

**Tilburg School of Humanities and Digital  
Sciences**

**MIDTERM REVIEW RESEARCH  
Department of Culture Studies  
2015-2017**

De Onderzoekerij  
Vondellaan 58  
2332 AH Leiden

Phone: +31 6 24812176

Email: [info@onderzoekerij.nl](mailto:info@onderzoekerij.nl)

Internet: [www.onderzoekerij.nl](http://www.onderzoekerij.nl)



# Contents

Preface.....	4
1. Introduction.....	5
1.1 Terms of reference for the assessment.....	5
1.2 The review committee.....	5
1.3 Procedures followed by the committee.....	5
2. Assessment of the Department of Culture Studies.....	6
2.1 The department of Culture Studies.....	6
2.2 Research quality.....	7
2.3 Relevance to society.....	8
2.4 Viability.....	9
2.5 PhD programme.....	10
2.6 Research integrity.....	11
2.7 Diversity.....	11
3. Summary and recommendations.....	12
Appendix A – Curriculum Vitae.....	13
Appendix B – Programme of the site visit.....	14
Appendix C – Tables.....	15
Appendix D – Meaning of the scores.....	17



## Preface

This report contains the results of the midterm review of the Department of Culture Studies of the Tilburg School of Humanities and Digital Sciences (TSHD). It spells out in detail our overall impression of the department as a high level and vibrant research unit that has boldly and innovatively taken on board a topical and timely new program, and that is making determined steps towards fully realizing the potential of the renewed definition of its identity. While our overall impression of the department's profile and activities is a positive one, we also realize that the department is in the middle of a process of transition, and, to that end, we have made a number of recommendations on how it could further enhance and develop its research culture, environment, strategies, activities and output.

As an evaluation committee, we are very thankful for the care with which the evaluation process was designed and organized. The documentation disseminated to us beforehand and the instructions given to us about our task were thorough and clear, and the help that we got during the process from the department, and in particular, from Ms. Esther Poort was extremely competent and professional.

The discussions we had with the department staff, the faculty management and students were very helpful and enlightening, and we were happy with the way in which the individuals and groups responded to our queries and were ready to engage in a lively discussion with the committee members.

We hope that the report manages to convey our evaluations and recommendations in a clear and effective way, and wish the department every success in its significant work.

On behalf of the evaluation committee,

Professor Sirpa Leppänen  
Chair



# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Terms of reference for the assessment

The midterm review of the research of the Department of Culture Studies of the Tilburg School of Humanities and Digital Sciences (TSHD) is carried out in the context of the assessment system as specified in the Standard Evaluation Protocol for research assessments in the Netherlands by the Association of Universities in The Netherlands (VSNU), the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) and the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW).

The review committee was asked to assess the scientific quality and the relevance and utility to society of the research conducted by the Department of Culture Studies in the reference period 2015–2017, as well as its strategic targets and the extent to which it is equipped to achieve them.

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

This report describes findings, conclusions and recommendations of this midterm research review of the Department of Culture Studies.

## 1.2 The review committee

The Board of Tilburg University appointed the following members of the committee for the midterm research review:

- Prof. dr. Sirpa Leppänen (chair);
- Prof. dr. Dirk De Geest;
- Prof. dr. Rodney Jones.

More detailed information about the members of the committee can be found in Appendix A.

The Board of Tilburg University appointed drs. Esther Poort of De Onderzoekerij as the committee secretary. All members of the committee signed a declaration and disclosure form to ensure that the committee members made their judgements without bias, personal preference or personal interest, and that the judgment was made without undue influence from the Department of Culture Studies.

## 1.3 Procedures followed by the committee

Prior to the site visit, the committee received detailed documentation comprising:

- The self-assessment report of the Department of Culture Studies, including appendices;
- The Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) 2015–2021.

The committee proceeded according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP). The assessment is based on the documentation provided by the department and the interviews with the management, a selection of researchers of the department and PhD students. The interviews took place on 17 October 2018 (see Appendix B).

The committee discussed its assessment at its final session during the site visit. The members of the committee commented by email on the draft report. The draft version was then presented to the Department of Culture Studies for factual corrections and comments. Subsequently, the text was finalised and presented to the Board of Tilburg University.



## 2. Assessment of the Department of Culture Studies

According to the SEP scoring system, as explained in Appendix D, the committee has awarded the following scores to the Department of Culture Studies.

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

### 2.1 The department of Culture Studies

The research program Rapid Social and Cultural Transformation: Online and Offline is based in the Department of Culture Studies (DCU), which is a department of the Tilburg School of Humanities and Digital Sciences (TSHD). Besides DCU, TSHD comprises the Department of Cognitive Science and Artificial Intelligence (DCA), the Department of Communication and Cognition (DCC) and the Department of Philosophy (DFI).

TSHD is one of the five schools of Tilburg University. As of 2018, the Tilburg School of Humanities changed its name into the Tilburg School of Humanities and Digital Sciences to better reflect its new profile for the future.

The research program Rapid Social and Cultural Transformation: Online and Offline focusses on the synergies between digital culture, multimodality and socio-cultural diversity, draws on a broad range of empirical data and aims at theoretical and methodological innovation. In previous years (2009–2014) the research unit hosted three different research groups (Language and Globalisation; Literature and Visual Art in the European Public Sphere; Religion and Ritual). In order to capitalize on the possible synergies between compatible and complementary perspectives on phenomena that often share underlying causes in globalization and the emergence of digital culture, these three different research groups have been integrated in one research program: Rapid Social and Cultural Transformation: Online and Offline. This program started running in 2015 and currently houses a total of 37.6 fte (42 members and 9 PhD's), not counting external PhD's and visiting scholars. These 37.6 fte comprise research, educational and all others tasks of the staff members. In the period now evaluated (2015–2017), the actual research time of the permanent staff was around 20 fte (appendix C, table 1).

The current focus of the program has been influenced by previous work in the department, particularly in the context of the research center Babylon. This center was established more than two decades ago to bring together scholars in linguistics and social sciences who study multiculturalism and multilingualism. Meanwhile, both the incorporation of globalization as a focal area of the entire research program and the program's embrace of the combination of Humanities and Social Sciences have ensured that Babylon and the research program cover roughly the same terrain.

The committee supports the strategy of combining the three former different research groups in order to encourage research synergies. As a strategic move the establishment of this program is bold, well founded and timely. However, the committee has the impression that the intended synergy has not yet been fully achieved. It strongly recommends that the department work to foster a truly collaborative and interdisciplinary research culture. This will require strong leadership using both bottom-up and top-down strategies, in other words, the mobilization and dialogic development of insights and innovations by the research staff and students, and of the vision, strategic guidance and support by the management.



Moreover, the committee suggests that the department find a way to articulate more precisely in what ways the new program is, partly, a continuation, and/or a further development of the relevant and significant work done previously in the department.

The mission of the research unit is 'to explore and explain how digitalization and globalization have consequences for social and cultural practices'. Importantly, the focus of the program is Humanities in the Digital Age, rather than Digital Humanities (with its emphasis on Big Data Research). The emphasis of this program is on the cultural, social and ethical consequences of digitalization and globalization, and on the multimodal cultural practices they engender. The program focuses on the social and cultural behaviour that people exhibit in today's globalized and digital society, and the creativity this often involves, and on the skills people need to cope with the linguistic, technical, political and interpersonal demands of this new environment. As such, it is complementary to many other research programs at Tilburg University and TSHD, where the study of digital society and digital communication are also main points of interest.

The committee believes that the vision and goals of the program have been formulated in a forward-looking and interesting way. However, the committee recommends a more explicit vision be articulated concerning the key goals and foci of the program in the near future. Despite the diversity of disciplines and approaches in the department, the core theoretical and empirical issues related to the work of the program on digitalization and globalization could be identified and accounted for in a more concrete and detailed way to further strengthen the vision and profile of the unit, as well as to better guide the work of individual researchers and groups.

## 2.2 Research quality

The committee concludes that, based on the categories of the SEP 2015-2021, the overall quality of the research falling within the department's remit qualifies as 2 ('the research unit conducts very good, internationally recognised research'). The committee's opinion is based on the following considerations.

The publication record demonstrates research of a high quality, indicated by an impressive publication record in highly ranked international, local and national journals. Some of the work is of an exceptional quality. Overall, the program has published a balanced proportion of refereed articles and articles intended for a non-specialized reading public, books and book chapters. This is laudable, since the output of refereed journal articles enhances individuals' professional development and visibility, whereas the output of book chapters, books and monographs is still widely recognized and highly esteemed in this field of research as well.

The research group has certainly managed to combine its internal profile with a very international orientation. Publications, as well as projects, forms of collaboration, conferences, meetings and dissertations display this high ambition. However, to accentuate this orientation even further, in addition to English, other languages (French or German) could also be given more attention in order to create a more genuinely (European) international profile.

While the publication record is impressive, the figures provided about the main research output also indicate a (slight, yet symptomatic) decline of output in all categories (Appendix C, Table 2). The committee believes that this may be the result of the growing teaching, supervision and administrative load of the staff, as well as of the growing amount of time that they need to spend on writing funding applications. The committee recommends that the department investigate in more detail what the underlying reasons are for this decline, and take appropriate measures to ensure that research staff will have enough time, support and resources to go on publishing.

As described in the self-evaluation report, in general the success rate in funding in the Humanities and Social Sciences is rather low. The percentages of funding based on research grants (1,63 fte in 2017) and contract research (2,14 fte in 2017) have been relatively stable over the review period. It is noteworthy that the department has been successful in attracting two staff members each of whom recently received a prestigious major personal grant (a VENI and a VICI grant, respectively), a WOTRO project and a number of smaller funds (in collaboration with social stakeholders).



As described in the self-evaluation report, the department aims to become a recognized interdisciplinary research group that is widely acknowledged as having solid expertise in research and teaching on digital and global cultures. Based on the self-evaluation report, the committee got the impression that there was not yet much collaborative work or examples of crossover into other disciplines in the departments of TSHD. With the exception of PhD students, there are very few co-publications and collaborative papers that articulate and exemplify the strive towards interdisciplinary research. However, during the site visit, the committee discovered that the programme clearly is in a process of transition towards a more interdisciplinary research culture. Especially during the meeting with the staff group gathered around the theme 'Perspectives of the Humanities', the committee heard several examples of promising interdisciplinary research projects. Moreover, the PhD students seem to be an important engine for innovative and interdisciplinary research projects. The committee recommends that the department enhance the visibility of interdisciplinary collaborations and demonstrate this explicitly in its activities and the dissemination of its profile. In addition, the committee recommends that the department continue the work on fostering a more collaborative and interdisciplinary research culture. It could be articulated more explicitly how such interdisciplinarity could be one of the strengths of the department, and how it could be an indication of its uniqueness, compared to other units in and outside the Netherlands that engage with digitalization and globalization. This requires a shared vision and continued investment in team building in the department. In order to be a coherent and viable research program that has genuine capacity to evolve further, researchers working in different research areas will need to find common interests, and to develop ways of making strategic alliances with the Department of Cognitive Science and Artificial Intelligence and the Department of Communication and Cognition. In addition, the committee recommends that the department be proactive in carving a niche for itself within the University's strategic research areas ('Empowering the Resilient Society', 'Enhancing Health and Wellbeing', 'Creating Value from Data') all of which are centrally relevant to the work done in the department.

Finally, the committee encourages the department members to continue their discussions on what interdisciplinarity means theoretically in the context of their work, and what repercussions it has in terms of their empirical work. A more explicit profile in this respect will contribute to the department's coherence and its specific research profile in a national and international context.

### 2.3 Relevance to society

As far as relevance to society is concerned, the committee concludes that the department's research output generally qualifies as 2 in the SEP 2015-2021 categories ('the research unit makes a very good contribution to society'). The committee's opinion is based on the following considerations.

The focus of the program is very timely and relevant with respect to how societies, cultures, language and communication, interaction, public discourses and debates are changing. The committee observed that the department clearly places a great deal of value on societal relevance and is committed to further strengthening this aspect of their research.

Based on the self-evaluation report and the interviews during the site visit, it became clear that a great deal of the work in the department (on, for example, migrant literacies, digital media, rituals) has great potential for social impact. Considerable effort is made to disseminate the scholarly research to a broader public by several means, including the DiggIt magazine, blogs, public appearances and debates. Many of the department members publish for the general public, and are in key positions to influence the academic, institutional and societal policies. Several department members serve as experts in online and offline press and broadcast media, discussing events related to, for example, Islam, the majority-minority relations, human trafficking, politics and public discourse. Overall, the extent of engagement is impressive by the standards of the disciplines involved. However, it is not clear to the committee whether enough is done to present these contributions as means of enhancing the visibility of department, and not only that of individual researchers.

While the committee applauds the department's emphasis on generating societal impact, there is no evidence in the documentation of an explicit strategy for ensuring that the research conducted in the department has sufficient pathways to generate impact. The committee strongly recommends that the department formulate a clear overall strategy for societal relevance that is more proactive than simply making research results available to the general public and policy makers. In order to better articulate the





impact of the department, the committee recommends formulating a concrete set of criteria defining different types of impact. Without such criteria, future societal engagements may depend excessively on the contingent interests of individual researchers, or on a reactive approach to enquiries from external partners. An overall strategy would also enable researchers to prioritize their societal interactions, and to develop increasingly durable partnerships in selected areas as appropriate.

In addition, the committee recommends that the department pay more attention to enhancing their ways of collaborating with digital actors themselves. Besides informants, and research subjects, individuals and groups could also be recruited as co-researchers, collaborators, and community and network liaisons. In this way, the team's work could also profit more from the practitioners' expertise. In addition, thanks to such collaborations, new possibilities for developing applications of research work could open up and be developed

DiggIt magazine is important for the visibility of both the teaching and research activities of the department (102.687 visitors between 1 September 2016 and the end of 2017), and bridging the gap between the academia and society. Staff members use the magazine to communicate their research findings and to provide input for societal debate. Student work and papers are published in it, provided that they are of a sufficient quality and have passed through the editorial process that is in place to ensure quality control. The committee believes that DiggIt is a very promising and innovative project that has already had a strong educational impact. It also shows a great deal of potential to transform scholarly publication practices. The committee recommends that the department continue to develop the magazine and also fully seize the opportunity it offers for conducting interdisciplinary research on online publishing, public debate and interaction with audiences.

## 2.4 Viability

Whilst the previous two sections contained an assessment of the performance of the department during the reference period, this section is more forward-looking. Based on the categories of the SEP 2015–2021, the committee concluded that the department ranks as 2 for viability ('the research unit is very well equipped for the future'). The committee's opinion is based on the following considerations.

The committee is impressed by the vibrant and dynamic research culture in the department, and its efforts to gain more research funding and to create a long-lasting and inclusive research program. The SWOT analysis conducted by the department identified and spelled out very clearly the strengths and the weaknesses of the current program and its aims. However, the committee is of the opinion that there still needs to be more awareness of the potential threats and risks facing the department. In particular, it needs to fully acknowledge the danger of losing both funding and staff members. Faced with such threats, it is the opinion of the committee that now is the critical moment to engage in more explicit strategic planning. To this end, the committee very strongly recommends that the department create a strategy group that includes staff members with different forms of expertise, and who are in different stages of their careers. Such a multi-voiced strategy group can be invaluable for the purpose of seeking and putting into practice innovative and inclusive long- and short-term plans with which the risks facing the department could be tackled.

One important aspect of the strategic planning now needed is to devise a recruitment plan that will strengthen the expertise in the department in the core areas of the program: digitalization and globalization. This is all the more important as, in the upcoming period, several key staff members will retire. In this situation, it is important to develop a recruitment strategy and to do so in a transparent and consultative manner.

The number of personnel seems to have reached its peak, which implies that all the members of the staff should actively contribute to the overall aims of the department. This requires a realistic and productive approach to stimulate research that recognizes and integrates the different emphases and traditions in the department. It also requires further investments in the publication strategy for developing joint publication projects involving junior/senior staff, interdisciplinary teams, and other researchers of digitalization and globalization (inside or outside Tilburg University).

The committee congratulates the department on its recent successes in attracting young scholars bringing in their own substantial research funding. Although the entire program clearly benefits from this,



a major challenge here remains the tension between collective projects and individual careers. This is also underlined in the SWOT-analysis, although its impact is underestimated. In the opinion of the committee, it is important to be conscious of the consequences of these individual successes on the other staff members within the department. This requires careful planning by the management of the department.

Another important issue is how to further develop the strategy for improving the likelihood of external funding. The committee strongly encourages the program to continue with the professionalisation of acquisition structures. It applauds the endeavour to have every major grant proposal written by a small team, consisting of at least the applicant, one senior researcher with expertise on review committees, one team member from another disciplinary field, and one PhD candidate. The downside of the strong focus on acquisition is that this will restrain the already limited time of staff members doing research. Therefore, an important aspect of the department strategic planning needs to be to secure the resources and opportunities needed for all staff members in different positions and career stages to be able to seriously invest in research and publishing.

## 2.5 PhD programme

The TSHD Graduate School is responsible for the PhD programme. The TSHD graduate school hosts three different types of PhD students. The first category consists of internally funded PhD students with a full employment status. The second category are self-funded PhD students who have a grant or a fellowship (mainly from NWO). The third group are so-called 'external' PhD candidates who receive supervision from one or more of the staff members, and who are enrolled in the Graduate School, but are not on the department payroll and who are usually not present on an everyday basis.

The PhD candidates are assigned two (co-)supervisors, at least one of whom is a Tilburg University professor. TSHD embraces teams of a professor and an assistant or associate professor, sometimes in arrangements whereby the assistant or associate professor act as the daily supervisor.

Having two supervisors means that students can profit from their wide-ranging theoretical and methodological expertise. In practice, PhD projects vary in the degree to which both supervisors share the responsibility over the work.

The TSHD Graduate School has taken several measures to improve the completion rates for internal PhD candidates, without compromising the quality of PhD projects and the final dissertations. These measures include a Training and Supervision Plan (TSP), regular meetings with the team of supervisors, HR meetings (Result & Development meetings), two confidential advisors, the creation of an Educational/Training module and the implementation of a digital portfolio. Recent developments also include the monitoring of the PhD candidates and the design of courses for all PhD candidates that addresses Research Ethics and Data Management. In addition, within the department, weekly 'Peers' meetings are organized by the PhDs themselves. In these meetings, draft chapters, conference papers and first analyses are discussed. Several senior research members, including the program leader, also join the meetings.

The committee interviewed current PhD students in various stages of their PhD studies about their supervision, research facilities and possible constraints on their research. The committee is impressed by the high quality and enthusiasm of the students they met. The department seems to have attracted exceptionally good PhD students who are conducting interesting projects. The committee got the impression that the PhD students are an important force in the development of an interdisciplinary research culture and in the introduction of a range of interesting ideas and innovative perspectives. The students with whom the committee spoke during the site visit were very positive about the training opportunities provided. They appreciated the flexible informal atmosphere and highly valued the weekly peer meetings, offering them a low profile and a stimulating and critical platform for supportive discussions.

The committee concludes that the internal organisation of the TSDH is sound and constructive. Students are closely monitored and tutored and well integrated into the TSDH research environment. The daily interaction between senior and junior researchers seems fruitful, although rather informal. The committee recommends that the department take measures to inform PhD students in a more structured way about the regulations and expectations concerning their studies.



Based on the figures included in the self-evaluation report, the time for completing a PhD thesis appears to be rather long. A substantial proportion of the PhD students took more than six years to complete their PhD. The committee recommends that the department investigate what the exact reasons for the long graduation times are, in order to take extra measures that will lead to a substantial increase in the number of post-graduates completing their PhD in four years.

## 2.6 Research integrity

University of Tilburg has divided the responsibility for informing and monitoring the staff and students on research ethics and integrity across different institutions. At the university level, there is an ombudsperson responsible for research integrity. This person has an independent status within the university organization and reports to the University Board. Research ethics is the responsibility of each School. In the period now evaluated, the policies in TSHD have undergone major changes.

In 2015, the Faculty Board took several steps to centralize ethics policies for the entire School. The TSHD Research Ethics and Data Management Committee (REDM) was set up to implement the new policy. For each new project, a data management plan could be submitted that accounts for how data are treated and stored. Research proposals in which ethical issues are involved also had to be submitted to the committee.

As more recent developments, the REDM has been responsible for the implementation of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in the School and it has adjusted its policy and procedures accordingly. The assessment of data management and ethical issues prior to the start of a research project has become more stringent. The research group often works with digital data, and it will keep up to date how the new guidelines impact this kind of research. The REDM committee can be consulted prior to submitting a proposal. As described in the self-evaluation report of TSHD, a key aim is to integrate a data management plan in the PhD program and to offer training and special mandatory courses for PhD-candidates.

The committee is pleased with the processes recently implemented for ensuring research integrity and research ethics. Since ethics, integrity and data management are becoming increasingly important, especially given the recently implemented GDPR, continued attention to these aspects is recommended at all the different levels within the university (department level, faculty level and university level).

Although the committee noted that the ethical dimensions of research are clearly taken seriously within TSHD, it also noted that PhD students did not seem fully aware of these dimensions and issues of research integrity. Therefore, the committee strongly supports the intended implementation of mandatory courses about these issues for PhD-candidates.

## 2.7 Diversity

The self-evaluation report describes the emphasis in the department on diversity, given the emphasis on multiculturalism and gender in much of the research of the department. This vision is fully subscribed to by the committee, as well.

The predecessors of the current research program already had a fairly good gender balance and a number of staff members from abroad. The committee noted that obtaining a well-balanced staff with respect to age, gender and cultural background still requires some additional effort. It is convinced that the department is very motivated to attract new scholars who contribute to the diversity in different aspects.



### 3. Summary and recommendations

In summary, the level of research quality is generally very high across all the research conducted in the department. Some of the work is of an exceptionally high quality. Overall, the program has published a balanced proportion of refereed articles to non-refereed articles, books and book chapters. The focus of the program is very timely and relevant with respect to how societies, cultures, language and communication, interaction, public discourses and debates are changing. A great deal of the work in the department has great potential for social impact.

The committee is impressed by the dynamic and vibrant research culture in the department and its goal in securing substantial research funding and in establishing and maintaining a solid long-term and cutting-edge research program. However, the committee believes that there needs to be more awareness of the potential threats and risks facing the department, particularly in terms of losing funding and research staff members

The committee invites the Faculty to consider the following suggestions:

- Foster a more collaborative and interdisciplinary research culture by showing strong leadership effectively using both bottom-up and top-down strategies;
- Engage in more explicit strategic planning by creating a strategy group representing staff with different kinds of expertise and representing staff in different stages of their careers;
- Continue the discussions on what interdisciplinarity means and what the repercussions are in terms of the empirical work of the department;
- Formulate a more explicit perspective on what should be the core theoretical and empirical topics and questions related to the research within the program on digitalization and globalization;
- Carve a research niche within the university-level profiling areas and develop interdisciplinary research with actors and groups in these fields within the context of the university;
- Enhance the visibility of interdisciplinary collaborations and demonstrate this explicitly in the documentation and public promotion of the department;
- Investigate what the underlying reasons are for the (relative) decline in research output and take proper measures to ensure that research staff will have enough time, support and resources to publish;
- Formulate a clear overall societal relevance strategy that is more proactive than simply making research results available. In order to better articulate the impact of the department, the formulation of a concrete set of criteria defining different types of impact is needed;
- Devise a recruitment plan which strengthens the expertise in the core areas of digitalization and globalization;
- Devise a strategic plan to secure the resources and opportunities needed for all staff members in different positions and career stages to be able to seriously invest in research and publishing;
- Devise a realistic and productive practical approach to stimulate both collectively and individually research, including a publication strategy for developing joint publication projects;
- Inform PhD students in a more structured way about the regulations and expectations related to their studies;
- Investigate what the exact reasons are for delay in completing PhD's and to take further measures that will lead to a substantial increase in the number of post-graduates completing their PhD in four years.
- Continue paying attention to research integrity and research ethics among all students and staff members.



## Appendix A – Curriculum Vitae

**Sirpa Leppänen** is a Professor of English in the Department of Languages at University of Jyväskylä, Finland. With her research team, she has investigated the ways in which resources provided by languages, modalities, discourses are used by individuals and groups in social media in collaborative and participatory socio-cultural practices, and the role they play in identity work, communality, belonging, participation and political action. In her work, she has approached these questions within a framework provided by sociolinguistics, discourse studies, ethnography and cultural studies, and looked at a range of multimodal social media practices.

**Dirk de Geest** teaches Modern Dutch literature and Literary Theory at the University of Leuven (KU Leuven, Belgium). He has published about several theoretical issues, a.o. systems theory, genre theory and (post)hermeneutics. His main field of research comprises Dutch literature from the 20th and 21st century (especially poetry).

**Rodney Jones** is Professor of Sociolinguistics and New Media and Head of the Department of English Language and Applied Linguistics at the University of Reading. His work focuses on the intersection between technologies and health, gender, sexuality and privacy.



## Appendix B – Programme of the site visit

### Tuesday 16 October

Time	Part	Collocutors
17.00 – 18:30	Site visit preparation	committee

### Wednesday 17 October

Time	Part	Collocutors
9.00-9.15	Welcome by TSHD board	Prof. dr. Wim Drees, Dean TSHD Mr. Cécile de Vos, Managing Director TSHD
9.15-10.15	Meeting with research management	Prof.dr. Marc Swerts, Vice-Dean of Research TSHD Prof.dr. Odile Heynders, Head of Department DCU Prof.dr. Ad Backus, Program Leader DCU
10.15-11.00	Time for deliberation and break	committee
11.00-11.45	Staff theme 1: Digitalisation and globalisation	Dr. William Arfman Prof.dr. Jan Blommaert Dr. Piia Varis Prof.dr. Ad Backus Prof.dr. Jos Swanenberg
11.45-12.45	Lunch	committee
12.45-13.45	Staff Theme 2: Future perspectives of the Humanities	Dr. Tineke Nugteren Prof.dr. Kutlay Yagmur Prof.dr. Jenny Slatman Dr. Sander Bax Dr. Mariek van den Abeele Prof.dr. Odile Heynders
13.45-14.30	Meeting with PhD students	Janieke Bruin Zeena Price Malgorzata Szabla Antonio Sforza Sanne van Driel Mingyi Hou
14.30 –14.45	Break	committee
14.45 – 15.15	Meeting with DiggIt Magazine	Dr. Ico Maly (editor-in-chief) Prof.dr Jan Blommaert (editor) Dr. Sander Bax (editor) Dr. Suzanne van der Beek (editor) Victoria Mohr (student-assistant)
15.15 – 15.45	Meeting with TSHD management	Prof.dr. Wim Drees, Dean TSHD Prof.dr. Marc Swerts, Vice-Dean of Research TSHD Prof.dr. Odile Heynders, Head of Departement DCU Prof. dr. Ad Backus, Program Leader DCU
15.45 -16.45	Time for deliberation	committee
16.45 -	Informal presentation	



## Appendix C – Tables

Table 1 Research staff in fte

	2015		2016		2017	
	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE
Scientific staff	36	9.34	26	7.66	30	8.94
Post-docs	8	3.35	10	3.89	9	4.35
PhD students	28	10.81*	25	8.18*	25	6.96*
<b>Total research staff</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>23.50</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>19.73</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>20.25</b>
Support staff	-	-	-	-	-	-
Visiting fellows	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total staff</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>

\* The number only covers internal PhD students

\*\* Due to the Reorganization BEST, the size of the Support Staff in fte belonging to TSH can no longer be indicated.

Table 2 Main categories of research output

DCU	2015	2016	2017
Refereed articles*	68	57	54.5
Non-refereed articles	37	37	30
Books	5	4	1
Book chapters	49	50	28
PhD theses*	12	10.5	10
Conference contributions*	7.5	6	4
Professional publications	42	23	17
Publications aimed at general public	45	39	27
<i>Other research output**</i>			
Special issue	1	0	1
Book editing	3	4	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>269.5</b>	<b>230.5</b>	<b>174.5</b>

\* The output of one PhD candidate also counts for the former Creative Computing program, resulting in half numbers.

\*\* Categories under 'Other research output' in the template for this table have been subsumed under the main categories: Entry for encyclopedia/dictionary under 'Refereed article'; Literature review, Working paper, Discussion paper and Web Publication under 'Non-refereed article'; Conference paper, Conference poster and Conference abstract under 'Conference contributions' and Book/Film/Article review under 'Professional publications'. The categories 'Special Issue' and 'Book editing' were retained as separate categories.



**Table 3 Funding**

	2015		2016		2017	
	FTE	%	FTE	%	FTE	%
<i>Funding</i>						
Direct funding	18.61	85	15.29	83	15.89	81
Research grants	1.37	6	1.00	5	1.63	8
Contract research	2.05	9	2.03	11	2.14	11
<b>Total funding</b>	<b>22.03</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>18.32</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>19.66</b>	<b>100</b>
<i>Expenditure in</i>						
	k€	%	k€	%	k€	%
Personnel costs	14502	91.59	13561	90.80	n/a	n/a
Other costs	1331	8.41	1373	9.19	n/a	n/a
<b>Total expenditure</b>	<b>15833</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>14934</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>n/a</b>

**Table 4 PhD candidates**

Enrolment*				Success rates											
Starting year				Graduated in year 4 or earlier		Graduated in year 5 or earlier		Graduated in year 6 or earlier		Graduated in year 7 or earlier		Not yet finished		Discontinued	
M	F	M+F		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	0	4	4	0	00	0	0	1	25.0	2	50.0	1	25.0	0	0
2010	3	7	10	1	10.0	5	50.0	7	70.0	8	80.0	2	20.0	0	0
2011	2	6	8	0	0	3	37.5	3	37.5	3	37.5	2	25.0	3	37.5
2012	2	1	3	0	0	2	66.7	2	66.7	3	100	0	0	0	0
2013	3	6	9	1	11.1	3	33.3	4	44.4	4	44.4	5	55.6	0	0
Total	10	24	34	2	5.9	13	38.2	17	50.0	20	58.8	10	29.4	3	8.8

\* All PhD candidates conducting research with the primary aim/obligation of graduating, based on 0.8-1.0 FTE contract. This includes PhD candidates with employee status (AiO/promovendi) and contract PhD candidates without employee status, receiving external funding or a university scholarship, who are conducting research under the authority of the research unit with the primary aim of graduating (beurspromovendus).





## Appendix D – Meaning of the scores

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

