

Research Assessment Report
Faculty of Religion and Theology
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
December 2018

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

This is the Research Assessment Report on the Faculty of Religion and Theology of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam over the period 2012-2017. In this period, the name of the Faculty was still “Faculty of Theology” (*Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid*).

This Research Assessment Report has been written in accordance with the *Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021 (SEP)*¹, supplemented by the *Quality and Relevance in the Humanities Manual (QRiH)*² and using the standard terms of reference.

The committee received a lengthy self-study, the previous report covering the period 2007-2011, and the program of the site visit.

All practicalities were carefully organized, with attention to detail, for which the members of the assessment committee are most profoundly grateful.

The assessment committee consists of:

Prof. dr. Kristin De Troyer (chair), Universität Salzburg

Prof. dr. Brouria Bitton-Ashkelony, Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Prof. dr. Mark Cartledge, Regent University

Prof. dr. Craig Harline, Brigham Young University

Prof. dr. Michael Welker, Universität Heidelberg

Marco Derks MPhil (secretary)

¹ The amended version (2016) of the Protocol for Research Assessments in the Netherlands, published under the authority of 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).

² Evaluations of Humanities Research according to the SEP, 21 September 2017.

II. ASSESSMENT OF THE RESEARCH UNIT

A. The Research Unit's Strategy and Targets

A.1. Addressing the subthemes of strategic targets, and mission of unit:

A Hindu Rector Magnificus, a Jewish President of the Executive Board, and a Faculty established in the Reformed Protestant Tradition with staff and students coming from a variety of religious, ethnic, and linguistic background: diversity is part of the DNA of the VU and reflects the diversity at large in the society. Fifth in the QS ranking, the VU wants to continue to play a major role in research but stresses that having an impact on society is part of the mission. This implies also that the VU wants, on the one hand, to ensure accessibility for the broadest audience possible and, on the other hand, to provide the expertise as embedded in the faculties to a variety of audiences.

The Faculty of Religion and Theology (from here onwards FRT) reflects the multi-religious and multi-ethnic ambition as desired by its leadership, acknowledging that there is still some possibility to grow at the level of the staff. Similarly, the FRT seems to have become the beacon of expertise for the Netherlands when it comes to religious, interreligious, theological and related questions and issues. The assessment committee noted that the FRT not only complies and embodies the mission and character of the VU at large, it does so with warmth and enthusiasm. It strives to be a leading force building bridges in a context of increased polarisation.

The FRT also has undergone an internal gigantic transformation from six traditional disciplines to a dual department (Belief and Practices; Text and Traditions) while at the same time picking up some of the most excellent scholars in the field from other distinguished faculties when they were closed down. Whereas on occasion the precise delineation between the two departments or the distinction between centres and clusters was not entirely clear (eg, Islam in BP, but ought to be part of TT), the new structure seems to be geared towards more interdisciplinary research and teaching, and stimulates interaction, creativity and innovation—all touching on the central theme of “lived religion,” a concept that, in the 2015 KNAW report on the future of the studies of religion, religious studies and theology, was considered central in the redefinition of the field. Whereas the majority of the staff positively embraced the transition, transformation and creation of new strategies, one person in the interview mentioned that two or three of the more senior faculty members still have a hard time adapting to the new situation.

The transformation of the FRT may explain the massive amount of output and success. Moreover, by metamorphosing the FRT has become a model for the rest of the scholarly world that is looking into how to transition from an older organisational model into a new theme oriented, society oriented faculty.

The wonderful success of associating more and more traditions of faith and religious affiliations and the related “reorganization of the research structure and redefinition of the profile of the faculty” requires a thorough care “for a strong disciplinary identity” (cf. the repeated call in the Research Review 2005-2011).

The chosen frame of orientation and radiation in three publics (academic, religious, societal) relates to a famous model of the 1980s (David Tracy's attempt to make sense of pluralism by differentiating academic, ecclesial and public theology), but is no longer sufficient. Whereas the distinctions between political, legal, civil societal and media related engagements are crucial, there is some vagueness with regard to the notions “society,” “social relevance” etc. as used in the report. Similarly, the area and definition of “religion” is in need of further scrutiny. Moreover, critical and constructive commitments in relation to the churches, the dialogue between and shared research into different religious traditions, as well as the engagement with secularisation and critique of religion have to be more precisely fine-tuned. The assessment committee is of the opinion that all of this can only be done successfully when the academic quality of research and the respect for international academic standards is strictly adhered to and further cultivated.

The assessment committee realized that the FRT has become a powerhouse for the study of religion and theology in the Netherlands. The dynamic development as visible in the VU at large and in the FRT in particular and its outstanding output has rightfully brought the VU, on the fifth place in the QS ranking,

right after Harvard, Oxford, Durham and Cambridge Although the VU and the FRT has obtained this position, there remains a founding mentality, which explains the impressive constructive mentality of the leading senior management of the university at large and the faculty and staff in particular and which functions as a motor for constant improvement.

The governing structure was clearly described. The goals of the FRT are mainly attained, albeit that measuring the success of some of the goals was problematic.

The assessment committee noted also that a dedicated chair for Jewish Studies is a must for a faculty that prides itself on reflecting the multi religious culture that is the Netherlands and *Mokum* in particular!

A.2. Addressing the subthemes of governance and rationale for sub groups:

A new structure was set up over the past years and the structure was adequately described in the self-study. The assessment committee applauds the new structure, but asks whether the new structure is efficient. E.g. are there not too many meetings? The assessment committee also wonders whether any thought has been given on how to make sure that the meetings are research oriented and research supportive.

The assessment committee wonders whether assessment committees need to be developed or further developed. Moreover, whereas integration of different fields is seen as positive, it wonders how to do quality control per discipline, in other words how to balance the enhancement of quality in different academic disciplines and integration of all the disciplines within the two main disciplines, TT and BP and within the faculty as a whole.

The assessment committee also believes that the FRT ought to establish an Interreligious and Interdisciplinary Topics Research Centre.

B. Qualitative and Quantitative Assessment

B.1. Research quality

B.1.1. Addressing the subthemes of quality, contribution to the body of scientific knowledge, and academic reputation:

In general, the members of the FRT publish more than what is the standard output norm as formulated by NOSTER, the Dutch School for Advanced Studies in Theology and Religion. The committee received a list of all the publication of the period 2012-2017. As this huge list turned out to be less helpful in order to judge the quality of the output, esp. as there was a lack of distinction between what was peer-reviewed and what was not, it was requested that the committee be sent a list of the top one to two books and ten articles (with an indication of the ranking of the journals as given in the list according to the DGO list) for the period 2012-2017, from all full professors, associate and assistant professors, and post-doctoral researchers, with a .80-1.0 FTE appointment, with the list being divided by departments TT and BP. The list was received, for which the committee was very grateful, and further distributed.

The following conclusions are based on the list as sent and need to be read with the list as provided in the attachment in mind. The committee tried to do justice to the different amount of research time allocated to the scholars, from 0.4 to 0.05 FTE. Whereas the committee had a difference of opinion on how precisely to proceed, as the list also contained chapters in books and edited volumes and articles in journals not mentioned in the DGO list, the committee did come to the conclusion that the output as presented in the list ought to be seen on an average as 2 –(1) for the quality of the output. There was discussion about the output of some scholars, whose names are respectfully not mentioned, with evaluations ranging from 1 to 3, and with, in some cases, decimal numbers being used to come to an average. As we respect and honour the evaluation of one team member in particular, we opted not to use the scale of either 1, 2, 3 or 4 to judge the total output, but reached an average of 1,47 for the output.

In the discussion, it was stressed that the output of the scholars needs to be seen in relation with the other important scholarly achievements as described below.

FRT is truly grand at grant catching. The amount of grants and the sort of grants (ERC, NWO and others) is truly impressive and can be considered an indicator as to why VU stands on the fifth place of the QS ranking.

Whereas the assessment committee acknowledges that there is an enormous output in grants and publications, it wants to constructively note that

- The FRT may need to highlight their outstanding performance more publicly, for instance on their website.
- The FRT may want to develop a strategy to further guarantee the amount of successful grant applications, as the money stream provided by the grants is truly large. A strategy may include making sure that at least two days a week faculty members can devote their time to research, which is the standard fte for research, that some months be teaching and meeting free, and that a system of sabbaticals following international standards is developed.
- The FRT may need to encourage especially more senior faculty to publish more emphatically in A-ranked journals and to monitor closely the quality of the book chapters as published with a variety of publishers—this encouragement is explicitly linked to more senior faculty as more junior faculty and doctoral and post-doctoral faculty members have already this goal in mind.
- The FRT, in dialogue with the VU at large may want to reconsider its “flex space,” in order to ensure that esp. faculty is present (juniors seem to be present) or find ways in which to nurture synergies, stimulate collaboration and interdisciplinary research and modelling the work discipline for students and junior scholars. It was noted that every faculty member who was explicitly asked preferred the traditional office space. The absence of one’s own books was also noted and regretted. The given set-up may also make the FRT less attractive for visiting fellows from other countries, who are usually accustomed to having some assigned office-space and, as guests, may find it trickier to negotiate flex-space than the locals. Moreover, whereas the flex office space maybe an answer to the constrictions in office space, the VU may want to reflect on the ecological impact as more and more scholars are working at home and heating their houses.
- Moreover, the FRT in dialogue with the VU at large may want to make sure that more administrative burdens can be carried by administrators and that more supporting staff is added to the grant writing help desk.
- The FRT may strive to either help to upgrade the Pure system to better reflect academic (A-) ranking performances or encourage faculty members to more correctly enter their data, specifically by indicating which publications are peer-reviewed, and which not, and also what level of journal is indicated.
- The FRT may want to encourage setting up limited projects or teams or centres that deal with specific themes and issues, in which the VU can take a leading role.

Whereas the reputation of the faculty is internationally recognized, it may be good to bring their successful faculty members to the foreground as well as rendering their grants and publications more visible. As the reputation of the faculty is so good, the FRT or the VU at large may want to consider applying to become member of the League of European Research Universities or the Guild.

B.1.2. Addressing the subthemes of productivity strategy and resources:

That the productivity of the FRT is outstanding is obvious. However, the FRT has to develop a plan for future funding, including a rationale for who in which cluster can submit a grant proposal, which grant giving institutions to address, how to diversify the third money stream.

Whereas the FRT can boast of a very successful period of grant obtaining within its context of striving for excellence, creativity and innovation, and buttressing the freedom given to faculty members to select their own research themes and topics, it may want to set up a strategy to positively reward successful faculty members as well as deal with or sanction faculty members that are not submitting grant proposals.

In the context of the high productivity and good research quality, it is thought that professors finding time (and a place) to come together and talk about research is a necessity to move forward and continuing the success story.

Overall evaluation:

Grants: 1

Scholarly Output: 1,47, thus between 2 and 1

B.2. Relevance to Society

The assessment committee notes that the FRT is embracing the new vision of the faculty and that it is very happy with it. Woven into their concept of research is their desire to make scholarly research more accessible and relevant to society. The FRT is extremely actively engaged with its different audiences and actively aspires to go to their audiences in contrast to their audiences calling on the VU. Projects that would once have been considered without societal impact are now rethought in order to ensure societal impact and engagement (see Paul van Geest's project).

B.2.1. Addressing the Subthemes: Policy:

Many of the faculty reach the public through media presentations and appearances.

The FRT is becoming *the* place for societal impact—if VU approves of something or puts its shoulder under a project, then different societal or church related groups and institutions accept the issue or project and continue working with or on it (e.g. the recent statement on Yemen).

B.2.2. Addressing the subtheme of what are the research products for societal target groups:

Whereas most of the faculty are already involved with and engaged in different forms of output for the different audiences, FRT may want to publicize on its webpage a list of experts on whom the general audience can call for expertise advice.

The assessment committee notes that the self-assessment itself was confusing at times in calling the same centre of sub-discipline by different names. The FRT may also benefit from aligning the titles of different departments, clusters, groups and centres and consistently using the same titles throughout their publications, whether online or in print.

Overall evaluation: 1

B.3. Viability

B.3.1. Addressing the subthemes of strategy, SWOT analysis, robustness and stability:

The assessment committee would like to emphasize the necessity for the FRT to develop strategies for the continuation of successfully obtaining funding research income, alongside the income stream from regular tuition (whether directly or via third parties and sister schools or institutions), for encouraging team work, and for spotting stars.

In this context, the assessment committee wants to underline the importance of giving plenty of time to faculty members to do their research, of providing time and space to meet and to do research (while not overburdening them with meetings, as mentioned earlier), of creating space for the development of a common dream towards the future, and ultimately of taking precautions to make sure that these common dreams can be turned into reality.

Moreover, whereas the newly established *Hora Finita* system seems to improve the selection procedures, the amount of intake of PhD students, the processes of monitoring PhD students and ultimately the graduation results, the assessment committee would like to underline the necessity of focussing on academic standards as well as the necessity to further distribute the amount of student per supervisor. Whereas 25 PhD students are currently successfully graduating per year, which is an improvement in comparison with

the past, there needs to remain some vigilance to neither dilute the quality of the doctoral dissertations nor overburden some faculty members.

Overall evaluation: 2-1

C. Quality and Organisation of PhD Programme, Research Integrity Policy, and Diversity

C.1. PhD Programme

Addressing the subthemes of selection and progression procedure:

With the newly established *Hora Finita* system a start has been made with improving the selection procedures, the amount of PhD students taken on board, the supervision and related progression monitoring procedure, and ultimately the successful obtaining of the PhD degree.

The admission procedure and the committees involved in the selection and later monitoring of PhD students pays attention to trying to find matching and fitting supervisors, requires the students to not only submit proposals but also develop a proposal and successfully defend it before a board of professors before being allowed to continue with their PhD projects.

The number of PhD students is staggering and given the work load of the staff involved and the large amount of international students coming in from institutions that may not be on the level of the VU, the assessment committee is wondering whether the FRT ought to not more focus on transforming quantity into quality.

In the context of scouting for shooting stars, the coordinator of the Research Master programme is the person dedicated to this task and who plays a central role in the Research Master which helps students to transition from regular MA programs into a ReMA which prepares for a doctoral program. In this context, the assessment committee wonders whether the standards for the TOEFL ought to be reviewed, or whether there are any other means of verifying the English level of students waiting to be admitted can be required.

During the site visit, the 30 ECTS doctoral program was clearly explained, albeit that some of the specifics remained a bit obscure. Whereas *Hora Finita* seems to take care of most of the aspects of PhD student life from entrance to graduation, it was wondered whether not more ought to be done to help especially fresh minted professors with their task of supervising PhD students?

The assessment committee was also wondering whether or not VU could create a stipend or price to encourage more promising students to apply for the doctoral program. In this context, the VU may want to find more funding to help the externally funded students. Moreover, the FRT may want to encourage its students to apply for international stipends and awards.

With regard to career perspectives after finishing a PhD: PhD students need to be encouraged to think creatively about the job market after obtaining a PhD. In this context it may need to be made more clear that only a very small group of students will progress into postdoctoral positions and further academic jobs.

Whereas the PhD students are clearly a very happy bunch, they would like the FRT to improve the reimbursement system, to encourage faculty members to be (more) often present (an argument against the flex space system), to develop policies for dealing with data collection and management, and to create a small fund for the after-hours trip to the pub to continue and discuss scholarly issues with their professors.

PhD students seem to be very aware of the need to publish in A-ranking journals and are very happy with the PhD Success and Personal Efficiency course and with NOSTER and its many seminars, courses and meetings.

After the serious upheaval in the recent past of theological studies and the study of religions, with many faculties closing down, the FRT seems to have become a stable house for PhD students. There are no signs of future collapse—to the contrary the emphasis on lived religion seems to be the key to the future.

Overall evaluation: 2-(1)

C.2. Research Integrity Policy

Addressing the subthemes of integrity, policy tools, and prevention of violations:

Research integrity is connected with how research is being portrayed on the VU website. The assessment committee notes that the input into PURE has resulted in many an error and misrepresentation online, but also acknowledges that the problems with PURE exceeds the level of the faculty. Moreover, it also acknowledges that the VU website is in transition and that the new landscaping of the VU ought to solve many a problem of inconsistency.

On the level of the data management of students, the *Hora Finita* system ought to be better in tracking students and managing data.

With regard to a research ethics policy, the assessment committee was happy to note that FRT is working on setting up a policy for discussing proposals, esp. when gathering of data from people is involved. The policy is being developed using the proposal that are coming in and the issues connected with it. As there is a shift to doing more empirical research, there is a growing need for having a functioning research ethics policy.

With regard to the issue of integrity in research, the FRT will be following and implementing the general code of conduct which is currently being discussed and created by the Netherlands, in collaboration with NWO.

Addressing the subthemes of data management:

The FRT follows the guidelines as set forward by the VU and has, for instance, opted out of using American systems, such as Google-drive, drop box, i-cloud and instead is buying into different systems.

C.3. Diversity

Addressing the subthemes of policy and effect on research:

The assessment committee applauds the mission of the VU and the FRT in particular with regard to diversity. The assessment committee is exceedingly happy with the diversity of the student body and the growing diversity among the faculty and staff. However, it was noted that there is a need to create formats for strategies of interdisciplinary and interreligious dialogue and studies within the faculty. Moreover, it is hoped that with all the emphasis on diversity the typical Dutch religious traditions will not be forgotten, and that chairs in Pentecostal Theology and Missiology as well as some centres such as the Hollenweger Centre will be continued in the future.

The assessment committee also acknowledges that the striving for diversity is happening within a context of warm collegiality radiating from the faculty and the staff who have a heart for students and an eagerness to contribute to society.

The VU at large and the FRT in particular has vacated the ivory tower of research and has moved into the village of interconnectedness, interfaith, inter- and multi religious and multi ethnicity which is the world at large.

It was an absolute honour and privilege to dwell for some days in this wonderful house!

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

In this section, the most important recommendations are gathered.

a. The Quality of the Research Unit as a Whole

Whereas most of the recommendations are already given in the appropriate sections in the report, the main recommendations are collected here again:

The assessment committee noted that a dedicated chair for Jewish Studies is a must for a faculty that prides itself on reflecting the multi religious culture that is the Netherlands and *Mokum* in particular!

The FRT may want to develop a strategy to further guarantee the amount of successful grant applications, as the money stream provided by the grants is truly large, and for instance, invest in a full time professional grant-writer (assistant).

The FRT may need to encourage especially more senior faculty to publish more emphatically in A-ranked journals and to more closely monitor the quality of the book chapters as published with a variety of publishers.

The FRT, in dialogue with the VU at large needs to development a sabbatical system in line with international standards.

The FRT, in dialogue with the VU at large ought to reconsider its policy of “flex space” and think hard about its viability.

The FRT may want to encourage setting up limited projects or teams or centres that deal with specific themes and issues, in which the VU can take a leading role, such as an Interreligious and Interdisciplinary Topics Research Centre.

The FRT, as a leader in the field, is encouraged to redefine the three fold definition of audience and develop the standard and the criteria for measuring for impact of research on the society at large

b. The Unit's PhD Programme

The FRT may want to create a stipend or price to encourage promising students to apply for the doctoral program and develop as strategy to helping students find funding.

Moreover, the FRT may want to encourage its students to apply for international stipends and awards.

c. The Unit's Research Integrity

The FRT needs to spend time and energy in either creating or implementing policies with regard to integrity in research and ethical aspects of research.

d. The Unit's Diversity

The FRT is encouraged to continue to strive for diversity in its student, staff and faculty members.

IV. APPENDICES

1. Short CVs of the Members of the Assessment Committee

Prof. dr. Kristin de Troyer (chair) is Professor of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament at the Paris Lodron University of Salzburg, Austria, honorary Professor of Hebrew Bible at the University of St Andrews, Scotland, and President of the European Society of Women in Theological Research.

Prof. dr. Brouria Bitton-Ashkelony is Full Professor and Martin Buber Chair in the Department of Comparative Religion in the Faculty of Humanities at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. She is also the Head of the Authority of Research Students in the non-experimental sciences (that is, the faculties of Humanities, Law, Education, and Social Sciences). She has previously served for 7 years as the Director of the Center for the Study of Christianity at the HU, and chaired several times the Department of Comparative Religion. She works on Patristics studies, theories of Religion, late antique Christianities, including Eastern Christianity.

Prof. dr. Mark Cartledge is Professor of Practical Theology at Regent University School of Divinity, and the President of the Society for Pentecostal Studies.

Prof. dr. Craig Harline is De Lamar Jensen Professor of Early Modern History at Brigham Young University, past fellow of the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, and past president of the Sixteenth Century Society and Conference. His research focuses on lived religion during the Reformation.

Prof. dr. Michael Welker, Dr. theol. Dr. phil. Dres. h.c., is Senior Professor and Director of the Research Center of International and Interdisciplinary Theology (FIIT) at the University of Heidelberg. He is also Honorary Professor at the Seoul Theological University, member of the Heidelberg Academy of Sciences and Humanities and the Finnish Academy of Arts and Letters.

Marco Derks MPhil (secretary) is Executive Secretary of the Netherlands School for Advances Studies in Theology and Religion. He studied theology at the Theological University Kampen and the University of Manchester, and is currently finishing his doctoral dissertation at Utrecht University. He has previously been the secretary of the education assessment committee for the Old Catholic Seminary on behalf of the Faculty of Humanities, Utrecht University.

2. Site Visit Programme Thursday 8 November 2018

- 08:45 Arrival at VU (meeting place: Senate Room, Faculty of Religion and Theology)
- 09:00 Welcome by the Rector Magnificus, prof. Vinod Subramaniam
- 09:20 Closed meeting of the Committee
- 10:30 Interview 1: Faculty Board (prof. Ruard Ganzevoort, Dean; prof. Bert Jan Lietaert Peerbolte, Director of Research)
- 11:00 Interview 2: Graduate School (dr. Arie Zwiep, Director Graduate School; prof. Bert Jan Lietaert Peerbolte, Director of Research)
- 11:30 Interview 3: Department Chairs and Members of the Management Teams (prof. Gijsbert van den Brink, Chair *Beliefs & Practices*; prof. Matthias Smalbrugge, Chair *Texts & Traditions*; MT members B&P: prof. Marianne Moyaert, prof. Stefan Paas; MT members T&T: prof. Wido van Peursen, prof. Mirjam van Veen)
- 12:00 Interview 4: Delegation Board of Professors (prof. Eddy van der Borght, prof. Wim Janse, prof. Marianne Moyaert, prof. Hagith Amirav)
- 12:30 Lunch Break
- 13:30 Closed meeting of the Committee

- 14:00 Interview 5: Research & Ethics Committee (prof. August den Hollander, dr. Miranda Klaver, prof. Bert Jan Lietaert Peerbolte, dr. Katja Tolstoj, dr. Arie Zwiep)
- 14:30 Interview 6: Researchers from the Faculty (prof. Henk Bakker, dr. Pieter Coppens, prof. Faustina Doufikar-Aerts, dr. Yaser Ellethy, prof. Mirjam van Veen)
- 15:00 Interview 7: PhD candidates (Christiaan Erwich, Anke Liefbroer, Inge Schipper, Eva van Urk, An-Ting Yi)
- 15:30 Interview 8: Talent scouting (dr. Katja Tolstoj and a number of ReMA students)
- 16:00 Closed meeting of the Committee
- 17:00 First impressions by the Committee

3. Quantitative Data on the Research Unit's Composition and Financing

These tables have been provided by the Faculty and replace the tables provided in Appendix 1 of the Faculty's self-assessment report.

Table D3a: Research Staff Overview in fte's

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Full professor	6,15	5,42	5,91	7,23	8,44	9,14
Associate professor	1,9	1,4	1,1	1,37	1,6	2,07
Assistant professor	6,95	5,89	6,34	5,61	5,7	6,48
Post docs	6,17	3,97	5,06	7,6	5,37	3,38
PhD employed	9,52	10,35	13,92	15,07	14,65	11,98
Total research staff	30,69	27,03	32,33	36,88	35,76	33,05
Support staff	1,24	1,52	1,44	0,6	1,58	0,96
Total staff	31,93	28,55	33,77	37,48	37,34	34,01

Table D3b: Main categories of research output

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Refereed articles	66	59	69	65	51	63
Non-refereed articles	25	22	25	28	18	13
Books (scholarly)	16	13	8	7	6	8
Book chapters	63	81	74	81	85	80
Books edited	16	13	22	21	13	14
Professional publications (books)	8	10	11	6	3	7
Professional publications (articles)	56	45	44	46	39	47
Publications aimed at the general public (books)	5	5	3	3	4	4
Publications aimed at the general public (articles)	39	26	43	37	16	14
Other output (book reviews)	96	66	112	82	83	22
Dissertations	4	22	18	20	18	17
Total publications	394	362	429	396	336	289

Table D3c: Funding Overview

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
<i>Funding</i>	<i>(fte / %)</i>	<i>(fte / %)</i>	<i>(fte / %)</i>	<i>(fte / %)</i>	<i>(fte / %)</i>	<i>(fte / %)</i>
Direct funding	14,85 / 47	10,78 / 38	10,57 / 31	13 / 35	18,63 / 50	22,02 / 65
Research grants	9,53 / 30	9,02 / 32	12,71 / 38	14,7 / 39	11,37 / 30	9,19 / 27
Contract research	6,95 / 22	8,05 / 28	9,79 / 29	8,63 / 23	7,35 / 20	2,81 / 8
Other	0,6 / 1	0,7 / 2	0,7 / 2	1,15 / 3	0 / 0	0 / 0
Total funding	31,93 / 100	28,55 / 100	33,77 / 100	37,48 / 100	37,35 / 100	34,02 / 100
<i>Expenditure</i>	<i>(m€)</i>	<i>(m€)</i>	<i>(m€)</i>	<i>(m€)</i>	<i>(m€)</i>	<i>(m€)</i>
Personnel costs	3,3	3,3	3,6	2,6	1,9	2,5
Material costs	1,8	2	2,1	0,5	0,4	0,6
Total expenditure	5,1	5,3	5,7	3,1	2,3	3,1

4. Explanation of the Categories Utilised (table 1)

The assessment categorised in this report are those mentioned and explained in Table 1 of the *Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021* (p. 8), which is copied below.

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.

5. List of Key Publications of Faculty Members as Specified in B.1 and Provided by the FRT

The list is added in attachment.

KDT, Salzburg, 17.XII.2018