

EVALUATION REPORT TU APELDOORN-TU KAMPEN

1. Introduction: Some Guidelines for the Evaluation Committee

Research assessments at Dutch universities take place every six years. The Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) is drawn up and adopted by the VSNU, NWO, and KNAW. The SEP assessments aim at revealing and confirming the quality and the relevance of research to society and to improve these where necessary.

The committee primarily aims to assess the scientific, societal and strategic aspects of the research. It pays attention to the research that the different research units have conducted in TU Kampen and TU Apeldoorn in the period 2012-2017. Where needed and possible, it will also take into account the research strategy as developed by the units for the next period.

Assessment structure to be followed: see Appendix E.

The following quantitative categories (in the form of figures) are used:

- 1: Excellent
- 2: Very good
- 3: Good
- 4: Unsatisfactory¹

The following qualitative categories (in the form of a narrative) are used:

-Research quality (including scientific publications, instruments, infrastructure, other contributions to science)

-Relevance to society (including social and cultural target groups, policy makers, public debates)

-Viability (including the capacity to meet its targets in the near future, the governance and leadership skills of the different units)

The committee is expected to assess also the following qualitative aspects

-PhD programmes (including the institutional context of the PhD programmes in all its aspects and coaching of the candidates to the job market)

-Research integrity (including the evaluation of the integrity policy to avoid violations)

-Diversity, understood as a tool for bringing together different perspectives and opinions (including indicators such as gender, age, ethnic background)

These three qualitative aspects are not expected to be done by means of a quantitative assessment.

The committee takes into account international trends and developments in academy and society. It judges the quality and relevance of the research on the basis of the targets as set by the different units.

The committee makes recommendations for the future.

¹ For the meaning of these categories, see SEP 2015-2021.

In view of the preparation of this assessment, the committee has received a very detailed and well-elaborated *Self-Evaluation Report Research 2012-2017* (September 2018). It also has received in time the SEP, the Terms of Reference.

With regard to the evaluation of the publications, the AC has followed the rankings as present in DGO (Religiewetenschappelijke en theologische tijdschriften – een gecategoriseerde lijst), even although the AC admits that the qualification B, given to several top journals, at times remains open to debate. In addition, the QRIH (Quality and Relevance in the Humanities) is consulted. At the moment of consultation, no detailed ranking was present in the QRIH.

2. TU Apeldoorn (TUA)-TU Kampen (TUK): a Joint Research Program for the Period 2012-2017

a. Introduction

TUA and TUK are smaller ecclesiastical universities (within the BA and MA around 150 students each and a good number of doctoral students, 25 and 30 respectively) that have as their central and most important task the training of future ministers, in an academic setting. Both universities profile themselves as being at the service of the Reformed Confessions. The churches cover 60% of the TUK budget, and 40% of the TUA budget. In addition, the Dutch government subsidizes 40% of the TUK budget and 60% of the TUA budget. As a result, TUA and TUK are required to meet the expectations of both state and churches. Since 2002, TUA and TUK merged all research activities, while the educational formation was offered on both locations separately. The plan to merge the two universities was not approved by the General Synod of the Christian Churches in October 2017. It was decided that the education of ministers for the Dutch Reformed Churches as from 2018 would be offered at the TUK instead of the TUA. These elements have no impact on this evaluation report, which concentrates instead on academic research.

However, this assessment report evaluates the first period since the academic research of TUA and TUK has been restructured, due to the following reasons: too few academic publications; insufficient coherence of the programs; unclear position of the program leaders; insufficient contacts with other institutes in the Netherlands and abroad; too much time investment in non-academic, ecclesiastical tasks. The restructuring of research in 2002 and the reshuffling of the common research programmes in 2012 intended to be an answer to the problems as summed up. The self-assessment report underlines that the restructuring has led to a growth of academic peer-reviewed publications, growing contacts with other institutes in the Netherlands and abroad, and a better distinction between ecclesiastical service and research.

This committee appreciates the fact that the self-assessment report clearly describes the efforts made to increase the academic value of the research as done in TUA and TUK, while explicitly stating that the program leaders' profile still needs further improvement.

This committee evaluated three research groups: Biblical Exegesis and Systematic Theology (BEST); Early Modern Reformed Theology (EMRT); Reformed Traditions in Secular Europe (RTSE). According to the general information of the self-assessment report, coherence was better than expected for BEST and EMRT, while still difficult for RTSE. With regard to the RTSE group, TUK decided to create in the near future two smaller groups: the Neo-Calvinism Research Institute, and the Center for Church and Mission in the West. The committee will offer some comments on this initiative, even although no precise data are present in this self-assessment report. The committee is well aware of the fact that both discussions about the future cooperation of the two universities and the absence of research projects through NWO funding have an impact on the research output of the programmes.

The committee also observes that the two universities are substantially supported by the churches they are serving, and that this service to the churches is an essential feature of daily business. As a result, academic research sometimes seems to be subordinate to the pastoral needs of the churches.

PhD and postdoctoral researchers are regularly financed by special funds and private individuals. While the churches' support for TUA and TUK remains stable, the state funding for TUA decreased in 2017, while the TUK increased. The external support for TUK constantly increased (2016 being an exception) with a rather important growth in 2017. This growth was due to funding from two national institutions for education for a research project on identity in secondary schools. The external means of TUA funding constantly decreased in the period under consideration. Nearly all external funds were intended to support the research group RTSE.

b. Procedures Followed

The Evaluation Committee prepared the site visit by dividing the work to be done in such a way that the experts for each domain submitted their first impressions concerning the self-assessment report to the chair of the Evaluation Committee. On the basis of these comments, a first draft of the report was prepared and served as a guideline for the introductory discussions with the two rectors and the programme directors (the programme is added in the appendices). After the meeting with the programme directors, the AC had a further discussion with both the rector of TUA and TUK but this time held separately.

3. Discussion with the Rectors

In the discussion with the rectors, the AC asked for clarification with regard to the impact of the churches on the two institutions, taking into account that their merger failed. In the discussion, it became clear that both institutions have a strong bond with their respective churches. These churches play an important role with regard to the composition of the executive board, the board of trustees and the curatorium. On an educational level, both institutions still function as church schools.

Because of the failed merger, the two institutions decided to go their own way (with the exception of the programme BEST), even although the current theological differences are content-wise minor ones. Differences are seemingly more a matter of emphasis rather than of content. Furthermore, topics as developed in e.g. systematic theology do not exclusively pertain to the Reformed theology as such, but could also be done in other universities with another denominational history and background.

Both rectors aim at continuing to share library facilities, and common research when possible (cf. the BEST programme). They also have expressed their willingness to search for new policies with regard to future collaboration.

4. Assessment of the Research Unit BEST (Biblical Exegesis and Systematic Theology)

a. Brief Description of the Research Unit's Strategy and Targets

BEST consists of exegetes and systematic theologians, who are participating in the programme: "Who is Like You Among Gods? The One and Three in a Pluralistic Context". As is indicated in the title, the programme focuses on the relation between unity and diversity, confession of the one God and pluralistic contexts, both in the past and the present. Members of BEST meet each other on a regular

basis (at least five times a year). Within the programme, which indeed is very open and thus well combines individual research interests with a common content interest, interdisciplinary interaction is the intended goal.

In fact, BEST offers a structure within which two methodological approaches meet each other: the historical-critical and the systematic theological. Unique in this setting is the dialogical interaction between the two, thus avoiding the distance if not the split between these disciplines, so characteristic in other institutions. This also becomes clear in the themes of the twice-annual conference organized by the research unit.

- b. Qualitative and Quantitative Assessment
 - i. Research Quality (infrastructure; instruments)
 - 1. Qualitative Assessment

The committee is pleased to see that in BEST three groups come institutionally together. It is true that this collaboration is influenced by the (small) size of each sub-discipline, but the scarcity of money and people in a sense is, through attempted collaboration, made fruitful in this programme. Furthermore, the group is investing now in the development of a methodological framework, recognizing the validity of the specific theological branches at the one hand, the need for interaction on the other. The AC considers this approach exemplary for it overcomes the distance between a (too) philological and a (too) theological approach.

The five most important scientific publications are with an internationally appreciated publisher (Brill, Leiden) and in very good journals such as *Vetus Testamentum*. The research of E. Peels is internationally recognized as outstanding. The thematic issue on the God of the Old Testament was published in Dutch in the in-house journal *Theologia Reformata*, which however has a blind peer reviewed-procedure.

Although the committee appreciates the efforts made by BEST, it does not understand why a promising group such as BEST does not attempt to be more ambitious with regard to external funding. If, as BEST claims, it has a strong and growing position, the programme should be more ambitious on this level. Indeed, given the lack of internal funding, such active participation in (inter)national research contexts should overcome the present weakness as described in the Self-Evaluation Report (cf. p. 15).

2. Quantitative Assessment

During the period under assessment, among the 30 refereed articles, 5 were published in A-journals, 5 in B-journals and 20 in C-journals. Among these 20 publications, 16 were published in *Theologia Reformata*. The contributions to books are OK. During the period under consideration, no books were written. The number of scientific publications meets the expected standard of 1 academic article per 0,2fte. More than 60% of all scientific publications of TUA and TUK are published in the BEST-programme, as a programme by far the most international in scope.

Score: 2/3².

- ii. Relevance to Society
 - 1. Qualitative Assessment

² The score 2/3 reflects both the very good output and the fact that 16 out of 20 C-journal publications were published in *Theologia Reformata*.

BEST has explicitly chosen to focus on a fundamental theological approach, an approach that contributes to a clear identity in a context of growing pluralism. BEST is well aware of the challenges bridging the gap between Bible, systematic theology and contemporary culture. The AC appreciates this clear position and the way the programme has been developed through multidisciplinary projects and conferences. The AC considers the conferences organized and the edited books as of great importance for society. However, it has the impression that at least two of the conferences focused mostly on Bible, while the 2017 conference on Covenant revealed the plurality of opinions about this concept. The “Sola Scriptura”-project probably best fit in the BEST programme and also has a clear impact on the role of the two universities in church and society.

The committee welcomes the attempts of BEST to discuss Biblical texts that are at odds with modern sensitivities, for a better understanding of such texts is of great help to overcome both fundamentalist and relativizing interpretations, thus doing justice to the content of the text. BEST is a good example of a programme that combines academic work and service to the churches. The churches seemingly do not interfere in the research agenda of this group, which can be explained either as a positive (academic independence) or as a sign of disinterest in academic results.

The focus on the filioque-clause in relation to Old Testament and Trinity is considered as an original one.

The BEST-attempts to communicate results of the research programme to a broader public are to be welcomed and should be promoted in the future.

2. Quantitative Assessment

BEST does make important efforts to be present in the public forum through use of the (new) media (blogs; newspapers) and publications for the broader public. Given the rather modest number of personnel the professional publications are rather impressive.

Score: 2/3.

iii. Viability (also leadership)

1. Qualitative Assessment

The programme description does not really offer an evaluation of the viability/leadership. It is explicitly recognized as a weakness in the self-assessment. It goes without saying that the combination of lack of funding and thus inability to attract qualified staff are a threat for this programme’s viability.

2. Quantitative Assessment

Score: 3

c. Qualitative Assessment (PhD Programmes; Integrity; Diversity)

i. PhD Programmes

The AC is happy with the fact that PhD’s in BEST (7 candidates finished their programme successfully) are integrated in the broader programme’s focus of universality versus particularity. However, in the self-assessment report, doctoral students do not become actively visible in the academic context of the structures of the two universities. Most often, these PhD candidates are “buitenpromovendi” but a better integration of their research in the existing structures would result in a higher appreciation of their work and a more adequate quality control.

The allowance to PhD programs is well described and shows that acceptance is based on serious preparatory work and collegiality. Proposals are to be approved by the research group. The AC appreciates that external students are accepted in the PhD programmes under the condition that they meet the requirements, including the knowledge of English for students coming from outside the Netherlands. It is an excellent practice to let international external PhD students stay for periods of 2 months in the institutions. Given the fact that the day to day guidance is done under the supervision of the promoter, the AC appreciates the presence of a second promoter on board, and this from the very beginning. This contributes to an enhancement of the quality.

The way in which doctoral students are guided through meetings, writing exercises and methodological discussions could be a good starting point for the creation of a doctoral school that spans the two institutions (cf. infra).

ii. Research Integrity Policy

Neither in the self-assessment report nor during the discussions with the AC, was a clear strategy on research integrity policy made visible.

iii. Diversity

On the level of the tenured personnel, no diversity policy has been developed to date. Only one member of the tenured and non-tenured staff is a woman (joining the staff in 2017); all other members are white men.

d. Recommendations (for all aspects arguments and recommendations)

i. Quality of the Research Unit as a whole

The AC considers BEST by far and away the superior *programme* in the TUA/TUK. BEST was the best performing programme. The AC strongly admonishes the BEST-programme to concretize the opportunities mentioned in the SWOT-analysis (cf. the link with the Anglo-Saxon traditions and the possible intra EU cooperation). Further collaboration and exchange with other institutions are to be promoted and developed. Such intensified collaboration will have a positive impact on the quality of research and thus on the research environment in which PhD's do their doctoral research. The AC suggests publishing more in international languages, especially in English. The AC also suggests diversifying in journals: more than 50% of the refereed articles are published in *Theologia Reformata*. Although the AC considers the publications in books as good (59), it strongly suggests making a distinction between book chapters, published with excellent publishers (Ugarit Verlag, Peeters, Brill ...) and other book chapters. Indeed, a rough distinction between these two categories results in 33 publications with excellent publishers, thus showing that this unit really has made a great effort to become more visible in the international fora. Publication of books in internationally recognized series is the best way to have an enduring impact.

The presentations of papers at conferences is, at first sight, rather poor (3 presentations). Indeed, a careful analysis of the output makes clear that visibility through participation in conferences is much better than a strict interpretation of SEP suggests (see, e.g., the *Sola scriptura* volume). The AC emphasizes the importance of the continuation of this common research programme. It suggests increasing the efforts to make the dialogue between the two disciplines more visible, e.g., through common position papers. For the moment, the interdisciplinary aspect of the programme needs further improvement. The role and impact of the systematic theologians must be strengthened. In this regard, the profile of the programme director must be better defined.

At the same time, this programme has made clear that research quality and service to churches and society do not exclude each other. In this regard, this programme can become an exemplary model for other programmes.

ii. PhD Programmes

This programme has a well-considered idea concerning the development of PhD programmes. It has the potential to apply for external funds, a logical step forward towards a broadening and deepening of the research infrastructure.

iii. Diversity

The AC suggests that in future appointments of tenured staff a more gender balanced approach should be developed, thus taking into account the changing composition of the students (the group of female students becoming more and more important in the classrooms).

5. Assessment of the Research Unit EMRT

a. Brief Description of the Research Unit's Strategy and Targets

The common denominator of this programme is Reformation research. EMRT consists of a group of researchers who combine high qualitative historical research with a profound theological knowledge of Reformation history. This is quite a deliberate choice which intends to do justice to the history and the background of the churches they primarily serve. It also has the advantage that justice is done to the theological content of the topics under discussion. Even although EMRT consists of the full professors of church history of the two theological universities, tenured and non-tenured staff members, and associate researchers, the number of unit members is, in terms of fte, rather modest.

The EMRT programme focuses on the Reformation, reformers, and the Catholic Reformation (Trent). Although the staff is rather limited if not modest, the foci are clear and relevant not only for the churches to be served but also for the Protestant community at large. Furthermore, through REFO500, the institutions dialogue with their peers on a regular basis.

b. Qualitative and Quantitative Assessment

i. Research Quality (infrastructure; instruments)

1. Qualitative Assessment

The programme concentrates on major events and projects in the Reformed history. During the period under consideration, EMRT proved to be a daring and successful enterprise (at least with regard to REFO500). Indeed, the programme was able to undertake challenging projects, something that was questioned during the previous assessment period by the AC at that time. The EMRT targets for the evaluation period under consideration were in fact successful: original research on the Reformation and the Reformed Orthodoxy was conducted and found its way into prestigious series and journals, and this for all foci present in the research programme.

The AC is of the opinion that this is a programme and a group with some highly qualified individual researchers, well recognized and appreciated internationally. In this regard, the impressive and outstanding performance of Prof. H. Selderhuis within the context of REFO500 must be mentioned. The committee appreciates Prof. E. de Boer's combination of the critical edition of work of John Calvin – a continuation of this important work would be a much appreciated service to the academic community - , the acts of the Synod of Dordt or on Veluanus and his role in the genesis of the Heidelberg Catechism on the one hand and the translation of Veluanus' work or the work of Speelman, stimulating the spirituality of the churches today, on the other.

Although the AC does not agree with the statement that there are relatively few A-journals for the field of church history – this committee is of the opinion that the problem lays with the inadequate composition of the DGO-list - it appreciates the attempts made to become internationally visible, and believes this programme has succeeded in so doing. The five most important academic publications show a rich diversity and are all published with respected publishers in the Netherlands, Germany and Switzerland. However, the success of this programme depends more on the performances of some individual professors than on the performances of the group as a whole. Strong personalities such as Prof. Selderhuis are very performative but not easy to integrate in the framework of research programmes such as this.

2. Quantitative Assessment

The number of refereed articles is good and diversified: 3 A journal publications, 9 B journal publications, 4 C journal publications. Publications in this group make clear that there is an urgent need to update the DGO-list or to elaborate a more diversified QRH-list. Indeed, it must be said that journals such as *Quaerendo* are internationally recognized as top journals in the field, and that publications in these journals are the result of serious peer review, but that they are simply absent in the DGO-list. In this programme, 8 books were published, 5 with very good publishers such as Droz, Brill, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht About 70% of the book chapters were published in books, published again by very respected publishers; yet a distinction between these contributions and those published with more local publishers would have made more visible the quality and growing quantity of academic publications in this group and would have done more justice to their international profile as such. Given the small size of the personnel for this programme (less than 2 fte), the publication output is good, although it should be added that some members excel, and thus mask a bit the low number of contributions of others. In any case, 34% of the publications is published in the context of service to academic audiences.

Score: 2/3³

ii. Relevance to Society

1. Qualitative Assessment

The EMRT programme deliberately chose for a combination of high-level research and sharing of insights with the broader public. The EMRT members are successful in their ambitions, thus sharing results of research with both church members and a broader public. The books meant for a broader audience proved to be (very) successful. The efforts to serve the community have been made visible in a special way in the context of the activities developed at the occasion of the 2017 Reformation jubilee. The attempts made to end the 1960's split within the Reformed Churches (Liberated) were partially made possible on the basis of research done at the TUK.

2. Quantitative Assessment

Score: 2/3

iii. Viability (also leadership)

1. Qualitative Assessment

This committee is of the opinion that the current programme leader, Prof. de Boer, has modestly contributed to the quality increase in this programme. On the other hand, the role played by Prof.

³ The quotation 2/3 is given because the outstanding work of some members of this programme in a sense masks the under average contributions of others.

Selderhuis in Refo500 Foundation and RefoRC is recognized as outstanding and gives proof of great leadership qualities. The high standard Refo500 Academic Studies series published with Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Göttingen) has contributed to a better insight in the diversity of the many “reformations” and “counter-reformations” (the series makes clear that there were more counter-reformations in the Protestant world than in the traditionally “Catholic counter-reformation”). Consultation of the books published in this series reveals that the reformed traditions offer a rich diversity of research topics, methodological approaches and even spans different time periods.

Although the plans for the new research period at first sight are promising, the rather insecure future of the collaboration between TUA and TUK might be a mortgage on the future of this collaboration. The AC considers this a pity, given the explicitly formulated option to concentrate on dialogue between historical approaches and theological interests, a given that should be fostered. Furthermore, both TUA and TUK explicitly want to be at the service of the respective churches and do have much in common. The AC is of the opinion that a separation of personnel and efforts as intended might become a loss for both universities and this on the level of interaction and dialogue, mutual enrichment through academic discussions and debates, and international appearance. This committee is not convinced that a loosening of the ties between the TUA and TUK for this programme is a good thing. Furthermore, the self-assessment report considers the small size of the research group in its current form as a real threat. If the church historians of the two groups decide to go their own way, this will weaken the performance visibility for both institutions. At the same time, the AC recognizes that for the period under consideration, the TUA excellently performed with a rather modest investment in research personnel (especially since 2014), which is reason why this AC is impressed by the work as done at TUA.

The professional publications and those directed to the general public are OK and seemingly find their way to a broader public, as has been the case with the work of Selderhuis, *Luther*, a book written in an accessible way, thus contributing to the Luther year at the popular level. It received even international attention.

2. Quantitative Assessment

Score: 2/3

c. Qualitative Assessment (PhD Programmes; Integrity; Diversity) i. PhD Programmes

The number of subsidized PhD-candidates was quite modest (1). During the period under consideration 10 external PhD candidates successfully defended their dissertations. Given the quite high level of autonomy of the promoter, the AC wonders whether the quality of these dissertations is sufficiently controlled. The AC suggests developing a better model with regard to the quality assurance.

ii. Research Integrity Policy

Neither in the self-assessment report nor during the discussions with the AC, was a clear strategy on research integrity policy made visible.

iii. Diversity

Both in terms of gender and of international attractiveness not much is said in this self-assessment. Only one member of the tenured and non-tenured staff is a woman (Prof. S. Hiebsch, joining the staff in 2017), all other members are white men.

- d. Recommendations (for all aspects arguments and recommendations)
 - i. Quality of the Research Unit as a whole

This is a programme with a very good and internationally appreciated output (of some members of the personnel). It is a programme with testified international collaboration. The editions published are important for the group's own identity but also for the international reference groups. The AC is of the opinion that the publication of editions of important reformers is to be continued. In this regard, the AC considers the edition of primary sources accompanied by flanking research an option that may meet both personal aspirations and research units' ambitions. The AC thus suggests that the expertise developed over the years should also result in a next step: the interpretation of the reformers' ideas in the context of the time they lived and the contemporary era. In a period when digitization is becoming more and more important, it is important to have the best editions at one's disposal: trustworthy research starts with trustworthy texts. After all, various cross-links are possible both on institutional levels and on an international level.

Members of this unit are key player in the REFO-network.

The inner coherence in the unit's research needs improvement: now, one gets the impression that the unit is a conglomerate of individual researchers. The conferences organized offer a good medium for such stronger collaboration. However, while the output of some of the members of this EMRT is impressive and is meeting the best international standards, the AC is wondering which means are available to encourage some of the other members to increase their public performance and their academic publications. The excellent work of some members of this programme is masking the weak performances of others.

- ii. PhD Programmes

The AC is of the opinion that a more intense collaboration between the TUA and the TUK will also be to the benefit of PhD students, for sharing expertise as present in both institutions will be a challenging help for them. Furthermore, the higher the critical mass, the better the results.

- iii. Diversity

The AC suggests that in future appointments of tenured staff a more gender balanced approach should be developed (the appointment of a female professor in 2017 is considered to be a first step in the right direction), thus taking into account the changing composition of the students (the group of female students becoming more and more important in the classrooms).

6. Assessment of the Research Unit RTSE (Reformed Theology in a Secular Europe)

- a. Brief Description of the Research Unit's Strategy and Targets

TUA and TUK did not follow the 2010 advice to cancel practical-theological research and continued this research at the services of the churches. New tenured staff was appointed, and two PhD-positions were created in order to stimulate such research. Moreover, a chair of missiology was founded.

In the period under consideration, RTSE has been a programme that represents a great variety of disciplines: practical theology; missiology; ethics; public theology; (historical study of) Neo-Calvinism; (partly) systematic theology. The financial investment of TUK and TUA is different in terms of

mandates. TUK is the main investor in this programme. TUA modestly contributed to the programme, 2015-2016 being an exception. Members of the RTSE, including paid PhDs, meet each other four times a year in order to overcome factual content orientated gaps between the disciplines. Once a year, a meeting with external PhD's is organised.

The programme focuses on the dialectic between the traditions of the Reformation and European modernity. The variety of disciplines present in this programme, which in fact is not very internally coherent, has been a challenge. Some disciplines focus on a Dutch context, while others are more internationally oriented. The retirement of several faculty members has been a hindrance in the development of the programme. With regard to interdisciplinary projects, the amount of diversity present could have been an opportunity for growth, but was not really developed in the period under consideration.

RTSE seeks to expand scholarly publications, while continuing to invest in professional publications at the service of the churches and society. Taking into account the critical assessment of the previous period, the RTSE focused more on a growth of its scholarly output.

- b. Qualitative and Quantitative Assessment
 - i. Research Quality (infrastructure; instruments)
 - 1. Qualitative Assessment

Apart from the attempts made to meet on a regular basis, the self-assessment makes clear that there was never really an intention to develop a coherent research programme. Bringing together practical and missional theology was, according to the self-assessment report, not experienced as a good fit. In this report, the drafters explicitly mention that the disciplinary pluralism is the main reason for this: "the programme (...) is a loose network of sub-programmes related to the intersection of "Reformed traditions" and "secular modernity" (pp. 35-36). They observe that "the above sub-programs do not really merge into one coherent research program." (p. 37) Indeed, the sub-programmes concentrate on history and theology of neo-Calvinism (a programme that started at the VU Amsterdam but was then moved to Kampen, with a good number of national and international collaborations with other institutions in terms of the public theology-aspect), Christian mission in Post-Christian Europe (in fact a successful sub-programme that, for the period under consideration, was organized at the VU and the TUK), Christian community and liturgy (with a focused interest in the relation between societal engagement and theological reflection), and Neo-Calvinism and modern political theology.

The sub-programme history and theology of Neo-Calvinism is a good example of the fact that international collaboration contributes to a greater visibility and a better output in terms of publications and PhD's. The AC suggests to further develop this collaboration, given the fact that Neo-Calvinism has a wider distribution than Europe alone: North America, Korea, Brazil.

The Christian mission in Post-Christian Europe very much benefitted from the VU setting. The self-assessment does not give clear information about the fact that Paas was appointed both at the VU and the TUK. His research time at both institutions was 0,2fte respectively, but this distinction is unclear in the survey (some of his publications appear both in his VU and TUK-bibliography, something one should avoid). However, the fact that Paas is still partly a member of the VU, ensures greater involvement in interdisciplinary projects, with collaboration with sociologists and anthropologists. The AC would like to get a clearer idea about what is meant with secularization (a concept strongly criticized since the end of the '90s) and how missiology and post-Christian cultures interact.

The AC is surprised that sub-programmes, with common layers of interest (cf. the sub-programmes 1 and 4), de facto did not attempt to develop a greater interaction and content coherence. The AC considers the refusal to collaborate between disciplines as a missed chance. It appreciates the scholarly work as done on individual basis (invitations to conferences, modest as they are in output [1 in this period under evaluation] can be a start in view of wider recognition), but is of the opinion that the research programme as such is, in terms of coherence and collaboration, a failure, mainly because, according to the self-assessment report, there was, from the beginning no real interest to collaborate.

2. Quantitative Assessment

The subtotal of scientific publications is about 17% of the total output. Some of the publications, published in journals that according to the DGO-list are recognized as academic, are put under the non-refereed journals (Theology Today, Theologia Reformata, Zeitschrift für Dialektische Theologie, Calvin Theological Journal). This is a bit surprising. In other programmes, journals such as Theologia Reformata are, in line with the DGO-list, put under the refereed ones. The number of refereed articles should be 28 (a bit less than 50% is published by one author). It is, at first sight, still rather low: 3% of the total output. Only 2 books out of 8 are published with internationally recognized publishers. However, 50% of the book chapters are published with good to excellent publishers. It would be good to make a qualitative distinction between the chapters written for an academic audience and the others. The number of refereed articles is, since 2015, declining. The average of one academic article/book chapter per 0,2 fte has not been reached, partly because of new appointments that seemingly are trying to find their way, partly because some researchers did not publish as might be expected. Also, the overemphasis on professional publications, often related to sponsoring by churches, plays a role. It gives the impression that serving the churches is more important than involvement in academia. Especially for this programme, the AC wants to formulate the following question: Are we speaking about a theological seminary corps or about members of a true academic institution? The AC is worrying about the academic future of this type of research. It deplores that splintering is preferred over coherent and focused collaboration.

Score: 3

ii. Relevance to Society

1. Qualitative Assessment

The RTSE programme clearly defines service to the churches as an important task and it has effectively made great efforts in this regard: the investment in personnel in the practical theology programme; the creation of a new chair of Missiology; publication of successful books like *Vreemdelingen en priesters*; contributions to synod reports; presence in newspapers; the creation of the Praktijkcentrum. The self-assessment report considers this as a real strength. The programme leader, together with Dr. Peels received the *Theologie Publicatieprijs* for one book and ended on the short list for this price with another book. The members of RTSE are actively involved in offering lectures to church audiences, are participants in political parties, schools, ecological organizations and the like. The leader of the sub-programme Neo-Calvinism and Modern Political Theology is actively involved in public debates.

There is no doubt that the publications with a societal impact were well received not only by the own church communities, but also nationally.

2. Quantitative Assessment

The AC appreciates the efforts made serving the churches and society. In fact, these efforts, positive in their own right, have a negative impact on the academic research.

Score: 2/3

iii. Viability (also leadership)

1. Qualitative Assessment

The attempts made to improve the academic quality of practical theology partly proved to be successful: the number of researchers who academically did not perform sufficiently, remains too high, despite the stimulating role of the programme leader, who, in many ways tried to lead by example, even although half of his research time is to be situated in the VU. This committee appreciates his commitment to increase the performance of this group, which, according to the self-assessment, did not become a coherent group. However, as is announced, the RTSE programme will be terminated. One wonders how the *started* academization (there is clearly space for growth) will be maintained and developed in the context of the new research structures.

RTSE considers service to the churches as a main activity, but observes that the heterogeneity of the unit is a hindrance for coherence in the programme, one of the reasons for the creation of two new centres. That the historical section of the programme will not be integrated in EMRT, but will result in the establishment of a new Institute of Neo-Calvinism Studies is, content-wise, not motivated. It is seemingly a decision of TUK, but for programme leaders of other programmes it is still unclear what its full extent will be and how affiliation will function.

In any case, this AC does not understand why collaboration between TUA and TUK in this programme will be ended, while TUK will create two new institutes (the AC is of the opinion that the research capacity available is not sufficient for an adequate staffing of just one institute or programme).

The AC is concerned about the actual absence of external research resources, for financing earned on a competitive basis creates a better critical mass and results in better intellectual performances. It does not understand that the RTSE's finances are described as sound (both in the weaknesses and the threats, the opposite is said; p. 42), while at the same time it is said that the recruitment of qualified staff is difficult. This AC is of the opinion that obtaining external financial means through projects is the best answer to this question. It is also a test with regard to relevance.

For the moment, the grants received are mostly meant for societal activities (cf. the Praktijkcentrum, a successful initiative, not directly intended to do academic research, that will serve as a partner for the Centre for Church and Mission in the West). However, one may wonder whether such initiatives should be the core business of an academic programme.

2. Quantitative Assessment

An urgent wakeup call is needed in order to activate the research activities and output of a good number of the tenured staff in this programme. Their poor performance is masked by the strong performance of the programme leader, even although a better distinction between his VU and TUK publications is still needed.

Score: 3/4

c. Qualitative Assessment

i. PhD Programmes

Within the context of RTSE substantial investments were made in PhD's. External doctorandi are expected to finish their work within a reasonable period, whereas internal researchers must be ready after four years. No general instructions for individual supervision exist. All candidates are expected to join the NOSTER training programme, but the fact that some individual researchers *do not meet NOSTER standards* (p. 42) might be a negative indicator about the quality of the PhD's allowed into the programme. Some external (unpaid) PhD candidates were qualified by the programme director as "mediocre". If this is the case, how will they contribute to the academic culture of a given research group? Given this discrepancy between description and factual situation, the AC is wondering whether the already existing measures such as the mentorship programme and regular meetings suffice. In this regard, the programme leader mentioned the lack of supervision and the personal circumstances in which external PhD's often have to work. In fact, when promoters do not sufficiently publish academic studies, will they stimulate their PhD's to high achievement in their own doctoral research and academic publications? What are the minimum standards a candidate is supposed to meet in order to be accepted in the programme? How will the quality of individual supervision be controlled and evaluated? The way in which the PhD guidance is presented, is alarming. In the interview with the PhD students, it became clear that the students regret the closing down of the programme, for they experienced the interinstitutional meetings as enriching.

ii. Research Integrity Policy

This group has not mentioned any Research Integrity Policy in its programme.

iii. Diversity

This is a research group consisting of white men. No women are enlisted in the tenured, non-tenured and PhD candidates lists.

d. Recommendations (for all aspects arguments and recommendations)

i. Quality of the Research Unit as a whole

There is a problem with this programme that will be stopped and replaced by new TUK programmes, where according the programme leader future programme leaders will be better equipped, will have their own budget and aim at collaboration with international colleagues.

Although items could have been of interest for different people in this programme, the AC has observed that most scholars wanted to do their own personal research, being of the opinion that group work can cost more than it provides. As a result, one does not find attempts to search for a content coherence nor for real interdisciplinary collaboration (with one exception). Furthermore, the AC is concerned about the fact that professors at the second-stage of their career are no longer interested in doing high level research. Some even have received termination of their research appointment and only focus on teaching, as if both can be separated on a university level.

From the beginning, it was clear that the position of the programme leader did not get the authority (and time) needed to make of this programme a success. The AC did not get a clear view with regard to the relation between the church historical projects and the others. Since this programme will be closed in the next evaluation period, it might be good to transfer the church historians to EMRT. Indeed, the broader interest in Calvin(ism) can be made fruitful in a programme that spans several centuries, as is also the case with regard to the Luther-research (in the EMRT-programme). The development of such a programme, focused on a common heritage (methodologically speaking the interaction of historians and theologians can enrich both as is seen in the BEST-programme), can

contribute to more international visibility, without excluding that specific topics can be developed through interaction with international peers. Although the AC welcomes the efforts made through new appointments for liturgical and catechetical studies on the one hand (Apeldoorn) and the creation of new institutes on the other (Kampen), it is puzzled by the fact that such efforts will not result in closer academic research collaboration in practical theology, a broad field indeed. The intended separation between the two institutions (for this programme) and the limited number of researchers available should serve as an invitation to more intense cooperation instead of growing distance, a cooperation that seemingly is welcomed by TUK and by one of the new appointees in Apeldoorn, which is a positive aspect indeed. Some PhD students explicitly regret the split between Apeldoorn and Kampen on the level of doctoral interaction. In any case, if everyone can continue to do their own thing without interaction, the success rate of the new investments might become a problem.

The academic publication record is not satisfying: 24 refereed articles make up less than 4% of the whole of the publications in the period under consideration. The unstructured mixing of the book publications (or chapters in books) does not do justice to the real efforts made to publish more on an academic level. The AC strongly suggests that the aspect “academic” receives more attention in the researchers’ profiles.

The AC appreciates the efforts made to obtain financial support from private donators. A first design for funding strategies is underway. In any case, in order to increase the research in- and output, applications to the NWO and other funding institutions should become a priority in the near future.

ii. PhD Programmes

The AC is of the opinion that a more intense collaboration between the TUA and the TUK will also be to the benefit of PhD students, for sharing expertise as present in both institutions will be a challenging help for them.

iii. Diversity

The AC suggests that in future appointments of tenured staff a more gender balanced approach should be developed, thus taking into account the changing composition of the students (the group of female students becoming more and more important in the classrooms).

7. Recommendations

a. General Observations

The AC is of the opinion that both institutions have a broader network than sometimes suggested in the self-assessment report. The AC observes that important collaborations were not mentioned in the report (e.g. between Apeldoorn and Münster). The AC also notes that the fact that the two theological universities are not imbedded in comprehensive universities is a hindrance for direct interaction with other humanities disciplines. Kampen, especially, is well aware of this problem and aims at developing networks with other institutions (PTHU; ETF-Leuven; institutes in Hungary and France; some of these partners are also connected to Apeldoorn). The rectors are well aware of the fact that this broadening and deepening of contacts is a work in progress and is to be developed in the years to come. The AC is wondering whether the development towards an independent seminary connected with a bigger university might not be an option to overcome the theological “isolation”,

without giving up the own identity and self-understanding. In any case, co-operation between the two theological universities on the one hand and with other disciplines might be of help to broaden the scope of research attention and interest.

The AC was somewhat surprised that the discussion partners often were not familiar with the possibilities as offered by funding organizations such as the European Community (Horizon 2020; ERC grants; Marie Curie).

The AC was impressed by the church commitment of the staff. However, it also had the impression that people sometimes preferred direct ecclesiastical commitment (and success) over the difficult, painstaking but very necessary task of academic research (cf. the discrepancy in the report between the scientific publications and the others). The AC wonders whether the explicit choice for the Reformation tradition increases the attractiveness of TUA and TUK on the level of the number of students.

b. Specific Recommendations

The AC regrets that because of the failed merger the collaborative research on common traditions has come under pressure. Indeed, the reformed traditions at Apeldoorn and Kampen are closer to each other than Catholic and Protestant confessions in German and Austrian universities and the latter prove that fruitful collaboration across denominational borders is possible and even leads to successful applications in humanities. The two institutions under assessment have the potential to create an important centre for reformed historical theology. Academic research and collaboration can and should continue even without strong institutional organizational ties. Several of the interviewed people still wish that collaboration between the institutes will be continued, if necessary, even on an informal level.

Common research efforts strengthen the visibility of both the institutions and the individual researchers. Furthermore, possibilities to collaborate with orientalists (cf. Hebrew, literary approaches, archaeology) are abundant but not yet systematically developed. The proposed division of programme 3 in two small institutes will lead to further fragmentation and is in opposition to the often-expressed complaint that the research staff of TUA and TUK is rather small.

The AC appreciates the fact that the professors do their work at the service of the churches. However, the discrepancy between the number of scientific publications and the other publications is (especially in programme 3) enormous: there is no balance between the two and it suggests wrong priorities. The time investment in these other publications gives the impression that the research time comes under pressure and that people choose for Dutch publications in local journals and books. Further, the AC also emphasizes that academic research is most fruitful when done in a critical and independent way. In this regard, the AC, referring to international examples, insists that academic autonomy is a prerequisite for research characterized by academic integrity. The AC is well aware of the fact that the research staff of TUA and TUK is rather small and that efforts are made to welcome researchers from elsewhere in the different research groups.

The AC is concerned about the lack of external research resources: even while opting for service to churches a good number of the research topics can receive interest and thus support from funding agencies. It is true that the move from theology to religious studies has had an impact on branches such as dogmatic or practical theology, in the Netherlands and elsewhere. However, historical and biblical issues are still eligible, especially when projects are submitted in collaboration with other institutions and other experts. The same is true for projects on interreligious dialogue. In any case, the AC admonishes both institutions to invest more in research applications.

Collaboration between researchers across the institutional borders will facilitate search for external funding. Such funding is not an obstacle for the service to the churches, but creates a critical independence from them. Currently, the funding of promising researchers mostly depends on the primary income of the two institutions as received from the churches and the state and thus seems to be a hindrance for out of the box approaches. The search for external funding can become an adequate answer to the dangerous current policy in which the non-tenured staff (for all three programmes) is decreasing if not disappearing. Subsidized PhD candidates are lacking in the EMRT-programme. The number of associate researchers (PhD's graduates outside the academic world who continue their research) remains stable for the three programmes.

The AC is of the opinion that the research groups do not have the size to split and divide programmes in new institutes. It advises that at least programme one and two continue in the current format. More weight and profile must be given to the position of the programme leaders, for this is a *conditio sine qua non* to stimulate academic researchers in the different programmes. In any case, the profile of the research director must be sharpened in terms of stimulation of research opportunities through subsidized projects.

The AC is of the opinion that the number of publications during the period under consideration at first sight is impressive. However, the number of scientific publications (including PhD theses and conference papers) represents less than 20% of the whole output. The AC understands well that TUA and TUK have a specific profile and first and foremost have to train ministers, thus offering a programme adapted to this aim. However, the AC insists that a broad training of students does not exclude specialization and research. In fact, several individual researchers very clearly demonstrate that specialization is possible in the given setting. Starting professors complain about the fact that academic research regularly is to be done in one's free time. The committee advises TUA and TUK to invest more in peer-reviewed publications. It immediately adds that the small percentage of refereed articles in journals (4%) is misleading. Indeed, a good number of publications were published in reputed series and with good publishers. Especially in humanities, this type of publication is internationally accepted as equivalent to publications in refereed journals. The AC suggests making a distinction between peer-reviewed publications (books, chapters of books) and contributions intended to reach the broader public. The way these two are intermingled in the current self-assessment does not do justice to the appreciated efforts made. Furthermore, the AC recommends publishing more regularly in English, because this will result in a wider international audience and a greater visibility.

The AC appreciates the fact that some form of quality control is present in the programmes: the discussion of the quality of proposals, the introduction of a TOEFL-test, the fixed periods of research by international candidates in the respective institutions are good starting points. The AC suggests better description of the aims and ambitions for training PhD students. At present, the three programmes use three different standards. Given the potential of PhD candidates both in Apeldoorn and Kampen, the creation of a common doctoral programme or a graduate school that can function as a framework for the entire doctoral training programme would be of immense help. It could result in a kind of universal standard for the doctoral training and as a control of the guidance of the doctoral students, without hampering the freedom of choice of concrete promoters. It could organize seminars that support students in writing academic articles or chapters in books; since up to now, the number of publications of these doctoral candidates is rather modest if not poor. In any case, up to the current moment, an overall coherent policy is missing. Especially in the case of financed researchers, publishing must be promoted, for these financed researchers often seem to be very promising future candidates for professorships. The idea of requiring a second supervisor is very

much welcomed. A graduate school would also create an atmosphere of collaboration between the PhD candidates and could become a “lab” for exchange of best practices. In the self-assessment not much attention is paid to this issue and the role and impact of NOSTER in the training of the PhD’s is not clear. PhD students considered participation in NOSTER, apart from the “psychological benefit” (meeting colleagues in the same phase of their dissertation) and the opportunity to present one’s own work, not substantial nor helpful. If it is not easy to send the external doctorandi to NOSTER-events and training sessions, an internal coherent training programme is needed. Especially for the external PhD theses, it is hard if not impossible to get a clear picture of the overall quality of the PhD-dissertations.

Given the fact that research stays abroad are experienced as positive and stimulating (focus on research; discussion with the peers; free from other obligations), the AC suggests promoting such research stays. It will also broaden the view of the PhD’s and their overall academic and cultural formation. A more active involvement and participation in conferences will result into the same effect: up to now, this part of the training seems to depend on the individual decisions of the candidates.

The AC invites the rectors and their boards to think about career planning of their doctors, for they will be the future professors and leaders in the two universities. Up to the current moment, this important step in view of *Nachwuchs* is underdeveloped. The same is to be said with regard to the support of doctors who want to apply for postdoctoral positions.

The AC invites the boards of TUA and TUK to develop a strategy with regard to the Research Units’ integrity.

The AC is of the opinion that the diversity on the level of gender and ethnic backgrounds is rather poor.

The AC deplores the fact that a programme with a really international appearance such as EMRT because of the failed merger of TUA and TUK will be given a looser character. Nothing is wrong with putting specific emphases in research – in most international contexts in humanities, research is done in the context of research units, without strictly defined programmes - , but a convergence of the attempts will contribute to the international reputation of this programme.

The AC does appreciate the many efforts made during the period under review. However, it has to observe that for several aspects, the problems mentioned in 2011, are still present. The coherence of the programmes or better the methodological and hermeneutical interaction in these programmes needs improvement. It is a misunderstanding to think that in a programme all have to do the same. The position of the programme leaders must be better defined in view of an optimisation of the research. The self-assessment report makes clear that the success of a programme is also related to the authority given to the programme director. It welcomes the fact that programme leaders will receive more budget and authority, but adds that proven leadership should be the criterion for the choice of programme leaders. In modern university life, professors are not only expected to teach and to do research, but also to promote research on the basis of managerial qualifications. The AC is still worrying about the discrepancy between academic research and non-academic services to the churches.

Last but not least, the AC strongly recommends that the composition of the academic personnel better reflects the growing presence of female students in the two schools. Furthermore, also the growing role of women in academia should become more visible in the staff of TUA and TUK.

Appendices

Short CV's of the Members of the AC

C.V. of Michael Beintker (1947)

Professor (emeritus) for Systematic Theology at the Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster,
Professor for Systematic Theology at the Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg (1990-1992)
1991–1992 Prorector for Humanities of the Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg (1991-1992)
1992–2015 Professor for Systematic Theology and Director of the Seminary for Reformed Theology of
the Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster (1992-2015)

Member of Cluster of Excellence “Religion and Politics in Pre-Modern and Modern Cultures” at the
Universität Münster

Chairman of the Joint Commission for the Reform of Theological Study (in Germany) (1999-2015)

2004 Dr. h.c. in Debrecen/Hungary

Since 2003 Member of the North-Rhine-Westphalian Academy of Sciences, Humanities and the Arts

Since 2010 Member of European Academy of Sciences and Arts (EASA)

Numerous Books and Publications: history of theology and theology of Karl Barth, reformed theology
in past and present and protestant dogmatics

C. V. of Martien E. Brinkman (1950)

Professor (emeritus) of ecumenical/intercultural theology at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

Dean of the faculty of theology of the Vrije Universiteit (2000-2005)

President of the European Societas Oecumenica (2000-2004)

Director of the International Reformed Theological Institute (IRTI) (2005-2015)

Director of the Interdisciplinary VU Research Institute for the Study of Religion, Culture and Society
(VISOR) (2007-2011)

Honorary Professor of the Reformed Seminary of Sarospatak (Hungary)

Research Fellow of the faculty of theology of the University of Stellenbosch (South Africa)

C.V. of Georg Fischer SJ (1954)

Jesuit since 1972; ordained priest 1981

Biblical Licentiate 1983 and Doctorate *in re biblica* 1988 (on Exod 3–4, “Jahwe unser Gott”) at the
Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome

Teaching since 1985 in many countries and continents

Habilitation 1993 in Graz on “Das Trostbüchlein. Text, Komposition und Theologie von Jer 30f”

Since 1995 chair for Old Testament and Languages of the Ancient Near East at the Theological Faculty
of the University of Innsbruck, Austria

Author of nearly 20 books and more than 100 scholarly articles

C. V. of Mathijs Lamberigts (1955)

Professor Church History Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies, KU Leuven

Dean of the Faculty of Theology, KU Leuven (2000-2008; 2014-2018)

Member FWO-V 1995-2005
Member Research Council KU Leuven 1994-2000
Reviewer FNRS, CNR, ERC, Polish Fund for Research
Member and President (since 2009) of the Permanent Tenure Committee (Universiteit of Freiburg, Germany)
Member of the Senior Advisory Board Eucor
Member of the Royal Flemish Academy of Belgium
Director of the Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique

Site Visit Programme

Thursday evening 1 November: arrival in Apeldoorn

Friday 2 November: Site visit TUA

09.00-10.30 internal consultation of the committee
10.30-10.45 coffee break
10.45-11.45 discussion with the rectores R. Kuiper and H.J. Selderhuis

12.00-14.00 lunch and guided tour of the Apeldoorn building
14.00-15.00 discussion with programme leader S. Paas
15.00-16.00 discussion with programme leader A. Huijgen
16.00-17.30 internal consultation of the committee

Departure by car to Kampen

19.00- : Dinner and continuation of the consultation in the Herenkamer of **restaurant De Bottermarck**, Broederstraat 23, 8261 GN Kampen

Saturday 3 November: Site visit TUK

09.00-10.00 discussion with four PhD students
from Apeldoorn: C.T. de Groot and H. de Waard
from Kampen: R. Alkema and J.M. de Jong
Alkema and De Groot are external PhD students
10.00-10.15 coffee break
10.15-11.15 discussion with programme leader E.A. de Boer
11.15-12.00 tour of the Kampen buildings
12.00- lunch and internal consultation of the committee

Finances (to be copied from the document)

An overview of the budgets of the two universities:

Year	TU APELDOORN			TU KAMPEN		
	State	Church	External	State	Church	External
2012	€ 1,209,705	€ 520,735	€ 44,000	€ 1,309,655	€ 1,719,481	€ 17,059
2013	€ 1,372,716	€ 518,587	€ 44,000	€ 1,377,642	€ 1,720,158	€ 43,599
2014	€ 1,312,243	€ 549,431	€ 41,000	€ 1,198,148	€ 1,806,416	€ 93,574
2015	€ 1,317,039	€ 544,261	€ 41,000	€ 1,173,057	€ 1,722,180	€ 154,386
2016	€ 1,342,972	€ 545,014	€ 35,000	€ 1,162,503	€ 1,722,180	€ 137,031
2017	€ 1,171,226	€ 575,956	€ 22,000	€ 1,339,097	€ 1,868,890	€ 248,504
Total	€ 7,725,901	€ 3,253,984	€ 227,000	€ 7,560,102	€ 10,566,206	€ 694,153

External only insofar as relevant for research

A significant part of the external funding for the TUK came from two national institutions for education for a research project on identity in secondary schools.

The research groups do not have their own budget, nor are the program leaders allotted any facilities. Financing comes through the two institutions. Nearly all of the incoming external funding was received for the research group Reformed Traditions in Secular Europe. This group also received a grant from the Maclellan Foundation, which contributed \$10.000 to the development of an evaluation instrument for church plants.

Time table: see SEP p. 16

RATING

- 1: World leading/excellent
- 2: Very good
- 3: Good
- 4: Unsatisfactory

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AC: Assessment Committee

SEP: Standard Evaluation Protocol

ToR: Terms of Reference (appendix B)