break
15.15 – 15.45	PhD students
15.45 – 15.50	Evaluation
15.50 – 16.30	Senior staff
16.30 – 17.00	Break
17.00 – 17.20	Reflections and preparing questions for the management
17.20 – 17.50	Management
17.50 – 19.00	Evaluation



**Wednesday September 23**

Time	Part
<b>UTRECHT UNIVERSITY</b>	
13.00 – 13.30	Preparatory meeting
13.30 – 14.10	Management
14.10 – 14.20	evaluation
14.20 – 14.50	Junior staff
14.50 – 15.15	Evaluation and break
15.15 – 15.45	PhD students
15.45 – 15.50	Evaluation
15.50 – 16.30	Senior staff
16.30 – 17.00	Break
17.00 – 17.20	Reflections and preparing questions for the management
17.20 – 17.50	Management
17.50 – 19.00	Evaluation

**Friday September 25**

Time	Part
13.00 – 16.00	Evaluation panel
16.00	Presentation chair



## Appendix B.1 - Quantitative data Leiden

Table 1 Research staff in fte Leiden

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Scientific staff	3.42	3.42	4.58	4.69	6.34	6.15
Postdocs	0.8	0.27	0	0.69	1.06	0.8
PhD students	5.79	4.15	2.23	1.68	3.74	6.67
<b>Total research staff</b>	<b>10.39</b>	<b>7.83</b>	<b>6.81</b>	<b>7.07</b>	<b>11.18</b>	<b>13.62</b>

Table 2 Funding – Leiden

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
<i>Funding in FTE</i>						
Direct funding	4.73	4.98	4.28	3.89	2.96	3.35
Research grants	4.89	2.25	0.93	0.21	0.51	0.91
Contract research	0.17	-	1.00	2.37	7.42	9.36
Other	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.3	-
<b>Total funding</b>	<b>10.39</b>	<b>7.83</b>	<b>6.81</b>	<b>7.07</b>	<b>11.18</b>	<b>13.62</b>
<i>Expenditure in k€</i>						
Personnel costs	127.684	158.893	202.206	265.538	262.365	447.711
Other costs	927.311	824.326	804.945	891.738	1.150.155	1.539.461
<b>Total expenditure</b>	<b>799.627</b>	<b>665.432</b>	<b>602.739</b>	<b>626.201</b>	<b>887.790</b>	<b>1.091.750</b>



## Appendix B.2 – Quantitative data VU

Table 1 Research staff in fte VU

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Scientific staff	3.94	3.94	3.52	4.14	4.23	3.45
Postdocs	0.17	0.17	0.04	0.20	1.09	2.86
PhD students	5.25	4.71	3.38	2.28	1.43	1.72
<b>Total research staff</b>	<b>9.36</b>	<b>8.82</b>	<b>6.94</b>	<b>6.62</b>	<b>6.75</b>	<b>8.03</b>

Table 2 Funding – VU

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
<i>Funding in FTE</i>						
Direct funding	6.30	4.86	4.47	3.80	3.18	3.36
Research grants	3.06	3.96	2.47	2.74	3.10	4.59
Contract research	-	-	-	0.08	0.47	0.08
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total funding</b>	<b>9.36</b>	<b>8.82</b>	<b>6.94</b>	<b>6.62</b>	<b>6.75</b>	<b>8.03</b>
<i>Expenditure in k€</i>						
Personnel costs	796	826	794	521	829	930
Other costs	108	120	104	61	121	139
<b>Total expenditure</b>	<b>904</b>	<b>946</b>	<b>898</b>	<b>582</b>	<b>950</b>	<b>1,069</b>



## Appendix B.3 – Quantitative data UvA

Table 1 Research staff in fte UvA

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Scientific staff	13.89	13.91	13.55	15.16	15.69	15.21
Postdocs	14.35	14.43	13.98	12.69	12.00	8.35
PhD students	31.28	35.63	34.51	36.15	31.61	28.43
<b>Total research staff</b>	<b>59.52</b>	<b>63.96</b>	<b>62.03</b>	<b>63.99</b>	<b>59.31</b>	<b>51.99</b>

Table 2 Funding – UvA

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
<i>Funding in FTE</i>						
Direct funding	11.92	11.74	11.83	12.55	13.25	10.26
Research grants	30.23	32.50	32.74	35.63	34.15	30.60
Contract research	17.23	19.57	17.45	15.61	11.71	10.60
Other	0.15	0.15	0.02	0.20	0.20	0.53
<b>Total funding</b>	<b>59.52</b>	<b>63.96</b>	<b>62.03</b>	<b>63.99</b>	<b>59.31</b>	<b>51.99</b>
<i>Expenditure in k€</i>						
Personnel costs	2,500	3,101	3,090	3,561	4,441	3,793
Other costs	2,437	2,329	2,571	2,981	2,922	2,491
<b>Total expenditure</b>	<b>4,937</b>	<b>5,431</b>	<b>5,662</b>	<b>6,541</b>	<b>7,362</b>	<b>6,284</b>



## Appendix B.4 – Quantitative data Nijmegen

Table 1 Research staff in fte Nijmegen

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Scientific staff	5.91	5.67	5.58	6.04	6.45	7.01
Postdocs	3.95	3.09	1.10	3.15	4.55	6.01
PhD students	3.93	2.80	1.87	5.52	10.61	10.47
<b>Total research staff</b>	<b>13.79</b>	<b>11.56</b>	<b>8.55</b>	<b>14.71</b>	<b>21.61</b>	<b>23.49</b>

Table 2 Funding – Nijmegen

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
<i>Funding in FTE</i>						
Direct funding	8.93	7.81	6.24	8.50	10.43	8.85
Research grants	1.08	0.63	0.66	4.80	9.52	13.63
Contract research	3.78	3.12	1.65	1.41	1.66	1.01
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total funding</b>	<b>13.79</b>	<b>11.56</b>	<b>8.55</b>	<b>14.71</b>	<b>21.61</b>	<b>23.49</b>
<i>Expenditure in k€</i>						
Personnel costs	862	697	536	885	1261	1484
Other costs	296	246	253	241	197	223
<b>Total expenditure</b>	<b>1158</b>	<b>943</b>	<b>789</b>	<b>1126</b>	<b>1458</b>	<b>1707</b>



## Appendix B.5 – Quantitative data Utrecht

Table 1 Research staff in fte Utrecht

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Scientific staff	4.96	4.94	3.88	5.60	6.47	6.20
Postdocs	-	0.46	0.83	0.80	0.13	-
PhD students	3.85	5.09	6.97	6.40	5.03	3.99
<b>Total research staff</b>	<b>8.81</b>	<b>10.49</b>	<b>11.68</b>	<b>12.80</b>	<b>11.63</b>	<b>10.04</b>

Table 2 Funding – Utrecht

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
<i>Funding in FTE</i>						
Direct funding	5.62	4.22	4.	5.15	6.00	5.37
Research grants	3.68	5.58	8.38	9.12	6.67	5.64
Contract research	0.47	2.06	0.10	0.13	0.16	0.03
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total funding</b>	<b>9.77</b>	<b>11.86</b>	<b>13.37</b>	<b>14.40</b>	<b>12.83</b>	<b>11.04</b>
<i>Expenditure in €</i>						
Personnel costs	655,329	712,296	764,053	900,272	842,299	752,962
Other costs	132,117	170,684	137,015	160,199	143,728	126,090
<b>Total expenditure</b>	<b>787,446</b>	<b>882,980</b>	<b>901,068</b>	<b>1,060,471</b>	<b>986,027</b>	<b>879,052</b>



## Appendix C – 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

