RESEARCH REVIEW

PSYCHOLOGY 2017

QANU
Catharijnesingel 56
PO Box 8035
3503 RA Utrecht
The Netherlands

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

Project: 0642

REPORT ON THE RESEARCH REVIEW OF PSYCHOLOGY OF NINE UNIVERSITIES IN THE NETHERLANDS

1. FOREWORD BY COMMITTEE CHAIR

The report before you presents the outcome of the review of the research in Psychology at nine Dutch universities, according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021 adopted by the KNAW, the VSNU and NWO. As prescribed by the protocol the evaluation committee, consisting of a chairman and six other foreign members (for its task assisted by two secretaries of QANU), performed an evaluation of the overall strategy and targets, the quality of the research and its societal relevance as well as the viability of the research Institutes. In addition, the committee also looked at the quality of the PhD training programs and at the Institutes' diversity and research integrity policies. Importantly, the evaluations concerned the research of the Institutes as a whole and not that of the constituent research groups within the Institutes.

Information about how the committee went about its task can be found in section two of this report, which is then followed by an overall evaluation of Dutch Psychology research in general (section three). The remaining sections express the committee's evaluation of each of the nine research Institutes separately.

On behalf of the entire committee and in my personal name I want to express our gratitude to the nine Institutes for having made our task quite manageable. The self-assessments were all very well written, transparent, to the point and informative. We experienced the interviews with the management, with delegations of the researchers and with groups of PhD candidates as very open and candid. Moreover, the cordial atmosphere in which the interviews took place more than compensated for the – admittedly - time and energy consuming task the committee was confronting.

A very special word of thanks should go towards the two secretaries who assisted the committee, Meg Van Bogaert and Anna Sparreboom. Their pre-evaluation briefings, their guidance throughout the entire week of the visit, not only in terms of our actual evaluation task, but also in terms of taking great care of us in other respects, allowed us to concentrate fully on the task before us. Moreover, their ever present good mood was much appreciated.

Within the context of the SEP the committee attempted to be as constructive and as fair as possible in writing down its evaluations. I can speak for the entire committee in stating that we were very impressed with the high quality of Psychology research in the Netherlands and its reaching out towards society. The committee is also convinced that all the Institutes reviewed have a viable future ahead of them. When we felt that a recommendation was in order, we did formulate it, in a spirit of modesty, knowing very well that not every dream can be fulfilled.

We wish you all a bright future!

Eddy Van Avermaet
Chair of the committee

2. THE REVIEW COMMITTEE AND THE PROCEDURES

2.1. Scope of the review

The review committee has been asked to perform a review of the research in Psychology at nine universities in the Netherlands. For each participating University the research in Psychology is reviewed as one research unit. The review in this report includes the following research units:

- Institute of Psychology (IOP), Department of Psychology, Education & Child studies (DPECS), Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR);
- Leiden University Institute of Psychology, Leiden University (UL);
- Department of Psychology, Open University of the Netherlands (OU);
- Psychology Research Institute Amsterdam, University of Amsterdam (UvA);
- Heymans Institute for Psychological Research, University of Groningen (UG);
- Faculty of Psychology and Neuroscience, Maastricht University (MU);
- Tilburg School of Social and Behavioral Sciences (TSB), Tilburg University (TiU);
- Programme *Navigating a Complex World: Perception, Identity, and Self-Regulation*, Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Utrecht University (UU);
- Psychology departments of the Faculty of Behavioural and Movement Science, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (VU).

In accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021 (SEP) for research reviews in the Netherlands, the committee's tasks were to assess for each research unit the scientific quality, the relevance to society and the viability of the research as well as the strategic targets and the extent to which the research unit is equipped to achieve these targets. Furthermore, a qualitative review of the PhD training programmes, research integrity policies and diversity policies were part of the committee's assignment. In addition, the nine research Institutes of Psychology asked the committee to assess the performance of Dutch Psychology on a national level, compared to international trends.

2.2. Composition of the committee

The composition of the committee was as follows:

- professor emeritus Eddy Van Avermaet (chair), KU Leuven, Belgium;
- professor Marcel Brass, Ghent University, Belgium;
- professor emerita Elizabeth Kuipers, King's College London, United Kingdom;
- professor Patrick Onghena, KU Leuven, Belgium;
- professor emerita Lea Pulkkinen, University of Jyväskylä, Finland;
- professor Bas Verplanken, University of Bath, United Kingdom;
- professor Jan Wacker, University of Hamburg, Germany.

The curricula vitae of the committee members are included in Appendix 2.

The committee was supported by Dr. Meg van Bogaert and Dr. Anna Sparreboom, who acted as secretaries on behalf of QANU.

2.3. Independence

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

2.4. Documentation provided to the committee

The committee received the self-evaluation report from the research Institutes under review, including all the information required by the SEP. The committee also received the following documents:

- The Terms of Reference;
- The SEP 2015-2021;
- Previous reports of research reviews in Psychology;
- General introduction to the Evaluation of Dutch Psychology, by the nine participating research Institutes.

2.5. Procedures followed by the committee

The committee proceeded according to the SEP 2015-2021. Prior to the site visit, all committee members were requested to independently formulate a preliminary assessment concerning the research unit(s) under review, based on the written information that was provided. To limit the workload for the committee members and to ensure that all research Institutes receive equal attention, each committee member was dedicated to four research Institutes. Nevertheless, all committee members read all self-evaluation reports and were jointly responsible for the review, scoring and report of all nine Institutes.

The final report is based on the documentation provided by the research units, but it also includes the information gathered during the interviews with management and representatives of the research units. The interviews took place from 17 – 22 September 2017 in Utrecht.

Preceding the interviews, the committee was briefed by QANU about research reviews according to the SEP and was provided with information regarding specifics about Dutch research (e.g. funding and position of PhD candidates). It also discussed the preliminary findings, decided upon a number of comments and questions, and agreed upon procedural matters and aspects of the review.

After the interviews, the committee discussed its findings and comments, allowing the secretaries to draft a first version of the review report. The draft was based on the discussions during the site visit and a written one-page review by the committee members. The draft report was verified and added to by the committee before being presented to the research units concerned for factual corrections and comments. The comments were reviewed by the secretary and incorporated in the final report in close consultation with the chair and other committee members. The final report was presented to the Board of the Universities and to the management of the research units.

2.6. Application of the SEP and scores

The committee used the criteria and categories of the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021 (SEP), for more information see Appendix 1. The committee would like to make a number of remarks with respect to using the SEP scores that should be taken into careful consideration when comparing the outcomes of this review with any other research review according to the SEP. The committee is of the opinion that the scores in this report cannot be compared to the scores in the previous report.

The committee agreed that for a score 1 (excellent) the committee had to be unanimous that the major part of the work of the research unit deserved the judgement: "one of the few leading groups worldwide" (in line with the present and previous SEP definition). As to the other categories, it should be remarked that the remaining present SEP scores range between 2 (very good), 3 (good) and 4 (unsatisfactory), while those of the previous SEP ranged between 4 (very good), 3 (good), 2 (satisfactory) and 1 (unsatisfactory). Because, as prescribed by SEP, the committee could only use whole numbers and no intermediate categories, such as 1.5 o 2.5, it follows that the present category 'very good' covers a broader range than its predecessor in the previous SEP. In line with this remark the committee decided to use the score 2 (very good) for research quality and relevance to society rather broadly, meaning that the range of this score runs from 'superior to good' to 'close to excellent'. It should therefore also be interpreted in close connection with the qualitative comments

in the text. Finally, within each research unit a number of research groups are combined, each with its own quality, relevance and viability. The committee combined the work of all research groups into its findings and scores, also including the interaction between the research groups and the overarching findings at the level of the research unit. This obviously led to an "average" score, which – again - cannot be compared with those of previous reviews without reading the qualitative comments in the text.

3. DUTCH PSYCHOLOGY ON A NATIONAL LEVEL

3.1. Introduction

Prior to the site visit, the committee read the self-evaluation reports of all nine participating Institutes/Universities, as well as the General introduction to the review and some additional documentation. In the interviews, the information in the documentation was discussed, verified and complemented. Overall, the committee was impressed by the high quality of Psychology research in the Netherlands and can fully subscribe the conclusion in the General introduction that Dutch Psychology performs well above the international benchmark. It should be observed that the CWTS analysis supporting this conclusion is based on a highly competitive benchmark, including countries such as the USA and the UK (see Appendix 4 on the CWTS analysis). In addition, the committee concluded that the research infrastructures and facilities have been expanded and improved considerably since the previous assessment, which also contributed to the overall very high quality of psychological research in the Netherlands.

3.2. Differentiation and multi-, inter- and cross-disciplinary research

The committee considered the broad coverage of all domains in the field of Psychology at nine Institutes that were evaluated a great strength for Dutch Psychology. Of course all Institutes have a different focus, but together they carry out research of very high quality on the national level, both fundamental and applied, in clinical, developmental, social and organisational, cognitive (experimental) Psychology and psychological methods. The science map that was created for the review demonstrates this broad coverage; Dutch Psychology ranges from research into social behaviour, work and organization, child development and mental disorders to studies into cognitive processes and brain imaging research.

At the same time, psychological research in the Netherlands has been shaped by the desire of the Dutch government to create a more differentiated landscape of research and teaching. In the Strategic Agenda for Higher Education, Research and Science (2011), which was based on the report of the Veerman Committee on the Future Sustainability of the Dutch Higher Education System (2010), the government urged each University to establish a distinct profile with a focus on multidisciplinary research, societal impact and relevance of fundamental research. The present review committee supported the above recommendation, because the creation of stronger research profiles will increase focus and specialization, but noted that it can also lead to the marginalization or disappearance of certain research topics or subfields. The review committee encourages differentiation and specialization, but at the same time would like Dutch Psychology as a whole to maintain coverage of all subfields. The science map in the General introduction of the self-evaluation reports provides a good overview of the profiles and strengths of the respective institutes and can serve as a starting point for this. In accomplishing full coverage of all Psychology subfields in the Netherlands, which is particularly necessary where subfields are aligned to teaching priorities, collaboration between the participating universities is required.

Multi-, inter- and cross-disciplinary research is stimulated by an emphasis on public outreach, a requirement for research to be socially relevant and calls for large consortia by national and European grant agencies and funding bodies (Strategic Agenda through NWO and Horizon2020 at EU level). The committee noted that the differentiation-policy of the government in some Institutes had resulted in the development of so-called research focus areas, themes that bring researchers from across a University together in cross-disciplinary clusters. Others have organized their research along more traditional disciplinary lines, but at the same time encourage researchers to align their research with the university-wide research areas. The committee observed that *there is not a single optimal organisational structure*; it observed that both systems with traditional disciplinary groups as well as more theme-inspired clusters can successfully foster collaborations and cross- and interdisciplinary research. The committee believes, however, that collaborations with researchers in other groups, departments, schools or faculties are most viable when they grow, at least to a certain extent, organically (i.e. guided by academic questions) and are not managed exclusively in a top-down

direction. Furthermore, high quality of the staff and encouragement and support from the management are key factors in facilitating cross-fertilization.

3.3. Research output: quality over quantity

The committee observed a trend towards valuing quality over quantity in evaluating the scientific output of staff members. This was mentioned explicitly by some research units, while in others the trend was less pronounced, or more implicit. It entails that researchers are no longer encouraged to publish as many articles as possible, but are stimulated to submit primarily top quality papers in high impact journals. The committee noted that this trend is connected to the move away from monodisciplinary, or single author, research towards more and more team based research groups both within and across disciplines. As a side effect, this move has an effect on the citation scores of the research output; although papers in neuroscience, for example, are generally cited more frequently than Psychology papers, inter- or cross disciplinary research by psychologists published in medical or neuroscientific journals may have lower citation rates than purely neuroscience publications in the same outlets. The committee does not feel this means that the inter- or cross disciplinary research is more or less valuable and fully supports the developments of publishing in journals that are most appropriate.

The committee was pleased to see that this quality-over-quantity-policy was often shared and operationalized across Departments, by researchers from junior to senior level. For PhD candidates, for instance, the obligation to have published all parts of their research-project (papers) before finishing their PhD is abandoned at a number of Institutes; having publications is no longer a prerequisite for defending the dissertation, and instead the focus is on the quality of the work. The committee appreciated the fact that in many institutes young researchers are supported and guided in the choices they make in their publishing strategy, since choosing to aim for quality instead of quantity of publications is easier and less risky for established scientists than for researchers in the early phases of their career.

3.4. Teaching and funding for research

All of the institutes that took part in this review also contribute to educational programmes in Psychology, which means that all research staff above PhD and postdoc-level have teaching duties, except when they have been temporarily exempted, for example because of research sabbaticals (normally they teach 40% of their contract, but sometimes up to 60% or 70%). Since direct funding for research is largely based on the number of enrolling and graduated students (see below), Institutes benefit from having large numbers of students. At the same time, with increasing numbers of students, the teaching load increases and also the amount of research time decreases. Because direct funding is based on student numbers of the preceding academic years, a misbalance of funding and teaching load may occur when student numbers have suddenly risen and the corresponding increase in direct funding lags behind. The committee spoke with the Institutes about the effect that this has on the teaching load of staff and concluded that particularly those at assistant professor level are at risk of spending too much time on teaching. This prevents them from investing their time in research and writing grant proposals. Sometimes the teaching load is experienced as a burden even by researchers at more senior level, who in addition also have to cope with increasing administrative duties. The committee advises the management of Institutes, Schools, Faculties and Universities to consider this issue in their strategic plans and policy.

The Institutes that were reviewed have different strategies with regard to acquiring funding for their research; they all rely on first-, second- and third stream funding, but the distribution of the funding into the three categories varies between institutes. In the review period (2011-2016), the proportion of direct government funding (first stream), which is based on the number of bachelor and master students that enrol and graduate in the educational programmes and the number of graduated PhD candidates at the institutes, ranged from 29% to 75% of the total funding. Second stream funding, which includes research grants at national and international level (e.g. VENI, VIDI, VICI and ERC), comprised 13-51% of the total research budget and is increasingly intended to be spent on multidisciplinary research projects. Third stream funding, which consists of funding for contract

research and Horizon2020, constituted 6-21% of the total funding. The direct funding of some institutes consisted of partial beta-funding. Although educational programmes in Psychology are not considered eligible for beta-funding by the government, the Executive Boards of a number of Universities have decided to allocate partial beta-funding to the Psychology programmes, which translates into a larger amount of funding per student. Because educational programmes in Psychology typically entail major and expensive equipment and facilities similar to natural sciences like biology and chemistry, the committee considers that the additional funding is justified. It requests the Executive Boards of all Universities to – if not already in place – consider if partial beta-funding would be appropriate considering the costs of the programmes.

The committee has seen that the Institutes all have different strategies with regard to acquiring second and third stream research funding and applauds the observed flexibility and vision in the process of adapting to new possibilities for funding. According to the committee, the increased focus on second- and third stream funding is understandable given the uncertainty about future developments in the funding system on policy level. The committee considers it important to have a sound balance between the three categories of funding and not become too dependent on one of them. The allocation of direct funding within the university is an important factor in the unpredictability of income. The committee observed that in some institutions the amount of direct funding is not always completely predictable. The committee wants to emphasise that clarity and predictability with regard to future (direct) funding are of crucial importance for the Institutes' strategic planning, human resources policy and financial management.

3.5. Human resource policy

The committee was pleased to meet many enthusiastic and inspiring researchers during the site visit and has the impression that overall all researchers feel that they work in a pleasant atmosphere and supportive environment. The committee noted high mobility of research staff between different Dutch universities. With regard to the career perspective of the researchers on different levels, the committee observed some potential challenges with respect to which different strategies are being implemented. These differences are predominantly the result of different university policies with respect to human resources.

The first observation by the committee concerns the promotion of staff from assistant to associate professorship level and subsequently the promotion to full professor. In some universities, a tenure track system is in place in order to provide assistant professors with a stable trajectory to an associate professorship in which expectations and possibilities are clearly defined for both parties. The committee clearly sees the advantages of a tenure track system, for both Institute and candidate, but also understands that financial uncertainties or university regulations prevent some Institutes from starting such a system. For assistant professors at Institutes without tenure track, career guidance and formal agreements about career prospects are particularly important, as the management of the respective Institutes is well aware. Nevertheless, it is important that the position and prospects of assistant professors is well integrated in the human resources policy, also given their - at times substantial - teaching load. The committee observed a similar challenge regarding the promotion from associate to full professor level; in Institutes without tenure track, full professors can often only be appointed when a chair is vacant. This means that some associate professors who are ready to be installed as full professor, have to wait or apply for a professorship at another university in the Netherlands or abroad.

The second challenge that the committee noted concerns the diversity of staff. It is striking that the self-assessments focus almost exclusively on gender and age regarding this matter. Ethnic diversity as well as issues regarding sexual minorities and people with disabilities are barely touched upon, if at all. The committee therefore stresses that the diversity policy at University, Faculty, School and Institute level should not only be concerned with promoting gender or age diversity, but also aim to enhance ethnic diversity as well as for example, the inclusion of sexual minorities and people with disabilities. Currently, diversity policies at the institutes that were reviewed is predominantly aimed at increasing the number of female full professors. The committee noted that, although all Institutes

are working on this and Psychology as a discipline has more female researchers than other areas, the targets set for the number of female full professors are generally not too ambitious, and female full professors are still outnumbered by their male colleagues (percentages in the range of 25% to 39% female full professors or exceptionally 50%). Moreover, there is an obvious 'leaky pipeline' effect: the majority of Dutch PhD candidates in Psychology are female (64%-87%), at associate level the number of male and female professors reaches a reasonable balance (40%-63% female), but the majority of full professors in Psychology are male (50% - 75%). The committee encourages the Institutes to continue to work on their diversity policy, to set more ambitious targets with regard to diversity, also independent of university or faculty policy, and to address the leaky-pipeline effect in their human resources policy.

3.6. Societal relevance

In accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol, the committee also reviewed the balance between fundamental and applied science and the quality, scale and relevance of the research Institutes' contributions to society. The specific findings with respect to the individual Institutes are provided in the chapters reviewing those Institutes. This paragraph provides overall findings and the approach of the committee to its evaluation of societal relevance.

Since Psychology, a discipline concerned with people and their behaviour, is in itself relevant to society, the committee chose to take this criterion a step further and look specifically at tangible products, a proactive policy with regard to relevance (such as the appointment of special chairs) and the translation and communication of scientific knowledge. In addition, the committee assessed the Institutes' responsiveness to research requests from society and the mutual interaction between social partners and researchers (two-way stream). Research that is fuelled by and carried out in cooperation with social partners and results in products that can be used by these partners, is considered a best practice.

Overall the committee was impressed by the products and other outcomes that were described by the Institutes with respect to societal relevance. There is an overall focus on knowledge transfer (in the Netherlands often referred to as 'valorisatie', or in English 'valorisation') and many Institutes have a clear policy in this respect. The strong focus on societal relevance was pushed by research councils, government and Executive Boards of the Universities. The committee was especially impressed by those Institutes that focus on combining fundamental, curiosity-driven research with more application-driven research. At a more general level, the committee also observed that the traditional distinction between 'fundamental' and 'applied' is becoming blurred as a result of the above developments. The research questions that drive so called 'fundamental researchers' are becoming more and more inspired by issues 'in the field'. The committee applauds this development.

3.7. PhD candidates

During the site visit, the committee also spoke with delegations of all Institutes' PhD candidates, both regular and so called external PhD candidates (in Dutch: buitenpromovendi). Candidates are normally admitted through applying for a PhD vacancy ('free' or in a research project), followed by a recruitment procedure, or they apply for a grant from a research council or private companies with their own research proposal. PhD vacancies are normally widely advertised, nationally and internationally. Most Institutes have research master programmes in which they educate young and talented students in their own field, who can apply for PhD positions after they graduate. The committee understood that a research master programme is a good way for the institute to identify and retain its young talents. At the same time it fosters cross-fertilization between disciplines because researchers from different areas collaborate in teaching.

Without exception, the committee met with enthusiastic and energetic representatives of the PhD communities. The committee noted some variation in the everyday work circumstances of the young researchers: some were part of an active PhD community within their research group, Department or Institute, and were sharing offices with other PhD candidates, whereas others were working on a more solitary basis. The extent to which PhD candidates were exchanging ideas, plans and results

with more senior researchers in their Institute also varied. The committee stimulates the Institutes to do their best to foster and facilitate an energetic PhD community and to enable PhD candidates to exchange their ideas, plans and results with other PhD candidates and more senior research staff, for instance in seminars. With regard to the supervision, the committee feels that the supervision and training of PhD candidates in Psychology is of a high quality and well organized, as is illustrated by the quality of the personalized training and supervision plans.

On average, PhD candidates spend 80% of their time on research and 20% on teaching and courses. In most cases the teaching activities of PhD candidates were indeed restricted to 10-15% of their activities. Some candidates who wished to teach more received a separate contract for this and could often extent their PhD project as a result. The committee further understood that the content of the teaching activities of the PhD candidates is normally in line with the candidates own research topic, which ensures that their PhD project can also benefit from it. Most PhD candidates receive their training at their local graduate school on the one hand and a national interuniversity research school on the other. The graduate schools oversee the formal requirements and administration of PhD projects and generally, though not exclusively, provide generic skills courses, such as methods and statistics, presentation skills, academic writing and project management. Courses offered by the national research schools complement the curriculum of the local graduate schools, often with more field specific content, focusing on Experimental Psychology (EPOS), Psychopathology (EPP), Cognition and Behaviour (Helmholtz), Psychometrics and Sociometrics (IOPS) and Social Psychology (KLI). The committee considers the national research schools an excellent asset for the training and development of the professional networks of PhD candidates and encourages all Institutes to ensure that their PhD candidates have access to the research schools relevant to them.

The committee was somewhat surprised to learn that the majority of PhD candidates in Psychology in the Netherlands take significantly more than 4 years to graduate; many of them defend their PhD only in the fifth or sixth year after starting. The reasons for these delays varied from problems with data collection, extra teaching duties, strategic postponing of the PhD defence and waiting times for the defence ceremony to changes of supervisor, part-time appointments, new jobs, pregnancy and parental leave or health problems. Naturally, these are all understandable and legitimate causes for delays and there were no signals that delays in their PhD trajectory caused financial or other troubles for candidates, but the committee nevertheless wants to stimulate the Institutes to shorten the duration of the PhD trajectories. In addition, the committee thinks that candidates should be able to defend their dissertation before all of their papers are submitted and accepted; delays caused by waiting for publication should be avoided. Interestingly, in those Institutes, where extensions of a contract are not the norm, the time to completion is much shorter. This implies that despite many good reasons for the delay, there also seems to be a cultural effect. This leads to the observation by the committee of a potential inequality between Dutch PhD candidates and international candidates. The latter group might have only a temporary permit to work in the Netherlands and is therefore more pressed to graduate in time. The committee advises the Institutes to prevent this inequality.

In the Netherlands, most internal PhD candidates – also when they are paid by grant money - have full employment status, which entitles them to social security and participation in pension funds. Recently, experiments started with a bursary system in which PhD candidates are appointed as fellows instead of employees, which would allow universities to attract more PhD candidates and thus increase the research output. The committee learned that candidates are sceptical about these developments, because they fear that they will lose their position in the university and social security benefits. It advises Institutes to take this into account when they consider a bursary system. After graduating, 60-80% of all former PhD candidates continue to work in academia, the other 40-20% finds a job in industry or the non-profit sector.

3.8. Scientific integrity: transparency, replicability and reproducibility

The beginning of the review period 2011-2016 was marked by the discovery of the extensive fraud by an internationally prominent Dutch social psychologist. It gave rise to criticism of common research practices in psychological science, which showed that a number of classic findings could not

be replicated in independent studies. In addition, new studies drew attention to common misreporting of statistical results, reluctance to share data and underreporting of non-significant results in psychological science. All of this combined led to a national and international crisis of confidence, in particular with respect to, but not restricted to, psychological research.

In the eyes of the committee, Dutch psychologists have done an excellent job in turning this challenge into an opportunity by starting to do research on scientific integrity and by taking initiatives to replicate important findings, by shaping a solid scientific integrity policy and by promoting responsible and transparent research practices such as pre-registration and professional data storage and –management. As a result, Dutch psychologists have become world-leading in the research on responsible research practices. Furthermore, the committee observed that these new research practices and an awareness of scientific integrity issues are well embedded in daily research practice and consciousness in the Dutch universities, particularly for PhD candidates, making for optimism about the future. In addition, it should be remarked that the Dutch initiatives have had a distinct impact on the way in which the issue of responsible research practices is now being dealt with in other fields of science.

6. RESEARCH REVIEW OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY OF THE OPEN UNIVERSITY OF THE NETHERLANDS

6.1. Introduction

The Department of Psychology in the Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences (P&OW) at the Open University (OU) consists of four sections linked to major Psychology domains and one section on psychological research methods and statistics:

- Clinical Psychology;
- Health Psychology;
- Work and Organisational Psychology;
- Lifespan Psychology;
- Methods & Statistics.

The history of research in Psychology at the OU is still very young. Until 2008 the central mission of the OU was focussed on distance education and innovation of (distance) education. Research in Psychology has only been developed in recent years and has expanded substantially over the past review period.

In 2010 the first research programme was developed, termed *The interaction between Implicit and Explicit Strategies for Behaviour.* The research mission was to develop a relevant and viable research group that produces high quality research, with significant (inter)national impact, both scientific as well as societal.

Although the research in Psychology at the OU should be evaluated using the same criteria as other research units, the committee considers OU to be a specific case. The primary focus of the OU lies on education and it relies heavily on distance and e-based teaching and learning. Whereas other universities have a long history of research, this is not the case for the OU. Moreover research time for the staff is limited to 30% (even only 20% in the first years of the review period). OU's special features should be taken into consideration in evaluating the current position and in making recommendations. The committee was pleased with the self-evaluation report, which was experienced as fresh, enthusiastic and ambitious. The OU has taken a brave step in joining the present nationwide review exercise.

6.2. The strategy and targets of the research unit

The research programme is designed to stimulate research in concordance with the domain specific focus of Psychology research in the world, the needs of society and its members, and the expertise of the Department's staff. The research programme is operationalised within the four research lines that are linked with the four specializations in the master programme.

Research-eligible staff went from 20% to 30% research time, and the intention is to grow to 40%. This is very ambitious given the large educational tasks of the staff. The committee is of the opinion that this cannot be accomplished by more efficiency, which is what was done to get to 30%. The University should (financially) support the Department of Psychology in order for this ambition being realistic.

The management of the research in Psychology is straightforward and seems to function well, as does the interaction with section heads. The publication strategy over the past period was focussed on quantity as well as on quality. This seems a wise strategy for a developing research Institute and the committee agrees with the current shift towards more focus on quality.

The committee was somewhat surprised by the research theme at OU, *the interaction between implicit and explicit strategies for behavior*, which seems not to be focussed on the strengths within the research, nor the unique position of the OU. The OU adopted this general theme for its research

and although it applies to the work that is done and is a useful and broad theme, the committee would suggest to adopt a second theme in order to open up a new domain which already exists under the umbrella Cyber Psychology, and can be applied in the various existing domains. The existing theme of implicit and explicit strategies on the one hand and Cyber Psychology on the other hand may also be crossed, resulting in a number of domains that have the potential to develop innovative research. Content wise OU wants to develop its research along the same lines as its four educational tracks, resulting in the four sections. At the same time it wants to organize its research under one theme. This very broad umbrella theme about implicit and explicit strategies for behaviour covers a major part of the field of Psychology and does not allow for a strong common focus. Given the more applied nature of the educational programmes and given the fact that the students mostly hold jobs in an applied context, it is highly recommended that the OU concentrates its future research efforts on applied issues. Methodologically, there is a strong expertise in distance and e-learning and e-communication. OU should not hesitate to capitalize even more than now on relying on this expertise in its research. In addition, the psychological processes involved in e-learning and e-interaction itself are worthwhile topics of research. In the domain of methodology research, the emerging field of 'Big Data' seems a natural OU niche.

The most important recommendation by the committee is that OU should focus on its unique position in research and define a unique profile rather than trying to become like other Dutch universities. The research in Psychology at OU was only recently developed, the Institute is small and research time is limited. Therefore the OU should specifically focus on its strengths.

6.3. Research quality

The committee is of the opinion that the OU is clearly still in the process of building a research programme and is conducting research of good quality, especially given the limited time available for research. The committee would like to emphasise once more that the brief existence of the research programme and the unique position of the OU with respect to research and education makes it difficult to review the work in a comparable way to the other research units. The Methods & Statistics section is a supporting unit of the disciplinary research domains and collaborations between this section and the four Psychology sections has resulted in high quality output.

The publication strategy in the period of this review seems to have been focussed on quantity, the research staff producing an exceptionally high number of papers per FTE. In the self-evaluation report a move from quantity to quality is suggested. This seems certainly warranted and is in line with the national trend. The key publications demonstrate to the committee that there is capacity to realize high impact publications. The citation scores are just above world average and support the potential of the OU.

There are some nice examples of invited lectures at international conferences, peer-reviewed comprehensive books with internationally recognized publishers and memberships of editorial boards, which indicate the impact and international recognition of OU's Psychology research.

Most external funding is obtained from applied organizations rather than from NWO. This is understandable given the status and focus of the research. Nevertheless, OU should attempt to also get access to more traditional lines of University research funding. It might manage to do so by highlighting the unique contribution of e-approaches to research questions in general, to developing behavioural intervention methods etc. The OU did not yet manage to obtain international research grants (ERC), but it is in the process of obtaining European funding in collaborative projects. In general, formulating OU's unique selling points in research themes more prominently may ameliorate fostering fruitful collaborations with other research institutions.

6.4. Relevance to society

During the interviews of the site visit and in the self-evaluation report a number of interesting examples were given of societal relevance of OU's Psychology research and of the effect of the work. A significant amount of the societal relevance is linked to socially relevant PhD projects. The e-health

interventions are of very good quality and fit nicely with the educational mission of the University. However, within the unique OU position on distance learning and e-health applications, there is room for improvement. Efforts in these directions should be intensified. There is certainly a lot of potential, but the volume of products that are relevant to society is still limited and as a result also impact is limited as well. In addition, the committee considers that more coherence is in order. At present not all examples of socially relevant research projects are in line with the OU goals and strategy. Taking into consideration the limited research time and small size of the staff, focus is required.

6.5. Viability

The OU has a unique position in the Dutch landscape. One element that contributes to this is their experience with and integration of digital technology, in particular the domain of eLearning. If capitalized on properly, this might put the OU at the forefront not only of eEducation, but also of eResearch. The researchers have access to lab facilities with up-to-date equipment, although the range of equipment is limited.

The research staff is limited, both in terms of FTE volume as well as time allocated to research activities (30%). What the research staff has accomplished is therefore all the more impressive. However, the small scale of the unit also implies vulnerabilities, such as disruptions due to staff turnover. Hence, increasing research volume would provide more stability.

Despite impressive accomplishments, much can still be done like formulating a more focussed mission statement and stressing the unique position of the OU. Also adopting a more comprehensive e-Identity and more extensive national and international collaborations and engaging with national research schools are topics that require attention. Specifically providing support for grant applications is required. At the moment this system is not in place, nor did the committee see a clear policy. With the 30% research time, support in the application trajectory is extremely important.

The recent merger with the Centre of Learning Sciences and Technologies and Research Centre for Teacher Professionalization offers new opportunities for collaboration and research within Psychology. Collaborations are starting to take place, but it is still early in the process and it is not yet clear how these will develop.

In concluding, the committee is of the opinion that the OU should think of a unique selling point that is in line with its unique educational mission. The psychological research could and should be geared towards the OU's mission "distance learning university using online media education". Some of the current research lines are similar to research lines at other Dutch universities, which have more resources and qualified staff members to conduct the research. The committee observes great opportunities for more research on Educational Psychology (adult education), the Psychology of distance communication and learning, the use of digital media, Big Data and apps.

6.6. PhD training

All PhD candidates at Open University, both internal and external, are a member of the local Graduate School that was established in 2010, which is not organized at Faculty but at OU level. The PhD training programme consists of courses in academic writing and presenting in English, qualitative and quantitative data analysis and writing and publishing in a scientific context. In addition, the Graduate School organises yearly PhD days with lectures and workshops on themes such as research integrity, career planning, project-management and knowledge transfer (valorisation). Candidates receive a budget of €5000, to be spent on additional specialised training and attending conferences.

The committee appreciates the OU's efforts and accomplishments in starting up the Graduate School from scratch since 2010. The committee noted a clear sense of community among the OU PhD candidates, in spite of the diversity in the types of PhD projects and arrangements. At present, because the PhD education provided by the Graduate School primarily encompasses generic skills courses, the committee thinks that the OU PhD candidates could benefit from the more field specific content courses that are organized by the national research schools in Psychology. The committee

therefore encourages the Institute to reach out to the national research schools, also because widening the horizon to other research environments and having the opportunity to present work in other contexts will be inspiring and instructive, and may stimulate communications with other institutions. This would particularly benefit the external PhD candidates at OU, who work in a slightly more isolated research environment than their 'internal' colleagues.

At the beginning of their trajectory, all PhD candidates at OU describe their project and a detailed schooling and supervision plan, which has to be approved by their (co)promotors. The committee has seen that the Graduate School has a well-developed supervision and monitoring system in which both internal and external candidates have regular evaluations and official assessments, on which go/no-go decisions are based. The committee is under the impression that the PhD candidates at the OU are satisfied with their supervision, the accessibility of their promotors and the overall atmosphere at OU, but noted that future career orientation could be offered more pro-actively.

6.7. Research integrity policy

OU has committees on research integrity and research ethics, in which the Psychology Department is represented, as well as an official confidential counsellor for research integrity a position held by a Psychology professor until 2015). Although these committees, procedures and instruments and the overall policy with regard to research integrity are in place, the committee noticed that on staff level, reflection on integrity issues and practices such as preregistration are not yet an integrated part of the everyday research culture. The committee therefore encourages the Institute to continue its efforts in communicating and educating the research staff with regard to scientific integrity policy and practices. Particularly external PhD candidates, who often work in a somewhat more isolated position, deserve special attention in this respect.

6.8. Diversity

The self-assessment of the Open University's Psychology Institute considers diversity in terms of gender, age and nationality. The gender division at OU's Psychology Department differs from that of other universities: women are well represented in higher management positions and at full professor-level, but the majority of associate professors is male. At PhD level, the majority of PhD candidates is female. The scientific staff is rather homogeneous in terms of ethnicity and cultural background, which is partly related to the fact that the educational programmes are in Dutch. The committee noticed that awareness about diversity is present at OU and is confident that policy and measures are in place to maintain a balance.

6.9. Conclusion and recommendations

The Department of Psychology at the Open University has had a successful start as a research unit; several high impact publications, citation scores and other marks of recognition indicate the performance, impact and international recognition of OU's Psychology research. In addition, a PhD training programme and scientific integrity protocols are developed. The committee recommends to define a more unique research profile, building on OU's strong expertise in distance and e-learning and e-communication, and to explore connected research themes such as the Psychology of distance communication and learning, Cyber Psychology, the use of digital media, Big Data and apps. By strengthening their research profile, the Institute can increase its chances of success in grant acquisition and inspire collaborations with societal partners.

6.10. Overview of the quantitative assessment of the research unit

After having assessed the research quality, relevance to society and viability, and comparing that to the developments and standards in the field of Psychology, the committee comes to the following quantitative assessments:

Research quality:	good
Relevance to society:	good
Viability:	good

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: THE SEP CRITERIA AND CATEGORIES

There are three criteria that have to be assessed.

- Research quality:
  - Level of excellence in the international field;
  - Quality and Scientific relevance of research;
  - Contribution to body of scientific knowledge;
  - Academic reputation;
  - Scale of the unit's research results (scientific publications, instruments and infrastructure developed and other contributions).

- Relevance to society:
  - quality, scale and relevance of contributions targeting specific economic, social or cultural target groups;
  - advisory reports for policy;
  - contributions to public debates.

The point is to assess contributions in areas that the research unit has itself designated as target areas.

- Viability:
  - the strategy that the research unit intends to pursue in the years ahead and the extent to which it is capable of meeting its targets in research and society during this period;
  - the governance and leadership skills of the research unit's management.

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

APPENDIX 2: CURRICULA VITAE OF THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Eddy van Avermaet (chair)
Professor Eddy Van Avermaet took his master's degree in Psychology at the University of Leuven in 1970, and his PhD degree in Social Psychology at the University of California at Santa Barbara in 1975. He is emeritus professor of Psychology of the University of Leuven, where for close to 40 years he taught introductory and advanced courses in (Social) Psychology for students in Psychology and other disciplines. He was chairman of the Psychology Department (1988-1994 and 2005-2007) and vice dean of education at the Leuven Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences (2005-2007). He also served as chairman of the Leuven University Board of Education (1995-2005). He was academic coordinator of Quality Assurance for the Flemish universities (1996-2012) and he was advisor to the Flemish minister of education on issues of higher education (2001-2004). His research concerned social cognition and cooperation and competition in interpersonal and intergroup contexts. For 30 years he was director of the Leuven Center for Social and Cultural Psychology. He was chief editor of the European Journal of Social Psychology (1994-1998) and he served as secretary and member of the Executive Committee of the European Association for Social Psychology (2002-2008). He was a member of the Recognition Committee for Dutch Research Schools in the Social Sciences (ECOS) of the Royal Dutch Academy of Science (2001-2007). He was twice a member of the Quality Assurance Committee for Psychology Curricula in the Netherlands (2001 and 2011) and he was a member of the NVAO Levelt Committee on the duration of Psychology studies in the Netherlands (2008).

Marcel Brass
Professor Marcel Brass studied at the Free University Berlin where he received his diploma in Psychology in 1997. Then he worked as a PhD candidate at the Max Planck Institute for Psychological Research in Munich. In 2000 he was awarded a PhD from the Ludwig Maximilians University, Munich. He then worked as a research scientist and Heisenberg fellow at the Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Science in Leipzig. Since 2006 he is research professor at the Department of Experimental Psychology at Ghent University. Between 2010-13 he held a guest professorship at the Behavioral Science Institute of Radboud University Nijmegen and was awarded a Kosmos fellowship from the Humboldt University Berlin in 2014. His editorial work includes guest editorships for the Proceedings of the Royal Society B and for Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews. His research covers a broad range of topics including the relationship of perception and action, cognitive control and the influence of high-level beliefs on basic cognitive processes. Methodologically, he uses cognitive neuroscience methods such as fMRI and TMS as well as classical mental chronometry.

Elizabeth Kuipers
Professor Elizabeth Kuipers is a Professor Emerita at the Institute of Psychiatry Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, and an Emerita National Institute of Health Research (NIHR) Senior Investigator. She obtained her first degree in Psychology at Bristol University, completed her MSc in Clinical Psychology at Birmingham University, and a PhD in Clinical Psychology from London University. Her research interests have always been in psychosis, both for the individuals and for their careers. She helped develop and evaluate family interventions and then individual cognitive interventions for psychosis. She was head of the Psychology Department at the IoPPN and an honorary Consultant Clinical Psychologist at the South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust until 2012. She chaired the NICE guideline group for Schizophrenia and Psychosis and Schizophrenia in 2009 and 2014. She is a Fellow of the British Psychological Society (BPsS) and of the Academy of Science. In 2010 she received the Shapiro award from the Division of Clinical Psychology at the BPsS for 'eminence in the profession'. In 2013 she received two lifetime achievement awards, one from the Professional Practice Board at the BPsS and one from Women in Science and Engineering (WISE). In the UK New Year's honours 2018 she received an OBE for services to clinical research, treatment and support of people with psychosis.

Patrick Onghena
Professor Patrick Onghena studied Psychology at KU Leuven, University of Leuven, Belgium (master's degree: 1988, postgraduate psychotherapy: 1992, PhD: 1994). He is professor of Methodology and Statistics at the Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, KU Leuven, where he was the dean from 2007 until 2015. He is a member of the Royal Flemish Academy of Belgium for Science and the Arts, member of the Belgian Federation of Psychologists, member of the Belgian Statistical Society, member of the Association for Psychological Science, international affiliate of the American Psychological Association, and international affiliate of the American Educational Research Association. His main research topics are: single-case experiments, randomization tests, meta-analysis and systematic reviews, mixed methods research, and research on statistics education.

Lea Pulkkinen
Professor Lea Pulkkinen studied Psychology, education and humanities at the University of Jyväskylä, Finland where she received her PhD in Psychology in1970. She worked in this University first as an associate professor at the department of education, and since 1973 at the department of Psychology, first as an associate professor and since 1982 as a full professor of Psychology until her retirement. She was the head of the Psychology Department for several terms and the dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences. In 1996, she was appointed as Academy Professor (an honour by the Academy of Finland) and in 1997 to 2005 she was the director of the centre of excellence in research on Human Development and its Risk Factors. She has advanced multidisciplinary work in family studies (the establishment of Family Research Unit in 1990) and in human-centred technology (the establishment of Agora Center in 2001), and directed or co-directed them. She has received international prizes such as the Aristotle Prize in Psychology in 2003, and national prizes such as the Finnish Science Award in 2001 and the Finnish State Award for her lifetime work in 2011.

Bas Verplanken
Professor Bas Verplanken graduated and obtained his PhD at the University of Leiden, The Netherlands, where he worked as a Research Fellow and Lecturer from 1980-1990. From 1990-1998 he was a Lecturer and Senior Lecturer at the University of Nijmegen. From 1998 to 2006 he was a professor at the University of Tromsø, Norway. In 2006 he joined the University of Bath, where he was the Head of Department of Psychology from 2010-2016. His research interests are in attitudes and decision making applied in the domains of Environmental, Health, and Consumer Psychology. He published on a variety of topics, topics including risk perception, environmental concern, unhealthy eating, travel mode choice, values, self-esteem, body image, worrying, mindfulness, impulsive buying, behaviour change, and sustainable lifestyles, and is an internationally recognised expert on habits. He served as an Associate Editor of the British Journal of Social Psychology and Psychology and Health.

Jan Wacker
Professor Jan Wacker studied Psychology at the University of Marburg (Diploma: 2001; PhD: 2005). He visited Harvard University as a research fellow in 2008 and is now professor of Differential Psychology and Psychological Assessment at the University of Hamburg, where he is currently research dean of the Faculty of Psychology and Human Movement Science. He serves on the editorial boards of the European Journal of Personality, the Journal of Research in Personality and the newly founded journal Personality Neuroscience. His research is concerned with the biological foundations of major personality traits and the improvement of Psychological Science.

APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

Sunday 17 September			
Time		**Activity**	**Participants**
15.30		Assemble in lobby	Review committee and secretaries
16:00	19:00	Welcome & Initial panel meeting	Assessment panel, secretaries
19:00	21:00	Dinner	Assessment panel, secretaries

Monday 18 September: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam & University of Groningen			
Time		**Activity**	**Participants**
9:00	9:30	Preparatory meeting VU-institute	Review committee, secretaries
9:30	10:15	Meeting management VU-institute	Prof. dr. P.J. Beek, *Dean* Prof. dr. C. Schuengel, *associate Dean Research.* M.M. van Aken, MSc, *director of management.*
10:15	10:30	Break / Evaluation	
10:30	11:15	Meeting programme leaders VU-institute	Prof. dr. J.C.N. de Geus, *chair /Biological Psychology.* Prof. dr. W.J.M.J. Cuijpers, *chair/Clinical-Neuro- and Developmental Psychology.* Prof. dr. J.L. Theeuwes, *chair /Experimental and Applied Psychology.* Prof. dr. D.I. Boomsma, *Biological Psychology.* Prof. dr. A.C. Krabbendam, *Developmental Psychology.* Prof. dr. P.A.M. van Lange, *Social and Organizational Psychology.*
11:15	11:30	Break / Evaluation	
11:30	12:00	Meeting PhD candidates VU-institute	Bart Baselmans, MSc. Catherina Molho, MSc. Chani Nuij, MSc. Fiona Hagenbeek, MSc. Joanne van Slooten, MSc. Sanne Bruijniks, MSc.
12:00	13:00	Evaluation VU-institute	Review committee, secretaries
13:00	13:30	Lunch break	
13:30	14:00	Preparatory meeting RUG-institute	Review committee, secretaries
14:00	14:45	Meeting management RUG-institute	Prof. dr. C.W.A.M. Aarts, *Dean.* Prof. dr. E.G. Gordijn, *director Heymans Institute for Psychological Research.* Prof. dr. ME. Timmerman, *director Graduate School.*
14:45	15:00	Break / Evaluation	

15:00	15:45	Meeting programme leaders RUG-institute	Prof. dr. P.J. de Jong, *Clinical Psychology and Experimental Psychopathology.* Prof. dr. P. de Jonge, *Developmental Psychology.* Prof. dr. T. Postmes*, Social Psychology.* Prof. dr. E.M. Steg, *Environmental Psychology*.
15:45	16:00	Break / Evaluation	
16:00	16:30	Meeting PhD candidates RUG-institute	Ole Gmelin, BSc*.* Leonie Kreuze, MSc. Aafke van Mourik Broekman, MSc. Burkhard Wortler, MSc.
16:30	17:30	Evaluation RUG-institute	Review committee, secretaries
18:30	20:30	Dinner	Review committee, secretaries

Tuesday 19 September: Utrecht University & Maastricht University			
Time		**Activity**	**Participants**
9:00	9:30	Preparatory meeting UU-institute	Review committee, secretaries
9:30	10:15	Meeting management UU-institute	prof. dr. M. van Aken, *Dean as of September 2017).* prof. dr. D. de Ridder, *Coordinator of the research assessment; Professor of Health Psychology.* prof. dr. T. Taris, *Head of Department Psychology.*
10:15	10:30	Break / Evaluation	
10:30	11:15	Meeting programme leaders UU-institute	Prof. dr. P. Boelen, *Clinical Psychology.* Prof. dr. K. van den Bos, *Social Psychology.* Prof. dr. H. Hoijtink, *Methodology and Statistics.* Prof. dr. L. Kenemans, *Experimental Psychology.* Dr. S. Thomaes, *Associate Professor Developmental Psychology.*
11:15	11:30	Break / Evaluation	
11:30	12:00	Meeting PhD candidates UU-institute	Lysanne te Brinke, MSc. Nicole Montijn, MSc. Laurens van Gestel, MSc*.* Fayette Klaassen, MSc. Paul Zerr, MSc.
12:00	13:00	Evaluation UU-institute	Review committee, secretaries
13:00	13:30	Lunch break	
13:30	14:00	Preparatory meeting MU-institute	Review committee, secretaries

14:00	14:45	Meeting management MU-institute	Prof. dr. A.T.M. Jansen, *Dean.* Prof. dr. A. Sack, *vice-dean Research.* Prof. dr. C. van Heugten, *Director Graduate School FPN & member Research Council.* Prof. dr. S.A. Kotz, *member Research Council.* Prof. dr. H.L.G.J. Merckelbach, *chair Research Council.* Prof. dr. P.E.H.M. Muris, *Scientific Director Postgraduate School EPP.* Drs. R. Hoekstra, *policy advisor & PhD coordinator.*
14:45	15:00	Break / Evaluation	
15:00	15:45	Meeting programme leaders MU-institute	Prof. dr. R.W. Goebel, *Cognitive Neuroscience (CN).* Prof. dr. E. Formisano, *Scientific Director research centre M-BIC of CN.* Prof. dr. P.E.H.M. Muris, *Clinical Psychological Sciences.* Prof. dr. H.L.G.J. Merckelbach, *Scientific Director research centre EPP of CPS.* Dr. A. Blokland, *Neuro- & Psychofarmacologie.* Prof. dr. R. A.C. Ruiter, *Work & Social Psychology.*
15:45	16:00	Break / Evaluation	
16:00	16:30	Meeting PhD candidates MU-institute	Ghislaine Schyns, MSc *(CPS).* Helen Mayrhofer–Luckmann, MSc *(CN).* Irena Bosovic, MSc *(CPS).* Natasha Mason, MSc *(NPPP).* Roy Haast, MSc *(CN).* Stefan Gruijters *(WSP).*
16:30	17:30	Evaluation MU-institute	Review committee, secretaries
18:30	20:30	Dinner	Review committee, secretaries,

Wednesday 20 September: Erasmus University Rotterdam & Open University			
Time		**Activity**	**Participants**
9:00	9:30	Preparatory meeting EUR-institute	Review committee, secretaries
9:30	10:15	Meeting management EUR-institute	Prof. dr. H. van der Molen, *Dean.* Prof. dr. P. Prinzie, *director of research.* Prof. dr. G. Smeets, *director of education*. Drs. J. Nagtzaam, *manager Erasmus Graduate School of Social Sciences and Humanities*. G. van den Hoek, MA, policy officer.
10:15	10:30	Break / Evaluation	

10:30	11:15	Meeting programme leaders EUR-institute	Prof. dr. R. Zwaan, *Brain and Cognition.* Prof. dr. I. Franken, *Cognitive Aspects of Psychopathology.* Prof. dr. F. Paas, *Educational and Developmental Psychology.* Prof. dr. A. Bakker, *Organizational Psychology.* Prof. dr. L. Arends, *Research Methods and Techniques.* only listening: Geert van den Hoek, MA, policy officer.
11:15	11:30	Break / Evaluation	
11:30	12:00	Meeting PhD candidates EUR-institute	Yiyun Liao, MSc, *Brain and Cognition.* Marieke van Meggelen, MSc, *Cognitive Aspects of Psychopathology.* Jacqueline Wong, MSc, *Educational and Developmental Psychology.* Keri Pekaar, MSc, *Organizational Psychology.* Iris Yocarini, MSc, *Research Methods and Techniques.*
12:00	13:00	Evaluation EUR-institute	Review committee, secretaries
13:00	13:30	Lunch break	
13:30	14:00	Preparatory meeting OU-institute	Review committee, secretaries
14:00	14:45	Meeting management OU-institute	Prof. dr. S. Brand-Gruwel, *Dean.* Dr. J. Winkels, *Chair Academic Affairs.* Prof. dr. L. Lechner*, Director Research Psychology.* Dr. C. Bolman*, Chair Ethical Research Committee.* Dr. E. Bakker, *Vice-chair Research Committee.* Prof. dr. A. Ernes, *Dean OU Graduate School.*
14:45	15:00	Break / Evaluation	
15:00	15:45	Meeting programme leaders OU-institute	Prof. dr. J. van Lankveld, *Clinical Psychology.* Prof. dr. L. Lechner, *Health Psychology.* Prof. dr. K. van Dam, *Work and Organizational Psychology.* Prof. dr. N. Jacobs, *Lifespan Psychology.* Dr. P. Verboon, *Methods & Statistics.*
15:45	16:00	Break / Evaluation	
16:00	16:30	Meeting PhD candidates OU-institute	Rianne Golsteijn, MSc. Juul Coumans, MSc. Kenny Wolfs, MSc. Mira Duif, MSc. Rob van Bree, MSc. Janet Boekhout, MSc.
16:30	17:30	Evaluation OU-institute	Review committee, secretaries
18.30	20:30	Dinner	Review committee, secretaries

Thursday 21 September: University of Amsterdam & Tilburg University			
Time		**Activity**	**Participants**
9:00	9:30	Preparatory meeting UvA-institute	Review committee, secretaries
9:30	10:15	Meeting management UvA-institute	Prof. dr. J.H. Kamphuis, *Department Chair*. Prof. dr. H. van der Maas, *director Graduate School*. dr. I. Visser, *director of Education College*. Prof. dr. A. Fischer, *director Psychology Research Institute.*
10:15	10:30	Break / Evaluation	
10:30	11:15	Meeting programme leaders UvA-institute	Prof. dr. J. Murre, *Brain & Cognition*. Prof. dr. H. van der Maas, *Psychological Methods*. Prof. dr. G. van Kleef, *Social Psychology*. Prof. dr. A. van Vianen, *Work & Organisational Psychology*. Prof. dr. M. Kindt, *Clinical Psychology*. Prof. dr. R. Wiers, *Developmental Psychology*. dr. H. Slagter, *chair Advisory Scientific Council (WAR).*
11:15	11:30	Break / Evaluation	
11:30	12:00	Meeting PhD candidates UvA-institute	David Maij, MSc, *social Psychology.* Florian Wanders, MSc, *Work and Organisational Psychology.* Jamie Elsey, MSc, *Clinical Psychology.* Daan van Renswoude, MSc, *Developmental Psychology.* Noor Seijdel, MSc, *Brain and cognition.* Lisa Wijsen, MSc, *psychological Methods.*
12:00	13:00	Evaluation UvA-institute	Review committee, secretaries
13:00	13:30	Lunch break	
13:30	14:00	Preparatory meeting TiU-institute	Review committee, secretaries
14:00	14:45	Meeting management TiU-institute	Prof. dr. ir. A.J. Schuit, *Dean.* Prof. dr. J. Paauwe, *vice dean of Research.* Prof. dr. J.J.A. Denissen, *Department Chair Developmental Psychology.*
14:45	15:00	Break / Evaluation	
15:00	15:45	Meeting programme leaders TiU-institute	Prof. dr. J.H.M. Vroomen, *Cognitive Neuropsychology.* Dr. T.A. Klimstra, *Developmental Psychology.* Prof. dr. I. van Beest, *Social Psychology.* Prof. dr. J.M. Wicherts, *Methodology and Statistics.* Prof. dr. J. de Vries, *Medical and Clinical Psychology.*
15:45	16:00	Break / Evaluation	
16:00	16:30	Meeting PhD candidates TiU-institute	Thijs van Laarhoven MSc, *Cognitive Neuropsychology.* Manon van Scheppingen MSc, *Developmental Psychology.* Nina Spälti MSc, *Social Psychology.*

			Michèle Nuijten MSc, *Methodology and Statistics.* Stefanie Duijndam MSc, *Medical and Clinical Psychology.* Laura Kunst MSc, *Medical and Clinical Psychology.*
16:30	17:30	Evaluation TiU-institute	Review committee, secretaries
18:30	21:00	Dinner	Review committee, secretaries

Friday 22 September: Leiden University & Final meeting			
Time		**Activity**	**Participants**
9:00	9:30	Preparatory meeting UL-institute	Review committee, secretaries
9:30	10:15	Meeting management UL-institute	Prof. dr. H. Swaab, *Dean.* Prof. dr. C. de Dreu, *Scientific Director as of mid-2017.* Prof. dr. M. Westenberg, *Scientific Director until mid-2017.* Drs. A. Zandvliet, *Institute Manager.* Drs. C. Donner, *policy officer Institute of Psychology.*
10:15	10:30	Break / Evaluation	
10:30	11:15	Meeting programme leaders UL-institute	Prof. dr. E. Crone, *Neurocognitive Developmental Psychology.* Prof. dr. W. van der Does, *Clinical Psychology.* Prof. dr. E. van Dijk, *Psychology and Social Decision Making.* Prof. dr. A. Evers, *Health Psychology.* Prof. dr. S. Nieuwenhuis, *Cognitive Neuroscience of Decision Making.* Prof. dr. M. de Rooij, *Methodology and Statistics of Psychological Research.* Prof. dr. C. de Dreu, *Social and Organisational Psychology.*
11:15	11:30	Break / Evaluation	
11:30	12:00	Meeting PhD candidates UL-institute	Bryant Jongkees MSc, *Cognitive Psychology.* Charlotte van Schie MSc, *Clinical Psychology.* Frank de Vos MSc, *Methodology and Statistics.* Janna Marie Bas-Hoogendam MSc, *Developmental and Educational Psychology.* Hilmar Zech MSc, *Social and Organisational Psychology.* Lemmy Schakel MSc, *Health, Medical, and Neuropsychology.*
12:00	13:00	Evaluation UL-institute	Review committee, secretaries
13:00	13:30	Lunch break	
13:30	16:30	General evaluation	Review committee, secretaries

APPENDIX 4: QUANTITATIVE DATA

The quantitative data provided in this appendix are those presented in the self-evaluation reports by the participating institutes.

STAFF	LEI		EUR		OU		UvA		MU	
Scientific staff	**average**	**2016**	**average**	**2016**	**average**	**2016**	**average**	**2016**	**average**	**2016**
HL	4,5	5,1	3,5	3,6	1,0	1,2	10,2	9,4	10,3	10,6
UHD	5,4	6,3	5,7	5,5	1,6	1,6	8,1	7,1	6,4	8,4
UD	15,3	19,7	7,2	7,4	6,3	8,2	20,1	26,1	27,4	32,0
postdocs	16,5	19,8	2,9	1,7	0,4	0,0	24,9	19,3	23,9	31,3
PhD students	33,3	35,4	16,8	18,4	5,3	3,1	55,8	57,6	57,0	49,2
total Research staff	**75,1**	**86,3**	**36,0**	**36,6**	**14,6**	**14,1**	**119,2**	**119,5**	**125,0**	**131,4**
support staff	2,7	4,8	3,6	3,0	0,2	0,8	7,1	7,6	16,5	18,3
visiting fellows (#)	0,0	0,0	0,8	1,0	2,5	2,0	5,8	8,0	30,8	49,0
total staff	**77,8**	**91,1**	**39,6**	**39,6**	**14,8**	**14,9**	**126,3**	**127,1**	**141,4**	**149,7**

STAFF	TiU		UG		UU		VU	
Scientific staff	**average**	**2016**	**average**	**2016**	**average**	**2016**	**average**	**2016**
HL	8,1	7,0	7,5	8,6	9,8	10,2	7,2	9,7
UHD	3,4	3,8	9,6	12,3	8,1	10,4	5,8	5,0
UD	16,5	15,0	12,6	10,1	16,0	23,8	9,3	11,0
postdocs	14,3	12,4	10,6	10,8	22,4	20,0	26,7	27,3
PhD students	44,8	38,2	42,9	37,1	41,7	37,8	52,0	51,5
total Research staff	**87,0**	**76,5**	**83,1**	**78,9**	**97,9**	**102,2**	**100,9**	**104,5**
support staff	N/A	N/A	5,1	5,0	4,5	6,3	8,3	6,3
visiting fellows (#)	2,5	3,0	4,2	6,0	5,0	9,0	6,2	6,0
total staff	**87,0**	**76,5**	**88,2**	**83,9**	**102,4**	**108,6**	**109,2**	**110,8**

FUNDING	LEI				EUR				OU				UvA				MU			
	average		**2016**		**average**		**2016**		**average**		**2016**		**average**		**2016**		**average**		**2016**	
Funding	**k€**	**%**	**k€**	**%**	**k€**	**%**	**k€**	**%**	**k€**	**%**	**k€**	**%**	**k€**	**%**	**k€**	**%**	**k€**	**%**	**k€**	**%**
Direct funding	2.808	40 %	3.264	45 %	2.341	75 %	2.636	84 %	62	54 %	90	73 %	11.167	67 %	11.493	67 %	7.036	55 %	7.687	54 %
Research grants	3.234	47 %	3.433	47 %	502	16 %	334	11 %	49	46 %	33	27 %	4.356	26 %	4.291	25 %	5.039	39 %	5.337	37 %
Other	89	13 %	58	8%	27	9%	15	5%	6	%	6	%	1.188	7%	1.428	8%	43	6%	1.181	8%
Total funding	6.934	100%	7.285	100%	3.118	100%	3.126	100%	1.118	100%	1.241	100%	16.723	100%	17.212	100%	12.904	100%	14.186	100%
Expenditure																				
Personnel costs	5.904	92 %	6.759	91 %	2.081	76 %	2.036	83 %	97	87 %	1.161	94 %	9.760	60 %	9.584	57 %	9.256	72 %	10.157	72 %
Other costs	532	8%	641	9%	685	24 %	410	17 %	14	13 %	80	6%	6.395	40 %	7.099	43 %	3.543	28 %	3.921	28 %
Total expenditure	6.436	100%	7.400	100%	2.767	100%	2.446	100%	1.118	100%	1.241	100%	16.155	100%	16.683	100%	12.799	100%	14.078	100%

FUNDING	TiU				UG				UU				VU			
	average		2016		average		2016		average		2016		average		2016	
Funding	k€	%	k€	%	k€	%	k€	%	k€	%	k€	%	k€	%	k€	%
Direct funding	3.16 5	50 %	3.3 07	51 %	5.9 56	71 %	6.15 5	60 %	4.5 24	48 %	5.06 5	49 %	2.93 8	29 %	3.01 2	28 %
Research grants	1.92 5	30 %	2.2 01	34 %	1.1 44	13 %	1.91 0	19 %	3.0 86	32 %	2.96 3	29 %	5.27 3	51 %	5.82 3	54 %
Other	1.31 6	21 %	1.0 29	16 %	1.3 35	16 %	2.16 5	21 %	1.8 82	20 %	2.35 4	23 %	2.04 4	20 %	1.94 5	18 %
Total funding	6.40 6	100 %	6.5 37	100 %	8.4 34	100 %	10.2 30	100 %	9.4 92	100 %	10.3 82	100 %	10.2 55	100 %	10.7 80	100 %
Expenditure																
Personnel costs	5.50 2	86 %	5.2 35	80 %	5.3 43	80 %	5.54 1	81 %	7.6 33	84 %	8.63 7	79 %	7.63 1	74 %	8.47 3	79 %
Other costs	904	14 %	1.3 02	20 %	1.3 04	20 %	1.30 3	19 %	1.4 45	16 %	2.28 3	21 %	2.62 3	26 %	2.30 7	21 %
Total expenditure	6.40 6	100 %	6.5 37	100 %	6.6 48	100 %	6.84 4	100 %	9.0 78	100 %	10.9 20	100 %	10.2 54	100 %	10.7 80	100 %

OUTPUT	LEI		EUR		OU		UvA		MU	
Scientific publications	**total**	**2016**	**total**	**2016**	**total**	**2016**	**total**	**2016**	**total**	**2016**
Refereed articles	1413	293	869	140	528	72	2149	355	1968	393
Scientific books	5	2	16	1	9	1	17	3	5	2
Scientific book chapters	170	17	83	5	62	12	196	20	37	3
PhD theses internal	76	14	0	0	15	1	0	0	124	25
PhD theses external	23	8	0	0	15	1	0	0	27	3
PhD theses internal and external	99	22	43	8	30	2	106	14	151	28
Other research output	6	1	0	0	5	1	331	42	145	30
total scientific publications	**1792**	**357**	**971**	**146**	**664**	**90**	**2799**	**434**	**2457**	**484**
Professional/popular										
Reports	13	2	11	1	11	0	34	5	8	4
Professional publications	135	25	54	4	46	9	237	31	409	51
Publications aimed at general public	3	1	4	2	8	1	310	15	22	5
Total professional/popular	**151**	**28**	**69**	**7**	**65**	**10**	**581**	**51**	**439**	**60**
publications/staff	**LEI**		**EUR**		**OU**		**UvA**		**MU**	
	average	**2016**	**average**	**2016**	**average**	**2016**	**average**	**2016**	**average**	**2016**
Refereed articles/ fte scientific staff	3,1	3,4	4,0	3,8	6,0	5,1	3,0	3,0	2,6	3,0
Refereed articles / fte total staff	3,0	3,2	3,7	3,5	6,0	4,8	2,8	2,8	2,3	2,6
Total output/ fte scientific staff	4,0	4,1	4,5	4,0	7,6	6,4	3,9	3,6	3,3	3,7
Total output/ fte total staff	3,8	3,7	4,1	3,7	7,5	6,0	3,7	3,4	2,9	3,2
fte PhD / fte scientific staff	0,4	0,4	0,5	0,5	0,4	0,2	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,4
internal theses/fte tenured staff	0,5	0,5	NA	NA	0,3	0,1	NA	NA	0,5	0,5
IN+EXT theses/fte tenured staff	0,7	0,7	0,4	0,5	0,6	0,2	0,5	0,3	0,6	0,5

OUTPUT Scientific publications	TiU total	 2016	UG total	 2016	UU total	 2016	VU total	 2016
Refereed articles	1916	298	1518	263	2414	341	2771	542
Scientific books	9	1	20	2	31	2	25	3
Scientific book chapters	113	15	239	17	265	30	172	17
PhD theses internal	110	13	81	11	0	0	0	0
PhD theses external	0	0	38	6	0	0	0	0
PhD theses internal and external	0	0	119	17	146	22	126	20
Other research output	69	21	61	16	26	8	29	4
total scientific publications	**2217**	**348**	**2076**	**332**	**2882**	**403**	**3123**	**586**
Professional/popular								
Reports	18	2	54	8	0	0	42	1
Professional publications	157	9	199	33	0	0	158	15
Publications aimed at general public	33	3	250	66	0	0	187	18
Total professional/popular	**208**	**14**	**503**	**107**	**0**	**0**	**387**	**34**
publications/staff	**TiU average**	**2016**	**UG average**	**2016**	**UU average**	**2016**	**VU average**	**2016**
Refereed articles/ fte scientific staff	3,7	3,9	3,0	3,3	4,1	3,3	4,6	5,2
Refereed articles / fte total staff	3,7	3,9	2,9	3,1	3,9	3,1	4,2	4,9
Total output/ fte scientific staff	4,2	4,6	4,2	4,2	4,9	3,9	5,2	5,6
Total output/ fte total staff	4,2	4,6	3,9	4,0	4,7	3,7	4,8	5,3
fte PhD / fte scientific staff	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,5	0,4	0,4	0,5	0,5
internal theses/fte tenured staff	0,7	0,5	0,5	0,4	NA	NA	NA	NA
IN+EXT theses/fte tenured staff	NA	NA	0,7	0,5	0,7	0,5	0,9	0,8

PhD candidates	LEI				EUR				OU				UvA				MU			
	number				number				number				number				number			
	m	f	total		m	f	total		m	f	total		m	f	total		m	f	total	
enrolment	19	42	61		9	25	34		7	8	15		29	56	85		39	73	112	
	4Y	5Y	7Y	DIS	4Y	5Y	7Y	DIS	4Y	5Y	7Y	DIS	4Y	5Y	7Y	DIS	4Y	5Y	7Y	DIS
% graduated	5 %	39 %	77 %	5 %	6 %	50 %	96 %	9 %	20 %	60 %	100 %	7 %	1 %	34 %	82 %	4 %	9 %	48 %	76 %	7 %

PhD candidates	TiU				UG				UU				VU			
	number				number				number				number			
	m	f	total		m	f	total		m	f	total		m	f	total	
enrolment	17	73	90		20	55	75		28	66	94		27	65	92	
	4Y	5Y	7Y	DIS	4Y	5Y	7Y	DIS	4Y	5Y	7Y	DIS	4Y	5Y	7Y	DIS
% graduated	17%	67%	89%	8%	8%	35%	76%	9%	12%	50%	86%	11%	38%	54%	74%	5%