

Summary of reviewer's recommendations APH midterm 2017-2019

Internal review committee

- General impression about APH is that it is a large, well-run research institute with clear scientific and societal impact.
- Most cohort studies of Amsterdam UMC are embedded within APH. A number of cohorts are not on the landscape map, and therefore not strong in funding rounds (e.g. NWO). Working together, will offer advantages.
- The focus on postdocs seems to have become less. More time must be invested in the coming period to support this important group within the APH network, both by joining initiatives at central level and by stimulating it from bottom-up within the research institute for instance with fellowships and leadership programs.
- More information about the ambition and vision of the research institute on diversity is desired.
- The research institute seems to depend (partly) on the departments and divisions. It is important to bring out more prominently the added value of APH as a network institute to her researchers.
- The scientific quality and societal impact of the research institute are good. But to show the viability and future-proof of the research institute, for example, the continuation of funding in the longer term should also be considered.
- The fluctuations in numbers in tables should be figured out and explained. The decrease in staff should also be looked at.
- Internal evaluation cycles with regard to strategic plans and deliverables, financial control, and annual figures of scientific and social achievements should be continued. However, consider the transition from a comprehensive annual report to an accessible brochure or factsheet.

External review committee

- Identify which Principal Investigators belong to multiple research institutes. That is where the opportunities for collaborations and grant applications lie.
- The dominance of Amsterdam UMC provides both positive and negative consequences for researchers from other faculties within the research institute. However, it is important to continue to approach this in a positive way.
- Research programs may differ in scientific and societal impact and their strategic plans. But it is important to continue to assess the viability of each research program. The structure should not become too complex, and perhaps more and larger programs are not always better. With the plans to install a new 'Digital Health' program, this is an appropriate time to evaluate the others.
- Postdocs are an important intermediate group to which more attention should be paid. Training and encouraging researchers to work outside the academy is also important.
- The research institute identifies high potentials within the institute and encourages with grants, fellowships, and nominations, etc. Also, the research institute could scout for talents within the pre-education context. In addition to the influence the research institute has in tenure track appointment rounds, the institute could consider bringing in talent from outside.
- The report could describe more prominently the use of the Scientific Quality Committee and the Quality Handbook.
- For the external evaluation, it is of added value to explore where PhD candidates and postdocs continue their careers.