

Evaluation 2005-2010

**Netherlands Institute for the Study of Crime
and Law Enforcement (NSCR)**

Content

1	Introduction	5
1.1	Scope and context of this review	5
1.2	The Evaluation Committee	5
1.3	Data supplied to the Committee	6
1.4	Procedures followed by the Committee	6
1.5	Aspects and assessment scale	7
2	Institutional framework of NSCR	9
2.1	Mission	9
2.2	Research	9
2.3	Organisational structure	10
2.4	Financial matters	10
2.5	Staff	11
3	Assessment of the NSCR research programme	13
3.1	Themes	13
3.2	Assessment of the research programme	13
3.3	SEP criteria	13
3.3.1	Quality and Productivity	13
3.3.2	Relevance	14
3.3.3	Vitality & Feasibility	15
4	Assessment of the institute NSCR	17
4.1	Overall assessment	17
4.2	Comments	17
4.2.1	Quality	17
4.2.2	Productivity	20
4.2.3	Relevance	20
4.2.4	Vitality & Feasibility	20
4.2.5	Overall comments	21
5	Supplementary questions from NWO	23
5.1	Introduction	23
5.2	Generic and institute specific questions	23
6	Conclusions and recommendations	25
6.1	Conclusions	25
6.2	Recommendations	25
6.2.1	Funding	25
6.2.2	Earning power	25
6.2.3	Consolidation of strengths	26
6.2.4	Societal relevance; output for wider audiences; relationship between research and policy	26
6.2.5	Research facilities: data	27
6.2.6	PhD training	27
6.2.7	Postdocs	27
6.2.8	Contract work	28
Annex 1	Curricula Vitae of Evaluation Committee Members	29
Annex 2	Programme of the Site Visit 23-25 March 2011	31
Annex 3	Interviews and presentations	33

1 Introduction

1.1 Scope and context of this review

This assessment concerns the research carried out at the Netherlands Institute for the Study of Crime and Law Enforcement (NSCR) since 2005. The evaluation was commissioned and organised by the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO).

The external evaluation follows the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 (SEP). It is the protocol for research assessment in the Netherlands as agreed upon by NWO, the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) and the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU).

The aims of the assessment procedure with regard to research and research management are:

- Improvement of research quality based on an external peer review, including scientific and societal relevance of research, research policy and research management;
- Accountability to the board of the research organisation, and to funding agencies, government and society at large.

To the evaluation criteria in the SEP, NWO added some supplementary questions addressed to the Evaluation Committee and to the institute itself; some questions were to be raised in all evaluations of the NWO institutes in 2011, and some were specifically devised for NSCR. Input from two other important bodies financing NSCR (the Netherlands Ministry of Security and Justice and VU University Amsterdam) was also included in the supplementary questions.

An Evaluation Committee was established and asked to produce a reasoned judgment of the institute and its research programmes, in accordance with the SEP.

Prior to the external evaluation, NSCR submitted a self evaluation document covering the period 2005-2010. This report was approved by the Governing Board of NWO in February 2011. The self evaluation report and addendum included a SWOT analysis and a full set of statistics at institute and programme level concerning input (finances, funding and staff) and output (refereed articles, books, PhD theses, conference papers, publications aimed at the general public, and other output) for the six years prior to the evaluation. The self evaluation report therefore offered a concise picture of the institute and research groups' work, ambitions, output and resources in accordance with the guidelines provided by the SEP.

Site visits form an important part of every evaluation and include interviews with the management of the institute, the programme coordinators, other levels of staff, and (usually, though not in the case of NSCR) site visits to laboratories and facilities.

1.2 The Evaluation Committee

The Evaluation Committee was appointed on 23 March 2011 by the Governing Board of NWO. Its members were:

Prof. dr. Corien Prins, chair	University of Tilburg (NL)
Prof. dr. Hans-Jürgen Kerner	University of Tübingen (D)
Prof. dr. David Farrington	University of Cambridge (UK)
Prof. dr. Patricia Brantingham	Simon Fraser University (Vancouver, Ca)
Prof. dr. Tom Vander Beken	University of Ghent (B)

A short curriculum vitae of each of the members is included in Annex 1.

The Committee was supported by NWO staff (Margreet Bouma and Patricia Vogel).

Before the site visit all members of the Committee signed the NWO Code of Conduct, by means of which they declared that their assessment would be free of bias and without regard to personal interest, and that they had no personal, professional or managerial involvement with the institute or its research programmes. It was concluded that the Committee had no conflicts of interest.

1.3 Data supplied to the Committee

One month prior to the site visit the Evaluation Committee received the self evaluation report from NSCR together with the site visit programme and an explanatory letter. The documentation supplied to the Committee included all the information required by the SEP as well as by the additional questions raised by NWO.

The appendices in the self evaluation report contained information on the present organisation of NSCR, the composition of its governing board(s) and scientific advisory committee(s), the names of the theme coordinators, extensive information on the present NSCR research themes, and lists of NSCR data sets, PhD candidates (2000-2010), visiting fellows, workshops, ISI publications by NSCR and comparable institutes, NSCR staff memberships of editorial boards and guest editorships, and prizes and awards. The addendum offered statistics on tenured and non-tenured staff, NSCR output (academic publications, PhD theses and publications for the general public), and the progress of PhD candidates per year.

During the site visit the Committee received further documentation about supervision meetings with three PhDs (January – March 2011), information relating to the SEP topic of ‘societal relevance’ (the NSCR Protocol for publications and some examples of fact sheets for the Kennislink educational web site), and protocols with regard to the topic of ‘data management’ (confidentiality declaration form, protocol for privacy and protocol for data property), plus a list of all NSCR publications from 2005 to 2010.

1.4 Procedures followed by the Committee

The Committee proceeded in accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015. The assessment was based on the NSCR self evaluation report and the other documentation provided by the institute, and the interviews.

The interviews took place during the site visit made from 24 to 25 March 2011. The programme of the visit is included in Annex 2.

The Committee met on the afternoon preceding the site visit to discuss and plan the interviews with the NSCR’s Management Team, theme coordinators, researchers, Governing Board and Scientific Advisory Committee.

They decided which of the PhD candidates and postdocs were to be interviewed. The Committee agreed on procedural matters and aspects of the assessment as described in the following paragraphs.

At a formal dinner in Amsterdam, the Committee met with prof dr. J.J. Engelen and prof. dr. F.M.G. de Jong, chairman and member of the NWO Governing Board.

The interviews with the NSCR Management Team, Governing Board, Scientific Advisory Committee, senior research staff, PhD students, postdocs and support staff took place during the site visit on 24 and 25 March 2011. All interviews were conducted by the entire Committee, except the interviews with the data manager and the librarian (conducted in Dutch by the Chair and two Committee members).

After completing the interviews the Committee discussed the scores and comments on the institute and its research programmes and determined the final assessment.

At the end of the site visit, a meeting was held with the NSCR director and the chair and a member of the NSCR Governing Board to report on the Committee's main findings.

In May 2011 a draft version of this report was sent to the NSCR director for factual correction and comments. The report was subsequently submitted to the Governing Board of NWO.

1.5 Aspects and assessment scale

The Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 requires the Evaluation Committee to assess four main aspects of the institute and its research. These are:

- *Quality* (subcriteria: quality and scientific relevance of the research, leadership, academic reputation, organisation, resources, and PhD training);
- *Productivity* (productivity strategy and the actual productivity);
- *Societal relevance* (such as societal quality, societal impact, valorisation);
- *Vitality and feasibility* (strategy such as strategic planning, SWOT analysis, robustness and stability).

These four main assessment criteria are rated according to a five point scale, as specified in the SEP. The verdict can be given in qualitative form, though a quantitative figure may be added. The scale is as follows:

5. Excellent

Research is world-leading. Researchers are working at the forefront of their field internationally and their research has an important and substantial impact in the field.

4. Very good

Research is internationally competitive and makes a significant contribution to the field. Research is considered nationally leading.

3. Good

Work is competitive at the national level and makes a valuable contribution in the international field. Research is considered internationally visible.

2. Satisfactory

Work adds to our understanding and is solid, but not exciting. Research is nationally visible.

1. Unsatisfactory

Work is neither solid nor exciting, flawed in the scientific and/or technical approach, includes repetition of other work, etc.

2 Institutional framework of NSCR

2.1 Mission

The Netherlands Institute for the Study of Crime and Law Enforcement (NSCR: *Nederlands Studiecentrum Criminaliteit en Rechtshandhaving*) was established in 1992 as a national research institute, on the initiative of the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) and the Ministry of Justice. The institute was to strengthen fundamental research into crime and law enforcement and complement the policy-oriented research that was dominating Dutch criminology. Other objectives included developing interdisciplinary collaborations and forming a bridge between the international and the Dutch research community.

During the evaluation period, the institute has benefited from the hospitality of Leiden University (until 2009) and VU University Amsterdam (since 2009). The institute is independent of the host university. The NSCR Board is appointed by NWO. The institute has a multidisciplinary, international Scientific Advisory Committee.

The institute's mission is to conduct independent, fundamental and multidisciplinary research into crime and law enforcement, leading to scientific progress and evidence-based knowledge for the criminal justice system.

In addition, NSCR has taken on four main tasks. First, to develop a national and international network of research communities, in collaboration with universities, research institutes, policy makers and professionals in the criminal justice system. Second, to collect unique large-scale longitudinal data sets that facilitate and renew national and international multidisciplinary research on crime and law enforcement. Third, to train young academics. Fourth, to supply evidence-based knowledge to the academic community and inform criminal justice policy making and policy analysis.

Through its focus, manpower, and ability to maintain and update large-scale longitudinal data sets, NSCR aims to ensure and promote continuity and international quality in Dutch criminological research. Thus it also aims to safeguard the presence and position that Dutch criminological research has achieved internationally. This is important, because history shows that criminology fluctuates substantially in Dutch Law faculties.

2.2 Research

NSCR has pursued its mission by developing a research programme with a strong emphasis on three themes: (1) mobility and the distribution of crime, (2) the citizen and the criminal justice system, and (3) life course, crime and interventions.

As a responsive research institute in the field of crime and law enforcement, it is obviously crucial for NSCR to conduct research on the criminal justice system (theme 2). The aim of theme 2 is to theoretically and empirically scrutinize the system itself: how it operates, its effects, the normative implications of the criminal justice system, how it involves citizens, and lastly, how citizens experience it (legitimacy).

However, effective enforcement and intervention depend not only on the criminal justice system, but also to an important degree on knowledge about the people who commit crimes and about the places where crimes are committed. For those reasons, two additional NSCR themes focus on the life course of offenders (theme 3) and the spatiotemporal patterns of crime (theme 1). The latter two themes feature prominently on the international research agenda, but are almost absent in Dutch criminological research. This lack of attention is partly due to insufficient manpower and resources for collecting the large-scale data needed for this kind of research.

NSCR research themes are:

Theme 1: Mobility and the distribution of crime

This research theme studies crime and law enforcement from a spatial and spatiotemporal perspective. The programme describes spatial and temporal variations in crime, and explains these variations as a function of the characteristics of places and of how potential offenders, potential victims, informal guardians and law enforcement agencies use their spatial environment over daily and weekly cycles.

Theme 2: The Citizen and the criminal justice system

This research theme focuses on how the criminal justice system operates, its effects, its normative implications (in a comparative perspective), the involvement and participation of citizens in the system, and the more general support of society for law enforcement. The central topics studied in this theme play an important role in the societal and political debate surrounding the increasingly harsh penal climate in the Netherlands.

Theme 3: Life course, crime and interventions

This research theme aims to describe and explain the development of criminal behaviour throughout life. The programme's main focus is on the interdependencies between criminal and conventional life trajectories and the effects of interventions during childhood (0-12), adolescence (12-18), emerging adulthood (18-28) and beyond.

2.3 Organisational structure

NSCR has no formal organisational research units or departments. Members of research staff contribute to one or more themes within the overall research programme. The three NSCR research themes report to the Director. Each theme has a theme coordinator; these coordinators and the director together form the institute's Management Team. The director reports to the NSCR Governing Board, which in turn reports to NWO. The director is advised by the Scientific Advisory Committee and supported by the Management Team, consisting of the three theme coordinators, and by the technical and administrative staff.

2.4 Financial matters

Significant changes had occurred in the period under evaluation. Originally about 40% of NSCR's basic budget came from the Ministry of Justice. The balance has shifted towards NWO, which is now the main financing body. The direct funding from the Ministry of Justice has been decreasing since 2008 and will end in 2014, due to internal budget cuts.

Until 2009 the basic funding from the Ministry of Justice and NWO was supplemented by the University of Leiden. Since 2009, this type of supplementary funding has been provided by VU University Amsterdam.

In the evaluation period the institute's earning power (research grants, contract research and other) fluctuated between 23 and 40 percent.

Table 1 **NSCR funding 2005-2010 in k€ and %**

Funding	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Total
Direct funding NWO	562	555	554	571	594	612	3.448
	35%	35%	31%	15%	25%	18%	24%
Direct funding Ministry of Justice	681	681	681	681	681	681	4.086
	42%	42%	38%	18%	29%	20%	28%
Temporary additional funding NWO			250	887	675	725	2.537
Leiden University	p.m.	p.m.	p.m.	p.m.			
			14%	24%	28%	21%	17%
VU University Amsterdam					p.m.+40	p.m.+40	80
					2 %	1 %	1%
Research grants	74	147	54	1,292	62	991	2.620
	5%	9%	3%	34%	3%	29%	18%
Contract research	295	215	222	282	242	332	1.588
	18%	13%	12%	8%	10%	10%	11%
Other	3	10	22	45	93	21	194
	0%	1%	1%	1%	4%	1%	1%
Total funding	1.615	1.608	1.783	3.758	2.387	3.402	14.553
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

2.5 Staff

Table 2 **NSCR staff (in FTE years) 2005-2010¹**

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
(Senior) researchers	10.2	9.2	9.1	9.5	11.5	11.0
Postdocs	1.5	0.9	0.5	0.1	1.8	3.8
PhD candidates	8.2	9.0	6.2	6.6	8.0	12.2
Junior researchers/ research assistants	2.1	3.0	1.2	4.3	5.2	5.8
Support staff	5.1	5.2	4.5	4.0	3.4	4.5
Total	27.1	27.2	21.5	24.5	29.9	37.4

¹ Maternity and parental leaves, teaching time, and other obligations have not been subtracted.

3 Assessment of the NSCR research programme

3.1 Themes

In its self evaluation report for 2005-2010, NSCR writes that the institute has pursued its mission by developing a research programme with a strong longitudinal emphasis; it is divided into three themes:

1. Mobility and the distribution of crime
2. The citizen and the criminal justice system
3. Life course, crime and interventions.

3.2 Assessment of the research programme

Although the Evaluation Committee scores the three research themes separately for the four main SEP criteria later in this report, it has decided to assess the themes together in this chapter. The Committee notes that staff activities appear not to be strictly divided between the themes or limited to a specific research theme. On the contrary, the Committee appreciates that it is not uncommon for staff members to cross thematic boundaries. Similarly, PhDs appear not to hesitate to take questions to staff working on research themes other than that to which their own topic relates. The internal organisation appears to be highly flexible, although the main organisational structure is not exactly clear to the Committee (see chapter 4).

3.3 SEP criteria

For the assessment of the research programme, the Committee considers the four main SEP criteria:

- Quality
- Productivity
- Relevance
- Vitality and feasibility.

Table 3 Research programme scores

NSCR research theme	Quality	Productivity	Relevance	Vitality & Feasibility
Mobility and the distribution of crime	5	5	4	5
The citizen and the criminal justice system	4	4	5	4
Life course, crime and interventions	5	5	4	5

3.3.1 Quality and Productivity

In general, quality and productivity are judged to be excellent. The Committee is impressed with the substantial increase in high-quality international, peer-reviewed publications.

Overall, the Committee feels that the research conducted under theme 1 is leading, in that it is generally ahead of the other two themes in terms of publication productivity and representing NSCR as a key player in the international research community. Theme 1 is also considered to be very well supervised. The research is excellent and well established internationally in the top journals.

In future, this theme could consider widening its focus. International links exist, but are primarily USA-oriented.

Theme 2 is well under way and has a good record but needs further consolidating, in particular in terms of coherence and vision. The Committee notes that theme 2 is less international in its orientation than the other two themes, but feels that, like them, it will eventually be an international leader. However, it recommends that more work be done on policy and institutional effects. The output of this theme necessarily includes articles focusing specifically on the Dutch criminal justice system. Many of these articles are published in Dutch.

They are highly relevant to policy makers (especially in the Netherlands), but do not have the impact of articles published in international peer reviewed journals. If this theme strove to conduct more comparative research, it could aspire to publication in outlets with greater impact. This factor influences both quality and productivity. The research is by nature oriented towards the Dutch criminal justice system. The Committee feels it possible that at some point the theme's focus might switch more clearly to more comparative research.

The quality of research under theme 3 is judged to be excellent and the theme has pursued highly topical lines of research. The orientation is more quantitative and longitudinal than that of theme 1. Also, the research conducted by theme 3 is still somewhat limited by the use of administrative data (research with longitudinal data is still at a fairly early stage).

The new outstandingly important longitudinal surveys should lead to great advances in knowledge but may take some time to come to fruition. The Committee encourages the researchers to spend time on assuring the high quality of the data collected even if this means that their rate of publication of results based on administrative data decreases.

The Committee has awarded a score of 5 for productivity, but indicates that the rate of exceptional publication should increase as these projects move further down the research road.

During the interviews that the Committee conducted, the PhDs and Postdocs expressed clear satisfaction with the research environment. PhD researchers at NSCR work in a stimulating, interactive and open working environment. The structure of PhD training is flexible, allowing both general and individual needs of students (e.g. specific methodological skills) to be addressed. The Committee feels, however, that those PhD researchers who need to collect new primary data run the risk of failing to complete their theses within the official 4-year period, because they are left with insufficient time for the analysis of the data and writing of the PhD thesis and research articles. The Committee suggests that the workload of PhD students who have to collect new data and the workload of those working with existing data sets should be monitored to ensure that the two are equal.

They should all have an equal opportunity to finish their theses on time and to write scientific articles within the period.

3.3.2 Relevance

NSCR (in particular theme 2) produces a range of publications in respected Dutch professional and public media. Such publications are a natural by-product of the institute's research publications. Although the Committee appreciates the institute's efforts to disseminate its research findings through its web site and other broadly accessible locations, publication for an appropriate wider audience appears to be a challenge to NSCR (in particular themes 1 and 3). The Committee feels that NSCR could put more effort into distributing the knowledge gained to a wider audience of policy makers, practitioners, the mass media and the general public. In particular, the Committee feels that the institute's unique position in the Netherlands, in combination with its high level of research output, generates a natural wider audience of people at senior levels of government. Efforts to reach this particular audience should feature more prominently on the strategic agenda of the institute, as a necessary spin-off of individual research projects.

Given the closure of the Research School on Safety and Security in Society (OMV), the Committee highly values the initiative taken by NSCR to develop a European trainee programme in collaboration with Cambridge University, UK. The development of a jointly established, well-structured training programme (Research Master in Criminology) with VU University Amsterdam is also seen as a very good initiative.

3.3.3 Vitality & Feasibility

The Committee considers the impressive increase in the number of peer-reviewed articles in top international journals as clear evidence of the vitality of the research lines. The fact that NSCR has recently been able to attract excellent young (international) researchers to fill postdoc positions is another clear indication of the stimulating and attractive research climate the institute is able to offer.

More details can be found in chapter 4, on the assessment of the institute.

4 Assessment of the institute NSCR

4.1 Overall assessment

For the assessment of the institute as a whole, the Evaluation Committee considered all the criteria and subcriteria listed in the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 (SEP, pp. 11-12).

Table 4 Overall assessment of the institute

SEP criteria			Score	
Quality	A.1	Quality and scientific relevance of the research	Excellent	5
	A.2	Leadership	Excellent	5
	A.3	Academic reputation	Excellent	5
	A.4	Resources	Very good	4
	A.5	PhD training	Excellent	5
Productivity	B.1	Productive strategy	Excellent	5
	B.2	Productivity	Very good	4
Relevance	C	Societal relevance	Very good	4
Vitality & feasibility	D.1	Strategy	Very good	4
	D.3	Robustness and stability	Excellent	5
Overall assessment			Excellent	5

4.2 Comments

The Committee discussed the institute on the basis of all the criteria and subcriteria and commented as follows.

4.2.1 Quality

A.1 Quality and scientific relevance of the research

The quality and scientific relevance of NSCR is judged to be excellent. The institute is unique in terms of its position, its research and its atmosphere. It is outstanding and internationally recognized as a centre for fundamental research in criminology. It is at the forefront in this respect and is truly unique in the world. The number of publications in the top journals in the field places NSCR at the forefront internationally and makes it a leader in scholarly publication. Through its cutting-edge research output and valuable longitudinal data sets, NSCR is among the world's most influential and productive research groups in the domain of criminology. The Committee highly values the productive atmosphere, which stimulates creativity and provides the freedom to carry out fundamental research. The research staff is excellent and talented. The Committee is impressed that a good number of the institute's PhD students have begun their publication careers in the most highly respected journals. This should be recognized as an important part of NSCR's scholarly quality and scientific relevance.

High achievement by senior researchers appears to have a positive impact on PhD students.

Finally, the Committee values the early initiatives that have been taken to conduct randomized experiments and urges NSCR to continue further in this direction. The Committee feels that this difficult but important type of study is precisely the kind of research that should feature on the future research agenda of leading institutes like NSCR.

The Committee values the newly established structural relationship and collaboration with VU University Amsterdam.

Score: 5, Excellent.

A.2 Leadership

The Committee feels that the quality of leadership remains excellent and that considerable progress has been made in the last few years as regards redistributing responsibility and research priorities among the members of the Management Team. An incredible amount of work has been done by the director, Gerben Bruinsma. He has clear goals, a clear strategy and priorities and the ability to present things clearly. He also appears to be a positive communicator, is committed and clearly likes to stimulate and foster young people. He is very approachable and available to all staff. Whereas in the past the leadership appeared to be vulnerable, the Committee now finds that the Management Team is solid and sufficiently well-informed to take over if necessary and to maintain leadership at the present high-quality level.

Score: 5, Excellent.

A.3 Academic reputation

The Committee considers the institute and its research staff to be stunningly successful. The Committee is impressed by the fact that even talented young PhD candidates and postdocs receive recognition in leading international journals. NSCR has been able to attract excellent researchers and invite the world's most influential scholars to come and stay at the institute. The institute has strong ties with other leading institutes around the world. Finally, the Committee regards the recently initiated research lines entailing the collection of extensive longitudinal data sets as highly innovative and scientifically valuable.

Score: 5, Excellent.

A.4 Resources

Human resources: In accordance with NWO rules, there are formal yearly job performance interviews. The impression of the Committee originating from some interviews that these talks have only recently become a standard procedure, has been corrected by NSCR on 9 June. The various yearly job performance interviews - about the way people do their work ('functionerings-gesprekken'), about their personal development and careers ('POP-gesprekken'), and assessments of their work ('beoordelingen') - have been there for years and according to NWO rules reports of these interviews are being kept in every person's human resources archive.

The Committee could not trace any NSCR structure/flow chart showing who is responsible for whom, who is doing what, what projects are financed out of the basic NWO funding, what projects are financed out of other financial resources, what strategic indicators are used to decide on matching of external funding, etc. Overall, the Committee felt that detailed information on the organisation of NSCR resources and its strategy regarding use of resources was lacking.

The Evaluation Committee went back to NSCR once more, to enquire about the existence of any structure/flow chart mentioned above. On 4 July the NSCR Director offered information from which the Committee concludes that at present no such structure/flow chart is used within the institute. As explained by the Director, the organisational embedding is described in the NSCR self-evaluation document (chapter 2, par. 2.7); communication within NSCR remains informal and direct; internal bureaucracy is minimized. The Director pointed out that the decision-making process of the NSCR is based on a set of general rules (which he explained in further detail). Besides, the boundaries between the three NSCR research groups are fluid and flexible in order to promote interaction and communication between researchers of all levels as much as possible.

Quality-wise, the researchers at the institute are very good. However, there appears to be an uneven distribution of work among the PhD students and postdocs and the number of postdocs could be increased.

Funding policy and earning capacity: At this moment, funding is excellent. However, NSCR is in a vulnerable position. It has been known for the last 2 years (since mid-2009) that the Ministry of Security and Justice will eventually stop funding the institute (2014 will be the last year) and its subsidy is already decreasing. NSCR has responded by urging all postdocs and senior researchers to write more applications for grants. The director considers the present size of the institute to be ideal, given its current total budget. Earning capacity is therefore set to be a challenging issue. The Committee strongly recommends NSCR to look for funding abroad, in particular at the European level. Given its strong international reputation, the Committee is surprised to see that no NSCR researchers have applied for or received international (e.g. European) research grants.

Research facilities: The Committee highly appreciates the large number of valuable administrative data sets that have been generated as part of the various research projects. It considers the detailed data and in particular the long-term follow-ups as important resources for further research and future projects. The Committee feels that it is important that NSCR has grasped the need to collect longitudinal data via repeated interviews. Studies of this kind are vitally important but difficult to conduct and therefore rarely carried out; nevertheless, this is precisely the kind of ambitious, challenging research that NSCR should be doing. Also, the Committee feels that the organisation of the data collection, the vitality of the collection as well as the quality control procedures for data collection require more attention. The interviews conveyed a rather static impression. Activities seem to be arranged in consecutive steps from project to results to data. The overall impression of the Committee is that NSCR focuses on archiving data from finished projects rather than aiming at the creation of a dynamic, searchable database collection. The Committee is not sure whether NSCR has an adequate strategy and the necessary facilities in place to achieve a more dynamic approach. Some further ideas are presented in the Conclusions and Recommendations.

Overall score: 4, Very good.

A.5 PhD training. Objectives and institutional embedding: structure of programmes; supervision; success rates; educational resources

The Committee feels that this issue requires the future attention of NSCR. It is clear from the interviews that PhD students enjoy working at NSCR. The Committee is impressed to see how a new generation of researchers is thriving in the research environment of the institute (something that is not apparent from the self evaluation report). In the interviews, the PhD students expressed genuine academic motivation. They have considerable freedom to choose their research topic.

Many students reported an excellent working environment at NSCR. They work “in a dream world” with lots of freedom to conduct high-quality research, without “the burden” of teaching obligations. Nevertheless, the Committee expresses concerns as regards the potential negative implications of a lack of structure in training. PhDs do attend training courses (NSCR is good at an informal type of institutional embedding), but PhD training is not always formally structured. That makes the present situation fine, but also vulnerable. The Committee wonders whether NSCR’s present informal approach may actually be even better than a formal structure. However, to get any training, the individual initiative of PhDs is crucial. Although the PhDs perform at a high level, regular assessment of progress by independent staff would be an improvement. This observation is particularly relevant given the earlier observation on the differences in workload depending on the type of data collection required and type of data used.

Score: 5, Excellent. Recommendations are given in chapter 6.

4.2.2 Productivity

B.1 Productivity strategy, productivity goals, publication strategy, rewards and sanctions

The publication strategy is outstanding.

Score: 5, Excellent.

B.2 Productivity

Scientific publications and PhD theses: Productivity in terms of scientific publications is excellent.

Professional publications, output for wider audiences: NSCR probably does much more than is apparent from the self evaluation report or from the interviews. However, the Committee feels that the institute should consider seeking access to high-level policy makers and make more effort to communicate its research results to this audience (see below, under C. Societal relevance).

Use of research facilities by third parties: Many challenges are associated with making data collected in criminological research available to independent researchers outside the institute. The institute's will to do this is commendable but the Committee feels that the institute needs to develop strategies in this respect (see earlier observations).

Score: 4, Very good. Specific recommendations are given in chapter 6.

4.2.3 Relevance

C. Societal relevance; societal quality, societal impact, valorisation

The Committee feels that societal relevance should be higher on the agenda of NSCR, if only because the institute's societal impact may influence the successful acquisition of external funding. The institute deals with highly relevant and topical issues and its research output is widely known in academia. However, the results of its research (especially in themes 1 and 3) are far less apparent and well-known outside the academic world and the Committee considers this to be somewhat problematic. The Committee recognizes that NSCR is making an effort to achieve broader visibility (by means of the Kennislink web site as well as fact sheets and press releases – although the NSCR lacks more interactive applications (e.g. weblogs)).

Although the Committee recognizes that societal relevance is not a mission in itself, it feels that NSCR could make greater efforts to render its highly important academic work useful to a broader audience. In this respect, the Committee particularly advises NSCR to aim at influencing senior (e.g. government) policy levels (rather than lower or medium levels). The challenge here, of course, is to have the right kind of impact. NSCR could consider having an advisory body for each major project or each theme. Also, NSCR could devote more effort to thinking through what its audience is for each theme. Finally, the institute could stimulate young researchers to achieve more societal impact, and in general work do more to foster internal awareness of the importance of disseminating knowledge to relevant stakeholders.

Score: 4, Very good.

4.2.4 Vitality & Feasibility

D.1 Strategy

In general, the strategic planning of NSCR looks good. The Committee feels, however, that the institute is at present missing opportunities for acquiring EU funding and is missing out on European collaboration. A strategy is needed for this, given both the forthcoming loss of funding at national level and the new and existing possibilities for funding and grants under e.g. European network programmes or from the ERC. More generally, the Committee considers it important that NSCR should broaden its scope to include Europe. At present, the institute has a strong Anglo-

American orientation (nearly all international visitors are from the USA or UK). There are, however, excellent research groups in various parts of Europe (Germany, Scandinavia, some in Spain, etc.). NSCR could make use of its excellent academic reputation to act as a facilitating intermediary between different academic worlds and regions. More specifically, the Committee thinks that NSCR is in a very good position to initiate and act as a leading partner in comparative work within Europe (comparative research on theme 2 in particular). Further thoughts are expressed in the Conclusions and Recommendations (Chapter 6).

Score: 4, Very good.

D.2 SWOT analysis

The Committee decided not to award a score for this criterion, but rather to give more detailed comments while scoring the other criteria and formulating its final recommendations.

D.3 Robustness and stability

The Committee feels that the research facilities are excellent overall. The institute offers a highly attractive and stimulating academic climate with high-quality expertise, rich data sets and good resources. The institute is frequently visited by renowned scholars from abroad. Promising new research lines involving large-scale data collection have been initiated (SPAN and TransAm); these offer a solid basis for the continuation of topical lines of research.

Score: 5, Excellent.

4.2.5 Overall comments

NSCR is unique. There is no other criminological institute in the world devoted to fundamental research on the themes addressed. The Committee recognizes the excellent quality of NSCR's research and the considerable progress the institute has achieved with regard to its research, number of publications in top scientific journals, scientific relevance, leadership and academic reputation.

NSCR is outstanding and internationally recognized as a leading centre for fundamental research in criminology. The number of publications in top journals in the field places NSCR at the forefront of international criminology. It is a leader in scholarly publication. In the light of all this, the Evaluation Committee decided that the overall score should be:

Score: 5, Excellent.

5 Supplementary questions from NWO

5.1 Introduction

Supplementary to the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP), the Governing Board of NWO has set the following generic questions to be answered during the external evaluations of the NWO research institutes (ASTRON, CWI, NIOZ, NSCR, SRON and the three FOM institutes, Rijnhuizen, AMOLF and Nikhef).

A number of questions were also specifically devised for NSCR. Those questions related to the earning power of the institute, achievements in terms of the 'consolidation of strengths', strategies for taking work in new directions over the next ten years, and NSCR's national role, facilitating role, research agenda and financial basis.

5.2 Generic and institute specific questions

Is the mission still appropriate? In the light of the mission of the institute, is a proper balance being struck between the institute's research, R&D and research facilities (their development and use)?

The Committee finds the NSCR mission clear and effective in producing excellent, cutting-edge research and facilitating the production of high-quality data sets.

What is the national and international importance of the institute now and what will it be in the near future? Does the institute have the right policies in place to meet the new challenges?

The Committee concludes that NSCR acts at the top level of the international research community and strongly believes that if it is able to acquire adequate finance, it will have the right resources and policies to maintain that level in the future. The research lines are vital and important in the light of future scientific developments. In order to meet future challenges (among them finding new finance), the Committee thinks that NSCR is in a very good position to initiate and act as a leading partner in comparative work within Europe. In the long run, stronger ties with European partners may help to guarantee the financial stability and survival of the institute.

As regards its national position, the Committee observes that NSCR plays a key role and is unique in Dutch criminological research. It is conspicuous for its interdisciplinary approach (combining criminology with various other disciplines) and empirical-analytical research. In addition, NSCR has acquired a unique position both in the Netherlands and abroad regarding its large data sets, containing both administrative and longitudinal data.

NSCR has clearly made an effort to establish a valuable partnership with the VU University Amsterdam, which has contributed six PhD students from its Phoolan Devi Institute.

The Committee learned that, although further steps need to be taken, the collaboration is already clearly beneficial in terms of the mutual supervision of the PhD projects, workshops, participation of senior researchers and other initiatives. The cooperation with Phoolan Devi will be evaluated through a mid-term review.

The Committee feels that NSCR could expand its relations with Dutch universities and other research institutes by allowing more visiting researchers on site and by developing the capacity for external researchers to access data collected by NSCR.

The Committee stresses, however, that fully developing this capability will require special care and consideration with regard to privacy, confidentiality and the potential abuse of data.

Finally, the Committee values the initiative taken to establish a joint structured training programme (Research Master in Criminology) with VU University Amsterdam. Given the closure of the Research School on Safety and Security in Society (OMV), it is of particular importance that NSCR should play a key role in developing high-quality PhD trainee programmes, both in the other universities in the Netherlands and at a European level (as currently in collaboration with Cambridge University, UK).

Should NWO continue to support the institute; if so, for what reasons? Are there more effective ways for NWO to support the same type of research and/or facilities?

The Committee recommends NWO to continue to support the institute. The Committee feels that a long-term budget is absolutely necessary to sustain the institute's top level research, present excellent staff and ability to recruit talented young academics (postdocs) from the Netherlands and abroad. Without such a budget, the unique and for future purposes highly valuable large-scale, longitudinal data sets are at risk. Although the Committee recommends that NSCR should do much more to obtain external funding, it believes that the institute's present unique position both in the Netherlands and worldwide can be maintained only with a long-term budget.

Is the institute doing enough to exploit its opportunities for cooperation with organisations outside the academic world?

In the period under evaluation, NSCR has established good relationships with organisations outside academia, including police forces, prisons, city councils and the Ministry of Security and Justice. Although the Committee recognizes that cooperation with organisations outside the academic world is not a mission in itself, it feels that NSCR could devote more effort to making its highly important academic work useful to a broader audience. In this respect, the Committee particularly advises NSCR to aim at influencing senior (e.g. government) policy levels (rather than lower or medium levels). The institute deals with highly relevant and topical issues and its research output has wide relevance to organisations outside academia. The Committee strongly advises NSCR to develop a long-term strategy for cooperation with a wider audience as regards all three themes. Such a strategy should be directed both at the dissemination of research results and at the acquisition of intellectually challenging research contracts from organisations outside academia.

6 Conclusions and recommendations

6.1 Conclusions

The Committee concludes that NSCR deserves to be regarded as an excellent, leading research institute with an outstanding international academic orientation and production. The in-house atmosphere is inspiring and the institute has been able to attract highly talented (young and more senior) researchers, both from the Netherlands and from abroad.

With regard to its national role, NSCR already occupies a unique high-level position in the Netherlands, in particular because of its focus but also because of the quality of its research. The Committee feels that, in general terms, the Dutch academic world benefits greatly from the presence of an institute of such excellence. Both its research agenda and its output are convincing in the light of the criminological developments and challenges faced by Dutch society today. In addition to this specific position within the Dutch academic environment, the Committee considers NSCR to be unique in world terms in its focus on fundamental research, academic leadership, scientific quality and an attractive in-house academic climate.

The quality of leadership is judged to be excellent. The institute has a clear academic mission and sets itself challenging goals. The director and programme leaders do a great deal to encourage the inspiring academic climate at NSCR.

Overall score: 5, Excellent

6.2 Recommendations

6.2.1 Funding

The Committee feels that there is much to gain from NSCR maintaining its present cutting-edge status, unique position of academic excellence and inspiring atmosphere.

The Committee therefore recommends NWO to fund the institute in the way it requests in its self evaluation report for 2005-2010 (p. 25). The Committee feels that a long-term budget is absolutely necessary if the institute is to maintain its present unique position both in the Netherlands and in world terms, sustain the excellent research staff currently working at the institute and recruit talented young academics (postdocs) from the Netherlands and abroad. Without such a guarantee, the Committee feels that earlier (financial and quality) investments will be at risk. This applies in particular to the unique and, for future purposes, highly valuable large-scale longitudinal data sets that have been generated in the last few years.

6.2.2 Earning power

Earning capacity is certainly an issue, given the financial problems that the institute will face if funding from the Ministry of Security and Justice ends in 2014. NSCR has taken initiatives to establish relationships with other universities (among them Cambridge University, UK) and to tap external funding sources (grants and project subsidies from organisations).

The Committee recommends that NSCR should do much more to obtain external funding, not only in the Netherlands but particularly in Europe. Illustrative in this respect is that, at present, NSCR has no researchers funded by international (e.g. European) grants. The Committee considers it of the utmost importance that international funding be sought.

6.2.3 Consolidation of strengths

As mentioned earlier, the Committee thinks that NSCR is in a very good position to initiate and act as a leading partner in comparative work within Europe. In the long run, stronger ties with European partners may help to guarantee the financial stability and survival of the institute.

The Committee strongly advises NSCR to make efforts in this direction. When investments and collaboration in Europe are being considered, the Committee thinks that, in addition to the suggestions made earlier (ERC grants and European framework programmes), it would be worth reflecting on the following ways to strengthen ties with European partners.

NSCR could invite small groups of experienced scholars from other European countries with the aim of 'using' them as a kind of 'advisory board' concerning research ideas or initial results of current research projects and their methodological, substantive and theoretical implications. Such experienced scholars could also be invited to present their own projects if they are or seem to be similar to those that NSCR is planning or currently running. This could be done (to mutual benefit) with the aim of obtaining ideas for new (e.g. European-wide) NSCR and NSCR-coordinated projects through an intense exchange of concepts, problems, solutions etc.

NSCR is extremely successful in international (USA) journals and among Anglo-Saxon researchers. Content-wise, however, the Committee feels that NSCR is limited by its strong Anglo-American orientation (USA and UK). There are good research groups in various parts of Europe (Belgium, Germany, Scandinavia, some in Spain, etc.) with interesting - European-oriented - research themes and output that could offer NSCR new perspectives.

The Committee wants NSCR to become more of a player in Europe and to let the European academic world benefit more from its excellence and output. The Committee feels, therefore, that the institute could collaborate more with European researchers, eventually becoming the key player in Europe. Now that the institute has reached the top on the international stage, it could act as an intermediary between the Anglo-Saxon academic world and European groups. NSCR could, so to say, act as a 'locomotive' for specific European research initiatives (e.g. comparative work in Europe).

Finally, the Committee encourages NSCR to continue to explore the opportunities for randomized experiments, especially in assessing the effectiveness of criminological interventions. The Committee acknowledges that such experiments are difficult to conduct, but believes they are very important in advancing knowledge and rarely used in Europe. The Committee feels they are precisely the type of study that a leading criminological research institute like NSCR should include in its future research agenda.

6.2.4 Societal relevance; output for wider audiences; relationship between research and policy

The Committee certainly does not want NSCR to reduce its efforts to publish in top international journals. However, it does want NSCR to increase its efforts to disseminate its research results to a broader audience, in particular those who influence policy (high-level policy makers and legislators). NSCR deals with highly relevant topics and its research results have a high profile in the academic world. The Committee acknowledges that publication for the appropriate wider audience seems to be a little more difficult for NSCR to achieve.

The institute disseminates research findings through its web site and other broadly accessible locations. However, its high-level research could naturally attract a wider audience of people at senior levels of government. Reaching this wider audience is a challenge. The Committee feels that NSCR could devote more effort to identifying its audience for each theme, each research line and even for each individual project. Contributions to the Kennislink web site and fact sheets are a good start. The web site is up-to-date but could play a more important role. There could be an

NSCR blog and the institute could consider having an advisory committee for each of its major projects or themes. In the long run, a greater societal impact could help to guarantee the survival of the institute.

The Committee strongly advises NSCR to invest effort in this (aiming at higher policy levels, rather than at lower or medium levels) and also to foster an internal climate that encourages activities aimed at achieving more societal impact. In short, the Committee considers it of the utmost importance that the management develop a long-term strategy for disseminating output to a wider audience, in particular at senior policy levels.

NSCR has developed three highly relevant and interesting themes featuring interesting and promising research lines. The Committee appreciates the fact that various researchers do not confine their work exclusively to their own theme or research line, but participate in other projects. Nevertheless, the Committee feels that more effort could be devoted to explicitly identifying possibilities for 'cross-fertilization' between the 3 themes and related fields of research. Such 'cross-fertilisation' could e.g. be stimulated by organising special 'creativity meetings' at NSCR.

6.2.5 Research facilities: data

NSCR has rightly identified opening its research facility to third parties as a goal for the near future. However, this is a complex undertaking. The expansion can be achieved by allowing more visiting researchers on site and by developing ways for external researchers to access data collected by NSCR but fully developing this capability will require special care and consideration with regard to privacy, confidentiality and the potential abuse of data.

External access may, for example, require the review of all research proposals by an independent committee, agreement from the providers of the data, encryption procedures, data aggregation and appropriate monitoring of data use.

This is particularly an issue in the case of administrative data collected from police and other government agencies. Safe external access requires a cutting-edge computer technology, but still might be subject to potential misuse. Privacy, confidentiality and anonymity are also important issues.

Developing an appropriate process may therefore require extensive legal, data protection and archival expertise and review outside NSCR to meet Dutch and European Union standards. Overall, the Committee advises NSCR to start by defining its strategy regarding dynamic, searchable database collections and working on a memorandum of understanding with the various Dutch police forces ('politiekorpsen').

6.2.6 PhD training

NSCR is an excellent, stimulating and flexible environment for PhD students. NSCR is good at an informal type of institutional embedding, but there is often no formal structure for PhD training. Regular assessment of progress by independent senior staff is advisable. All PhDs should have an appropriate training programme. At present, too much depends on their individual initiative. Also, the institute should care more about ensuring consistency in PhD workloads, especially with regard to data collection. The Committee advises NSCR in certain circumstances to farm out data collection to a survey company.

6.2.7 Postdocs

The Committee suggests that NSCR should expand the number of postdocs. This would be an excellent strategy for the achievement of more high-quality research. It recommends recruiting them from all over Europe. This would enhance the international role of NSCR, especially in Europe.

6.2.8 Contract work

As regards contract work (financed by ministries, policy organisations, etc.), the Committee also sees opportunities for NSCR, provided that such contract research is in line with the academic work of the institute. However, this would require a more active involvement and higher profile in The Hague (at the relevant ministries).

The Committee considers it important that NSCR should reflect on the appropriate future balance between fundamental research and contract research, expressly noting that NSCR can and should be selective: it should strive to attract intellectually challenging contract research projects. The Committee feels – and knows from personal experience – that such research projects are available (if not in the Netherlands, then certainly abroad).

Annex 1 Curricula Vitae of Evaluation Committee Members

Chair

Prof. dr. J.E.J. (Corien) Prins

Corien Prins holds degrees in law and Slavic languages and literature from Leiden University (The Netherlands). She was appointed Professor of Law and Informatisation at Tilburg University in 1994. There, she founded the Institute for Law, Technology, and Society (TILT) and headed it until 2008. At present, she combines the position of professor at Tilburg University with membership of the Dutch Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR) in The Hague. In addition, she is currently a research fellow with the International Victimology Institute Tilburg (Intervict) at Tilburg University. Earlier, she acted as the Director of Studies of the Research Master at the Tilburg Faculty of Law.

Corien Prins is a member of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) and sits on the KNAW Research School Accreditation Committee (ECOS) and other committees. Between 2001 and 2007, she was a member of the Board of NWO's Social Sciences division (MAGW). She has chaired various scientific committees on behalf of NWO, WODC and Dutch ministries. Her present research topics include (international) regulatory issues surrounding ICT and new technologies (biotechnology, ambient intelligence, nanotech), privacy, identity theft/fraud and on-line victimisation.

Members

Prof. dr. Tom Vander Beken studied law and criminology at Ghent University. He has been a member of the bar (1991-1996) and is currently a full-time professor and director of the Institute for International Research on Criminal Policy (IRCP) at Ghent University. He teaches criminal justice related courses, has published mainly in the areas of (international and comparative) criminal justice and organized crime, and has been involved in numerous research projects. He is a member of the Research Council of Ghent University, Expert to the Research Foundation Flanders and Member of the Commission of Science Policy of the Flemish Council for Science and Innovation.

Prof. Patricia Brantingham is holder of the RCMP University Research Chair in Computational Criminology at Simon Fraser University (Canada), Professor in the School of Criminology and Director of the Canadian Institute for Urban Research Studies (ICURS). She is a world-class Environmental Criminologist who studies pattern theory, criminal justice planning, and crime prevention through environmental design. ICURS is a university research institute that has on-going memoranda of understanding with various government ministries and policing agencies. The partners provide their data in secure but detailed spatiotemporal form for independent research. The data is routinely updated, allowing dynamic as well as long-term studies to be conducted. These data sets include 25 years of all calls for police service in Vancouver and RCMP data for all of British Columbia. The data include detailed spatiotemporal information for all calls, and all crimes and persons involved.

Prof. David P. Farrington, O.B.E., is Professor of Psychological Criminology at the Institute of Criminology, Cambridge University, and Adjunct Professor of Psychiatry at Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic, University of Pittsburgh. He is co-chair of the U.S. National Institute of Justice Study Group on Transitions from Juvenile Delinquency to Adult Crime and co-chair of the U.S. Centers for Disease Control Expert Panel on Protective Factors against Youth Violence. His major research interest is in developmental criminology, and he is Director of the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development, which is a prospective longitudinal survey of over 400 London males from age 8 to age 48. He has been President of the American Society of Criminology, President of the European Association of Psychology and Law, President of the British Society of Criminology, President of the Academy of Experimental Criminology, Chair of the Division of Forensic Psychology of the British Psychological Society, and Vice-Chair of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences Panel on Violence. In addition to over 530 published journal articles and book chapters on criminological and psychological topics, he has published 80 books, monographs and government publications.

Prof. Hans-Jürgen Kerner Full Professor at the Faculty of Law, University of Tübingen, with special responsibility for the fields of criminology, juvenile (penal) law, corrections (including prison law), and penal procedure. He is Director of the Institute of Criminology, where he has – inter alia – led interdisciplinary research teams for 25 years. He has been Chair of the European Society of Criminology; Coordinator of the post graduate LL.M.-Programme of the Faculty of Law for foreign law graduates; Coordinator of the Tübingen Criminology and Criminal Justice Theory-Practice Programme, which is a series of continuous workshops in further education for practitioners and academics alike; President of the German Foundation for Crime Prevention and the Reintegration of Offenders in Bonn; Chair of the German Association for Court Aid, Probation and Parole Assistance, and Care and Resettlement of Offenders in Berlin; Member of the Research Group on Victim-Offender-Reconciliation, Heidelberg et al. in Germany; Honorary President of the International Society for Criminology in Paris. He is a life time member of the American Society of Criminology and the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (USA) and a member of numerous other scholarly associations.

Annex 2 Programme of the Site Visit 23-25 March 2011

23 March (Wednesday), day of arrival

17.30	19.30	Closed session (synchronizing planning & approach) in NH Hotel Barbizon Palace
20.00	22.00	Welcome dinner offered by the NWO Governing Board: prof. dr. Jos Engelen (Chair) and prof. dr. Franciska de Jong (in Restaurant Vermeer).

24 March (Thursday), first day of site visit

8.15		Transport to NSCR (VUA, Initium building)
9.00	9.15	Prof. dr. G.J.N. (Gerben) Bruinsma: welcome and a short guided tour of the institute
9.15	10.15	Management Team (Director and Theme Coordinators: prof. dr. H. (Henk) Elffers (theme 1), prof. dr. P.H. (Peter) van der Laan (theme 2), prof. dr. mr. C.C.J.H. (Catrien) Bijleveld (theme 3))
10.15	12.45	Senior research staff (to be decided by the Evaluation Committee)
12.45	14.00	Lunch with NSCR staff
14.00	16.15	Postdocs and PhDs (to be decided by EC)
16.15	16.45	Support staff
16.45	18.00	Closed session of the Committee
18.00		Transport to NH Hotel Barbizon Palace
20.00		Dinner in Restaurant Open (15-20 minutes walking distance from hotel)

25 March (Friday), second day of site visit

8.15		Transport to NSCR (VUA, Initium building)
9.00	9.45	NSCR Governing Board: prof. mr. dr. Y. (Ybo) Buruma (Chair); prof. dr. C.D. (Kees) van der Vijver and prof. dr. K.L.K. (Kees) Brants)
9.45	10.30	Open Programme: three presentations by young researchers from the NSRC themes (maximum 10 minutes each plus time for questions)
10.30	11.30	NSCR Scientific Advisory Board: Prof. dr. P. (Paul) Ponsaers (Chair)
11.30	12.30	Closed session
12.30	13.30	Lunch with Director and Management Team (if Committee wishes)
13.30	16.00	Closed session
16.00	16.30	Communication of preliminary findings/main topics of the evaluation report to Gerben Bruinsma, Director, and Ybo Buruma, Chair NSCR Board
17.00		Transport to airport/hotel

Annex 3 Interviews and presentations

During the site visit the Evaluation Committee interviewed:

NSCR Governing Board

Ybo Buruma	(Chair)
Kees Brants	
Kees van der Vijver	

Management

Gerben Bruinsma	(Director)
Henk Elffers	(Coordinator theme 1)
Peter van der Laan	(Coordinator theme 2)
Catrien Bijleveld	(Coordinator theme 3)

Senior research staff

(research theme / connected with)

Wim Bernasco	(1)
Arjan Blokland	(3 / UL)
Marijke Malsch	(2)
Michael Tonry	(2)
Frank Weerman	(3)
Peter van der Laan	(2)

Postdocs

(research theme / connected with)

Nicole Haas	(2)
Hanneke Palmen	(3)
Wouter Steenbeek	(1)

PhDs

(research theme / connected with)

Maud van Bavel	(1 / VU)
Karin Bijersbergen	(2)
Vere van Koppen	(3 / WODC)

Support staff

Eran Wesselius	(Data Manager)
Peter van der Voort	(Librarian)

NSCR Scientific Advisory Committee

Paul Ponsaers	(Chair)
---------------	---------

Three presentations on NSCR projects were given:

Sanne Hissel	'Upbringing and well-being of children of incarcerated mothers' (theme 2 / VU)
Andrew Lemieux	'Time use and victimization, offending, fear of crime' (theme 1)
Arjan Blokland	'Transitions in Amsterdam (Trans-Am)' (theme 3 / UL).