

Research Review Humanities
Faculty of Humanities
University of Amsterdam

Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities (QANU)
Catharijnesingel 56
PO Box 8035
3503 RA Utrecht
The Netherlands

Phone: +31 (0) 30 230 3100
Telefax: +31 (0) 30 230 3129
E-mail: info@qanu.nl
Internet: www.qanu.nl

© 2013 QANU Q 370

Text and numerical material from this publication may be reproduced in print, by photocopying or by any other means with the permission of QANU if the source is mentioned.

Contents

Preface.....	5
The review committee and the review procedures	7
Part 1: Review of the faculty.....	9
Part 2: Assessments per research cluster	15
Programme ACLC.....	17
Programme ASCA	19
Programme ICH.....	21
Appendices	29
Appendix A: Curricula vitae of the committee members.....	31
Appendix B: Explanation of the SEP scores	35
Appendix C: Programme of the site visit.....	37
Appendix D: Response by Faculty of Humanities.....	39

Preface

This report summarises the results of the peer review assessment of the research programmes in humanities of the University of Amsterdam.

The Committee wants to express its gratitude for the efforts made by all involved to provide the necessary documentation. This documentation contained valuable information and formed a very useful basis for an objective evaluation procedure. The Committee also wishes to acknowledge the constructive atmosphere of the discussions during the site visit. All representatives were willing to share their opinions and concerns in a very open manner.

The organisational and administrative support by QANU and by the Faculty allowed the Committee to focus on the assessment in a well-organised manner.

As chair of the Committee I would like to thank my fellow committee members for their commitment and dedication to this evaluation process. We have worked together as a real team, open-minded and thoughtful. We all realised the challenge of this task, and I am pleased to be able to conclude that this report reflects the common opinion of the Committee.

René Boomkens,
Chairman of the Committee

The review committee and the review procedures

Scope of the assessment

The Review Committee was asked to perform an assessment of the research in Humanities at the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Amsterdam. This assessment covers the research in the period 2006-2011. In accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 for Research Assessment in the Netherlands (SEP), the Committee's tasks were to assess the quality of the Faculty and the research programmes on the basis of the information provided by the Faculty and through interviews with the management, the research leaders, researchers and PhD students, and to advise how this quality might be improved.

Composition of the Committee

The composition of the Committee was as follows:

- Prof. René Boomkens, Professor of Social and Cultural Philosophy, University of Groningen, the Netherlands, Chair;
- Prof. Elizabeth Deeds Ermarth, Professor of Cultural Studies, Trent University, Canada;
- Prof. Simon Garrod, Professor of Cognitive Psychology, University of Glasgow, UK;
- Prof. Christine Geraghty, Honorary Professorial Fellow, University of Glasgow, UK;
- Prof. Sabine Iatridou, Professor of Linguistics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), USA;
- Prof. Ulrike Mosel, Professor emerita of General Linguistics, Christian Albrechts University Kiel, Germany;
- Prof. Heinz Schilling, Professor emeritus of Early Modern European History, Humboldt University Berlin, Germany;
- Prof. Kristiaan Versluys, Professor of American literature and culture, University of Ghent, Belgium;
- Prof. Jay Winter, Professor of History, Yale University, USA.

A profile of the Committee members is included in Appendix A.

Dr. Marianne van der Weiden was appointed secretary to the Committee by QANU (Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities).

Independence

All members of the Committee signed a statement of independence to safeguard that they would assess the quality of the Faculty and research programmes in an unbiased and independent way. Any existing personal or professional relationships between Committee members and programmes under review were reported and discussed in the committee meeting. The Committee concluded that there were no unacceptable relations or dependencies and that there was no specific risk in terms of bias or undue influence.

Data provided to the Committee

The Committee has received detailed documentation consisting of the following parts:

1. Self-evaluation report of the unit under review, including all the information required by the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP), with appendices.
2. Copies of five key publications per research programme.

3. A confidential policy document on the reconsideration of the Faculty research organisation.

Procedures followed by the Committee

The Committee proceeded according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 (SEP). Prior to the Committee meeting, each programme was assigned to two or three reviewers, who independently formulated a preliminary assessment. The final assessments are based on the documentation provided by the Faculty, the key publications and the interviews with the management and with the leaders and researchers of the programmes. The interviews took place on 6, 7 and 8 November 2012 (see the schedule in Appendix C) in Amsterdam. Following the site visit to the University of Amsterdam, the Committee proceeded to conduct a similar assessment of the Faculty of Arts at the VU University Amsterdam.

Preceding the interviews, the Committee was briefed by QANU about research assessment according to SEP, and the Committee discussed the preliminary assessments. For each programme a number of comments and questions were decided upon. The Committee also agreed upon procedural matters and aspects of the assessment. After the interviews the Committee discussed the scores and comments. The texts for the committee report were finalised through email exchanges. The final version was presented to the faculty for factual corrections and comments. The comments were discussed in the Committee. The final report was printed after formal acceptance.

The Committee used the rating system of the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 (SEP). The meaning of the scores is described in Appendix B.

Part 1: Review of the Faculty

1. The Faculty

The Faculty of Humanities of the University of Amsterdam (UvA) offers teaching and conducts research in the disciplines of arts, philosophy and theology. Teaching is organised by departments, research by four research institutes. The three faculty research institutes are the Amsterdam Center for Language and Communication ACLC, the Amsterdam School for Cultural Analysis ASCA and the Institute of Culture and History ICH. The interfaculty Institute for Logic, Language and Computation ILLC is a cooperation between the Faculty of Humanities and the Faculty of Science and is evaluated by a separate Assessment Committee.

ACLC is centred on language and linguistics and is the home basis for 33 tenured staff members. ASCA takes an interdisciplinary approach to art, culture and philosophy, including new humanities fields such as cultural analysis and media studies. Within ASCA 86 tenured staff are employed. ICH covers most of the classical Humanities disciplines, ranging from history and archaeology, to literature and religion, with 159 tenured staff. ICH is organised in five research pillars and two horizontal multidisciplinary initiatives.

Earlier in 2012 the Faculty Board set up a committee to advise on the research structure. The advice was submitted to the Dean in early June, including a number of possible scenarios. At the time of the site visit the Dean's reaction was available and played a role in the various interviews with the management and the staff of the research institutes. The Faculty Board proposes to organise the research in six to eight sub-units within one large research institute, encompassing the whole Faculty.

Assessment

The Faculty Board and the Directors of the Institutes have successfully strengthened the research institutes and adapted them to several new developments and measures from the national level and the University Board. Especially several of the problems that were signalled three (mid-term review) and six (previous assessment committee) years ago in regard to ICH, have been addressed and partly solved.

Generally, the Faculty and Institutes continually attempt to follow the diverse and bottom-up initiatives and research ideas that constitute the core of the research policy of the Faculty. Thus, the Research Priority Areas (RPAs) are seen not only as an alien threat from outside, but all the more as a challenge to make them as intellectually productive as possible for the specific research conditions of the humanities and the three research institutes. Other challenges are posed by the so-called national top sectors and the general tendency on direct economic valorisation of research. Here, also, the Committee thinks the Faculty is trying to be as adaptive and creative as possible, without being naive.

The Committee's assessment of the organisation of the Faculty's research organisation and the quality, productivity and relevance of the research output are generally positive, which might raise the question why a reorganisation would be necessary. Nevertheless, after extensively talking with several groups that are involved and responsible for this reorganisation, the Committee expects that the reorganisation will be implemented cautiously and may lead to a more open and flexible research organisation. In order to sustain the high quality of the research of the current research institutes, the Committee strongly advises that the over-all bottom-up flourishing of research projects and new initiatives and the positive effects of researchers feeling part of real research

communities must be maintained in the new structure. Crucial conditions are the continuation of financial control by the research units, their intellectual freedom and the diversity of their research.

2. Quality and academic reputation

Evidence of the quality of the Faculty's research is provided in the self-evaluation report for each of the research institutes, based on various criteria, such as key publications and their impact, prizes and awards, invitations to address major conferences, the organisation of international conferences, editorships and memberships of academies. The high impact scores of a number of ACLC researchers indicate their influence and academic reputation. ASCA's academic reputation brings international scholars and students to its doors. Within ICH, several special chairs have been founded by various institutions and are held by acknowledged national experts.

Assessment

The Committee recognises the important work done in the previous years. The quality of most of the research is excellent. The Amsterdam Centre for Study of the Golden Age is indeed renowned world-wide.

The data in the self-evaluation report show that most of the awards, key publications and conferences for the three institutes date from 2008 and 2009 and that in most categories the numbers decline thereafter. The Committee noted in the interviews that the Faculty's policy is on quality instead of quantity, which may be an explanation for this decrease. In addition, a number of high-profile researchers have left the UvA in the past years, due to retirement. The Committee expects that the high reputation of the Faculty's research will be continued by their successors.

3. Resources

The self-evaluation report provides the following data on staff and funding:

Table 1. Research staff embedded in the Faculty of Humanities

	2006		2007		2008		2009		2010		2011	
	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte
Tenured staff												
ACLIC	42	13.7	40	13.9	40	13.8	36	11.6	34	10.7	33	10.1
ASCA	87	30.8	90	30.0	90	27.5	89	28.6	86	29.5	86	30.9
ICH	154	45.9	161	47.1	163	47.9	163	47.3	155	45.0	159	48.5
Non-tenured staff												
ACLIC												
ASCA	19	11.3	20	11.0	16	8.7	17	11.7	17	9.8	16	7.1
ICH	8	7.7	6	4.8	6	5.6	7	5.2	6	4.0	7	5.6
	30	9.4	43	15.4	47	18.7	42	17.9	44	19.7	41	14.2
PhD candidates												
ACLIC												
ASCA*	30	26.8	29	25.0	26	22.8	19	16.3	19	15.7	26	20.3
ICH	105		114		108		108		111		112	
	81	53.4	80	50.4	90	55.8	80	54.0	80	47.5	87	50.8

*including employed and contract/external PhDs.

Assessment

The reputation of the ACLIC researchers is evidenced by their success in attracting national and international research grants. ASCA is very successful in attracting externally funded PhD students. The disciplinary set-up of the Dutch research grant organisation NWO makes it more difficult for ASCA, having an interdisciplinary orientation, to attract NWO funding. Within ICH, especially Archaeology, History and Golden Age have been able to secure external funding. The

Committee considers the support that the Faculty delivers for grant applications and project management to be indispensable, given the growing importance of external funding.

Table 2. Funding of the research staff embedded in the Faculty of Humanities

	2006		2007		2008		2009		2010		2011	
	k€	%	k€	%	k€	%	k€	%	k€	%	k€	%
Direct funding												
ACLC	1700	61	1723	61	1619	62	1409	53	1236	50	1322	59
ASCA	5051	74	5651	74	5079	65	4906	65	5784	73	6484	81
ICH	4991	78	5184	75	5009	70	5188	67	4743	64	5118	70
Research grants												
ACLC	811	30	778	28	651	25	1047	40	986	40	816	36
ASCA	1708	25	1964	26	2485	32	2356	31	1871	24	1358	17
ICH	945	15	1205	17	1545	22	1648	21	1740	23	1410	19
Contract research												
ACLC	262	10	321	12	338	13	193	7	229	10	104	5
ASCA	63	1	43	1	285	4	330	4	264	3	175	2
ICH	420	7	555	8	591	8	923	12	959	13	745	11

4. Productivity

The self-evaluation report provides the following data on research output:

Table 3. Main categories of research output in the Faculty of Humanities

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Refereed articles						
ACLC	52	60	57	56	54	48
ASCA	79	131	108	128	109	80
ICH	44	70	66	74	115	94
Non-refereed articles						
ACLC	10	10	7	8	7	12
ASCA	122	105	118	87	68	47
ICH	97	94	124	115	94	72
Books						
ACLC	2	9	5	2	4	2
ASCA	5	16	7	14	10	5
ICH	43	37	30	27	13	27
Edited books						
ACLC (not recorded)	-	-	-	-	-	-
ASCA	30	24	22	24	16	11
ICH	34	41	38	51	45	36
Refereed book chapters						
ACLC	49	47	49	32	37	23
ASCA	80	117	90	133	112	111
ICH (incl. non-refereed book chapters)	205	187	190	171	200	171
Non-refereed book chapters						
ACLC	13	9	14	7	4	3
ASCA	17	11	14	6	11	12
ICH (included in refereed book ch.)	-	-	-	-	-	-
PhD-theses						
ACLC	4	6	8	12	5	7
ASCA	13	12	9	15	14	12
ICH	24	28	26	36	27	24
Conference papers						
ACLC	34	24	33	36	24	33
ASCA (not recorded)	-	-	-	-	-	-
ICH (partially recorded until 2010)	26	20	65	69	267	269

Professional publications						
ACLC	11	22	26	37	24	16
ASCA (not recorded until 2011)	-	-	-	-	-	56
ICH	243	233	250	257	169	149
Publications aimed at the general public						
ACLC	26	11	10	7	6	9
ASCA (incl. prof. publ. until 2011)	189	178	196	134	83	26
ICH	137	192	220	181	80	77
Total publications						
ACLC	201	198	209	197	165	153
ASCA	535	594	564	541	423	360
ICH	853	902	1009	981	1010	919

Assessment

The Committee observed a decreasing trend in almost all categories of research output. The main explanations offered during the site visit were the high teaching load and the policy to aim for quality of output over quantity.

Teaching has taken up much extra time and energy in the past period because of the teaching reorganisation, introducing block teaching for all bachelor and master programmes. Teaching obligations during an 8-week block are a heavy workload, but then the next block might be ‘free’ for research. The workload of chair holders related to their responsibility for PhD students has also increased. The UvA policy is to not automatically replace a full professor when he/she leaves the university but rather increase the number of non-tenured staff. Since in the Netherlands the final responsibility for a PhD dissertation can only rest with a full professor, even though much of the daily supervision is delegated to associate or assistant professors, the Committee maintains that this makes for an unnecessarily high workload for full professors and does not do justice to the input of associate and assistant professors.

The Committee endorses the Faculty’s policy to stimulate staff members to publish in A-journals. ACLC implements this policy by providing bonuses and by making it a condition for the approval to attend international conferences. The Committee noted that nearly all publications are in English speaking journals and maintains that presence in leading French or German journals should not be neglected.

5. Societal relevance

The self-evaluation describes how the three research institutes include societal relevance in their research and how they make their research output accessible for people outside academia. Examples of the former are second language acquisition and the publication of dictionaries (ACLC), cooperation with museums and presentations to ministries and parliamentary committees (ASCA), briefings for government bodies and professional and popular publications (ICH).

Assessment

The societal impact of the Faculty’s research is a concern that is taken seriously by all three institutes. The Committee agrees that it is not always easy to find the right balance between public and academic output, and that public output often demands a simplification of results, as was stated during the site visit. Nevertheless, being part of the public debate is necessary in the current political situation for humanities research.

Aiming for valorisation of research outcomes has clearly become an integral part of all research projects and grant applications. Cultural heritage is one of the areas with opportunities for entrepreneurs and job opportunities for PhDs outside academia.

6. Strategy for the future

In order to strengthen its position in the future, the Faculty has formulated a number of special research fields ('speerpunten') and participates in the university-wide Research Priority Areas (RPAs). Cross-institutional initiatives within the Faculty are stimulated. The objective of the proposed reorganisation of the research structure is to encourage the collaboration between researchers of the different institutes.

In addition, attracting funding from national and European grant organisations will continue to be supported by offering favourable financial conditions for the accommodation of project and contract research and by providing support for researchers in the application for and management of external research funds. A sabbatical leave can be granted to write a research grant application.

Assessment

The Committee noted a wide support among the management and the staff of the research institutes to invest in the priority areas, as identified at the various levels of the university. RPAs lead to the rethinking and strengthening of research ideas and projects, provided they are content-driven and build on the bottom-up initiatives and social structures that are already in place. The first RPA, Brain and Cognition, has clearly profited from its status as an RPA and the additional funding it received. The suggestion to start a new RPA based on the Center for European Studies, in collaboration with the Faculties of Social Sciences, Law and Economics, is a worthwhile idea.

In finding the best possible implementation of a new research structure, the Faculty will have to strike a balance between opening up the borders between the current institutes and research groups on the one hand, and preserving the feeling of being part of a certain research community on the other hand. In general, the Committee noticed support for the objective to achieve more flexibility in the research activities.

Direct funding is mainly based on student numbers in the bachelor and master programmes. Since these have been decreasing in the past period and will probably continue to do so, attracting external funds is a necessity. The support provided by the Faculty is a valuable investment.

The Committee learned that it was difficult, even impossible, to attract high profile staff from outside the UvA for the so-called 'profleringsleerstoelen' related to the special research fields of the Faculty. Since these are temporary professorial positions and the UvA does not offer a tenure track to its academic staff, these chairs were not sufficiently attractive for non-UvA applicants. The Committee suggests that the adoption of a tenure track system may be worth considering, given the international 'market' of high profile academics.

7. PhD training and supervision

The Faculty annually appointed 16 PhD positions from its own resources. In addition, a number of PhD places (eight in 2011) are funded by the government's Sustainable Humanities Programme. Typical for the UvA is that the majority of these positions is awarded on the basis of an open selection procedure, on the basis of the candidate's own project proposal.

PhD and Research Master training and education are the responsibility of the Graduate School. National research schools provide content education, while the local Graduate Schools focus on skills training. Progress of the PhD candidates is monitored by the supervisors and toward the end of the first year a go/no go decision is taken on the basis of a pilot study to be submitted by

the candidate. In order to improve the chances to complete a PhD project within the period of employment, most PhD contracts are part time contracts over a longer period of time, i.e. four years of 0.8 fte instead of three years and three months of 1.0 fte. PhD students who are involved in teaching can be given a larger (in the case of part time contracts) or longer (in the case of full time contracts) contract.

Assessment

The PhD students of all three institutes seemed to the Committee to be generally very satisfied with the general PhD policy and with the way supervision and evaluation of their work are organised, with a crucial role played by the Directors of the institutes. All three groups feel integrated into a research community and students were confident about how their own research benefitted from collaboration in the institutes. Especially in the case of ICH this is a significant improvement, given previous evaluations.

The Committee wishes to point out the complex relations and separated responsibilities between the Graduate School, the research institutes and the national Research Schools. Internally these relations pose no serious problems, but the teaching quality of some national research schools clearly falls outside the scope of the Graduate School, while it is responsible for that quality all the same.

The duration and the completion rates of the PhD projects in the assessment period clearly present room for improvement. The Committee expects that the more rigorous approach in monitoring and evaluation will have a positive effect.

In order to create a solid intake of well-prepared PhD candidates in all research areas, the Committee strongly advises to continue the efforts for establishing a Research Master in European Studies, possibly by combining it with an already existing Research Master.

Part 2: Assessments per research cluster

The committee assessed the following research clusters of the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Amsterdam:

		Quality	Productivity	Relevance	Viability
1	ACLIC	5	5	5	4
2	ASCA	5	5	4	5
3	ICH				
3.1	Archaeology	4	3.5	4	4
3.2	History	5	5	5	5
3.3	Literature	4	4	2	2
3.4	Art	2	2	2	3
3.5	European Studies	5	5	5	4
3.6	The Dutch Golden Age	5	5	5	5
3.7	Religion*	-	-	-	-

The detailed assessment per research cluster follows in the next section of this report.

* The Committee has not assessed the programme Religion because it started very recently (2011).

1. Amsterdam Center for Language and Communication ACLC

Coordinator: Prof. dr. Kees Hengeveld
Research staff 2011: 37.46 fte (10.07 tenured, 7.09 non-tenured, 20.3 PhD)

Assessments:	Quality:	5
	Productivity:	5
	Relevance:	5
	Viability:	4

Short description

ACLC is a broad research institute in linguistics with specialists in language typology and description, language variation and change, language acquisition, and linguistic modelling. ACLC research is organised in two research programmes. The Language Blueprint is primarily interested in understanding the linguistic system, while Learn ability is primarily interested in understanding language acquisition.

Quality

The research programme “The Language Blueprint” covers the central areas of language evolution, language variation and formal linguistics. Being coherently organised and flexible enough to adjust to new developments, it has led to innovative research results of the highest quality. For example, work on Functional Discourse Grammar is a major theoretical development and the PRAAT system of computational phonetics has become the international standard in the field. In fact, the ACLC enjoys an excellent reputation internationally, as shown by the many prizes and awards its members have received, their invitations as keynote speakers and their involvement in the organisation of international conferences.

Productivity

The researchers of ACLC have regularly published their scholarly work in first-rate peer-reviewed journals. In the period under review (2006-2011) they have produced 24 books with internationally renowned publishing companies. The productivity strategy of the ACLC has worked well. The Committee particularly supports the recent emphasis on publishing in higher impact outlets. This seems to have been successful with A+B publications increasing from 17 to 26 per year over the period despite the reduction in senior fte.

Relevance

The societal relevance of ACLC’s research is reflected particularly in their work on sign language, specific language impairment, first and second language acquisition, the documentation and analysis of languages not previously described and their publications for the general public such as books for language learners or an interactive web page on language endangerment for secondary school students.

Viability

The ACLC is a healthy research institute that works well. The excellent standard of research, however, can only be maintained if departing staff members are replaced and their teaching load is not increased. The Committee strongly recommends an increase in senior staff.

The interviewed advisory board and staff members expressed their concern that the reduction in number of full professorships (in fact a decrease, as two chairs will be merged) may have an adverse effect on future appointments. Since it is only full professors who can influence university government, this restricts the institute’s ability to influence future professorial

appointments. In relation to this point the ACLC management's number one request was for an increase in senior positions. The ACLC staff also placed great emphasis on this issue and asked the Committee to convey this concern in the strongest possible terms.

Another concern shared by both the advisory board and the staff is the promotion system, namely that Assistant and Associate Professors are not necessarily considered for promotion. This has several negative results, including the loss of valuable faculty.

Furthermore, there was concern that only full professors can function as promoters of PhD candidates. Assistant and associate professors who do become de facto supervisors are recognised as such by their acting as a so-called 'co-promotor' and are compensated for their time investment (to a similar extent as full professors are), but they cannot act on their own and are dependent of a full professor as 'promotor'.

By conducting joint seminars on language and cognition and monthly meetings, the ACLC collaborates with ILLC, which is extremely important for the future interdisciplinary development of linguistic research at Amsterdam. The Committee wants to emphasise that this relationship might be endangered with the imminent departure of a leading assistant professor and would like to emphasise the significance of replacing him with somebody who can play an equivalent role as a bridge to the ILLC.

Finally, the ACLC staff expressed nervousness about the impending reorganisation and concern that the creation of too large a research center will have adverse effect on the interaction and dynamic among the researchers. The current size of the ACLC is taken to be ideal.

2. Amsterdam School for Cultural Analysis ASCA

Coordinator: Prof. dr. Christoph Lindner
Research staff 2011: 62.95 fte (30.9 tenured, 5.6 non-tenured, 26.5 PhD)

Assessments:	Quality:	5
	Productivity:	5
	Relevance:	4
	Viability:	5

Short description

ASCA is a research institute and doctoral school dedicated to the interdisciplinary study of culture from a broad humanities perspective. Its researchers work at the intersections of core disciplines in the humanities to develop new theoretical frameworks and research methodologies for analysing culture in all its forms and expressions. ASCA's research programme consists of 45 individual research projects and is organised in five interrelating constellations.

Quality

ASCA provides a space in the university curriculum for new, contemporary work at the cutting-edge of knowledge: a place for intellectual innovation that focuses on understanding contemporary culture using the methods of various disciplines. The mid-term assessment was concerned that ASCA express more completely its principles of coherence. That has certainly been achieved to the Committee's satisfaction. People at all levels of the programme understood and spoke eloquently of the benefit of ASCA's interdisciplinary emphasis and collaborative structure, and there is plenty of evidence that productive exchange has become a key feature of the programme.

ASCA's strong international reputation is evidenced by the caliber of its visiting scholars, its high number of applications for the few funded PhD places and by the originality of its structure. Its various structural elements –seminars, workshops, reading groups, conferences, annual Summit–offer a wide but focused range of opportunities for participants to choose from in pursuing their particular topics of interest, and to do so by means of wide-ranging discussions that are not required to stop at the boundaries of a particular discipline.

The Committee finds the leadership both strong and at the same time responsive to staff members, operating with a light touch so as to enable exploration of new ground while at the same time fostering the overall aims of the university. It has good relationships with the departments from which it draws instructors. Yet the Committee notes that the director of ASCA appears to lack influence in the hiring of new faculty and researchers. This problem was raised by a previous assessment team but still has not been addressed by the university.

Productivity

The range, variety and quality of work produced by ASCA personnel are of the highest standard. It is genuinely interdisciplinary and does not lapse into the kind of splicing activity too familiar at institutions that claim interdisciplinary commitments without grasping what such work involves. One member of the Committee was able to attend the third annual 'Summit' of ASCA, an event that brings its work to bear on problems of importance to the institution and to the society at large. The Summit presentations by researchers were focused and scholarly in character and entirely at home at the highest levels of professional activity.

In 2011 the list of publications from ASCA personnel was shorter than in previous years owing to a number of factors (teaching reorganisation, problems with online registrations) but largely because of a new ASCA policy emphasising quality, not quantity, Better not More. There is strong evidence of this new policy in the increase in refereed articles, publication in high quality journals and in prestigious University Presses.

Relevance

By interdisciplinary means ASCA is able to make social relevance a focus of its programme, as it ventures beyond the knowledge silos that separate art from science and academic from public affairs. The issues taken up by ASCA researchers routinely bear directly on social issues and on new methods for considering them. In an academic context the work from ASCA is of a very high impact. Their established scholars are well-known and internationally effective. They contribute to major debates in the interdisciplinary fields they work in and this high-level work is geared toward discussion of the social world and its practical issues. The Director's expressed interest in fostering public outreach through talks, radio and TV interviews and other such modes promises enhanced public awareness of ASCA's work.

Viability

ASCA plainly enjoys strong and flexible leadership; the SWOT analysis is an honest appraisal of the situation and its five year plan is clear, well thought through, and achievable. Its resources remain problematic.

ASCA thrives as a bottom-up research structure that allows and hones its diverse projects in ways that make them mutually informative. There is a high level of collaboration between researchers and the Institute is managed within a flexible structure that is responsive to requirements of particular projects or PhD topics, e.g. the 9/11 group, the "Cities" seminar, the Media and Performance reading group. ASCA receives 96 applications for every one of its four funded PhD places annually. 74% of its graduates get academic jobs. These facts together with the evident sense of intellectual community justify the highest assessment score for Viability.

Nevertheless the Committee has some concerns about ASCA's position. The limited funding for new PhDs annually remains the significant problem noted in previous assessments. The total number of new PhDs allotted to ASCA each year is low at 4 and inadequate given the manifest strengths of ASCA. PhD training is a major focus for ASCA and the quality of the training is exemplary. Rewarding its international success with a more reasonable number of funded PhDs would be in line with the Faculty's and the University's strategy.

Finally, the Committee learned late of a planned reorganisation at the Faculty. Given the potential for disruption that such reorganisation could involve, we opt to comment here on the potential of such change to interfere fundamentally with the work of ASCA. Its SWOT analysis notes that "whatever the outcome of reorganisation, it is important that ASCA retains its intellectual and organisational autonomy." The Committee shares this concern. ASCA's methodological uniqueness depends on it at least maintaining the intellectual independence, and the limited budgetary and managerial independence it currently has.

3. Institute of Culture and History ICH

Coordinator: Prof. dr. Michael Wintle
Research staff 2011: 113.54 fte (48.51 tenured, 14.2 non-tenured, 50.83 PhD)

Short description

ICH is a broad research institute, covering the period from classical antiquity until today, and building on the input of researchers from a wide variety of Humanities disciplines. Characteristic are a historical approach and a primary focus on European history and cultural heritage. ICH consists of four research pillars (Archaeology, Art, History, and Literature) and two 'horizontal' multidisciplinary initiatives (European Studies and The Dutch Golden Age). Archaeology, Art and History each have developed a common research agenda, thus creating coherent research programmes.

Assessment

The Committee has not felt able to attach scores on Quality, Productivity, Relevance and Viability for ICH as a whole. The outlook and work of the various research groups within ICH and the appreciation of the Committee for the research policy and results of each of these groups shows so much variation that averaging the scores would not do justice to the Committee's assessments. The Committee wishes to acknowledge, however, that since the previous assessment the ICH director has been able to build a coherent research institute in which most groups of senior researchers and all PhD students actively participate. The Committee expects that this policy will be continued and will thus strengthen the ICH research.

3.1. Archaeology

Coordinator: Prof. dr. Vladimir Stissi
Research staff 2011: 16.83 fte (4.42 tenured, 3.9 non-tenured, 8.51 PhD)

Assessments: Quality: 4
 Productivity: 3.5
 Relevance: 4
 Viability: 4

Short description

The research programme Archaeology combines four areas with four thematic approaches. The four areas are (I) The Romans in the Netherlands and its direct surroundings; (II) The Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period; (III) The Greek world from the late Bronze Age till the Hellenistic Period; (IV) Central Italy from the Early Iron Age till the Roman takeover. The four thematic approaches are (A) Central places as centres of religious culture and parts of religious networks; (B) Central places as parts of systems of production, exchange and consumption of goods, for example pottery; (C) Central places, cultural groups and cultural identities; (D) The interaction between urban centres and the countryside, including regional approaches of the landscape, and reflection on issues of identity.

Quality

On the basis of the key publications the Committee assesses the quality of the work done by this group as very good. The research is theoretically strong as well as methodologically convincing. In addition, it covers impressively broad fields – Greek and Roman Antiquity as well as northwestern Roman provincial and medieval archaeology. In these fields as well as in landscape studies the group has a leading position within the Netherlands.

Productivity

Many articles and conference papers have been published. However, publishing activities in reviewed periodicals and the publication of books should be enforced.

Relevance

The relevance of the work produced is high within the respective academic fields; with regard to landscape research, it is also of considerable societal relevance.

Viability

The Committee maintains that the theoretical and methodological basis are well established. The research group's viability is also strong as a result of the funding of fieldwork by academic (NWO) as well as private funding.

3.2. History

Coordinator: Prof. dr. James Kennedy
Research staff 2011: 26.81 fte (9.52 tenured, 2 non-tenured, 15.29 PhD)

Assessments: Quality: 5
 Productivity: 5
 Relevance: 5
 Viability: 5

Short description

The History programme has a strong diachronic representation, with expertise extending from ancient Greece and Rome to the most recent history, with the Faculty's early modern historians, although formally belonging to the Golden Age Studies programme, collaborating in the programme. A research focus on Western Europe is complemented by the Eastern European research being done within European Studies and, since 2009, by American Studies. Expertise on the ancient and medieval Middle East is strongly present and a significant set of research lines seeks to connect European history with (post)colonial empire and with processes of globalisation.

Quality

The University of Amsterdam is a centre of historical excellence. It has fostered work primarily in European history, for reasons integral to the development of the profession in the Netherlands, but is more trans-national and global today than it was in the past. Areas of excellence include the world-renowned Centre for the study of the Golden Age. All history graduate students are carefully monitored and seem content not only with the content of their training but also with the supervision they receive.

Productivity

The productivity of this cluster is excellent. The number of academic publications is high.

Relevance

The clear leadership of the cluster has enabled this group to be productive and to engage in socially-relevant projects. The researchers are clearly visible in the public debate and have strong links with leading museums.

Viability

The dynamics of this research cluster and its commitment to continually explore new possibilities of cooperation in order to strengthen its international and national profile offer good chances for the future.

3.3. Literature

Coordinator: Dr. Jelle Koopmans
Research staff 2011: 20.15 fte (10.02 tenured, 2.99 non-tenured, 7.14 PhD)

Assessments: Quality: 4
 Productivity: 4
 Relevance: 2
 Viability: 2

Short description

The Literature programme is designed to shelter and stimulate research in literary history in a broad sense. It does not have an integrated overall programmatic structure. Chronologically, the interests range from classics, medieval studies, early modern and modern studies, to post-modern and 21st century. Geographically, the range goes from Rumania to Ireland, from Iceland to Andalusia. The common interest lies in redefining the object of literary history and its relations to other fields as well as in the materiality of sources and what they can tell us.

Quality

There is valuable scholarly work presented here, some working in traditional disciplinary contexts and some providing a comparative perspective. There are instances of valuable contributions to archival and philological work as well as to debates within a large range of particular scholarly fields and national traditions of scholarship. Some of the work presented is exploring new areas such as graphic literature. Sometimes outstanding, often erudite, the research is always thorough and solid, and the academic reputation thus engendered commands respect.

Academic reputation is also evident by a number of board and academy memberships but there is limited evidence of international exchanges or collaboration. There is some evidence of collaboration by staff participating in the Centre for Medieval Studies and Early Modern Drama group.

The self-evaluation report appears to show a leadership which is at odds with much that the Faculty and university seems to be aiming for in terms of research policy and strategy. The Committee understands that PhD students are supported by the ICH and Faculty structures and that the completion rate is good.

Productivity

The self-evaluation report suggests that the policy within this subject is to balance academic work placed with appropriate academic publishers with other work which is placed with more popular publishers. This is an understandable approach but the Committee cannot see why this appears to be set in opposition to a policy of publishing in A-rated journals; from the table in the self-evaluation report, this shift does seem in fact to have occurred though it was not demonstrated in the key publications. Similarly, although clearly publication in European presses is important for this programme, there is no sign of a desire to make appropriate research more widely known through the UK or US publishers. The overall output of the programme is described in the self-evaluation report as 'impressive' but there is no clear explanation for the drop in research outputs between 2009 and 2011.

Relevance

There is evidence of some staff generating interest in their research through public lectures and website/media work. However, there is little sign of a policy to encourage societal relevance by a

wider range of staff or of innovative thinking about where new connections and collaborations might be made.

Viability

The self-evaluation report identifies future problems in terms of teaching commitments and maintaining student numbers. However, the Committee considers that the viability of this research programme is also threatened by its expressed resistance to new developments in the organisation, generation and publication of research within the Faculty and the ICH. The Committee agrees that the work of individual scholars is crucial to the humanities, but it is also the case that collaboration (at a variety of levels) is increasingly becoming a feature of the best work in the field. This does not seem to be evident in the Literature Programme and the Committee believes that research staff, particularly perhaps those at a junior level, are not being encouraged to gain the benefits of working with colleagues across subject groups and take a full part in the ICH. This will make it difficult to maintain the quality of this programme's research outputs and its viability within ICH or other interdisciplinary structures.

3.4. Art

Coordinator: Prof. dr. Lex Bosman
Research staff 2011: 16.73 fte (8.52 tenured, 0.4 non-tenured, 7.81 PhD)

Assessments: Quality: 2
 Productivity: 2
 Relevance: 2
 Viability: 3

Short description

The Arts research programme includes mono-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary research in the fields of music, theatre, visual arts and architecture, in close relation to the humanities at large. The programme's staff covers a broad period, stretching from late antiquity to the present day. The research reaches from the actual production of artefacts, via their evolution over time, to their present-day appropriation, evaluation and institutionalisation. These interests are approached from a theoretical point of view, which also implies a joint interest in contemporary debates on cultural heritage.

Quality

Based on the complete list of publications and on an extensive reading of the five key publications the Committee cannot decide otherwise than a meager 'satisfactory' for the quality of the research output. Only one of the key publications is a monograph by one of the staff members, published in 2008, but based on PhD-research which started in 1993. Then there are three edited volumes with only minor contributions by members of ICH-Art, and a very short article in a German edited volume on the Magdeburger Dome. One of the three edited volumes was actually edited by members of ICH-Art, an interesting collection of essays on Van Gogh's (inter)national identities, but this book seems to be directed to a more general debate on national identity than to the international art historical research into the work of Van Gogh.

Productivity

The average output between 2006 and 2011 of 8 refereed articles and 3 books per year by an average of 8 fte (between 25 and 34 tenured staff members) is seriously lower than is the case in other ICH-groups and is almost less than satisfactory. There is no visible increase over the last few years. Success in acquiring research grants and contract research projects remained low over the reviewed period (19% of the total funding from 2008 onwards).

Relevance

Some individual members of the programme contribute to public debates on a regular basis, but a more structural role of the programme in valorisation and societal outreach seems to be lacking.

Viability

The programme is built around a relatively small group of researchers mainly working on an individual basis. The claim of providing disciplinary richness and variety of research goals and output cannot conceal the fact that the programme itself does not seem to deliver any surplus value to the research of its individual members. The Committee suggests that to be safer for the future, the Art-program should develop a stronger research structure for its members and/or seek to cooperate with other members/groups within ICH.

3.5. European Studies

Coordinator: Dr. Luiza Bialasiewicz
Research staff 2011: 11.7 fte (8.01 tenured, 0 non-tenured, 3.69 PhD)

Assessments:	Quality:	5
	Productivity:	5
	Relevance:	5
	Viability:	4

Short description

The research profile of European Studies is focused on the comparative analysis of European political cultures, states and nations from the nineteenth century onwards, including the history and practice of European integration. Within this framework, two prioritised research areas are identified: (1) Nationalism and identity in and of Europe, focusing on the history and representation of the national idea in specific European countries and sub-regions and of Europe 'as a whole' (the 'idea' and/or 'identity' of Europe); (2) National governance and transnational change in Europe, concerning the historical and current connection between national and international developments in Europe, especially the extent to which processes of international change affect domestic or national governance.

Quality

This programme has the marks of quality in abundance, from publications to leadership. There is a deep pool of talented colleagues from which the teaching and output of the section is drawn. The use of many approaches to this subject is evident, as is the productivity of colleagues in the field of cultural history, broadly conceived. Consequently, the team sees European studies as being at the heart of the research priority areas of globalisation and heritage, a strategy the Committee wholeheartedly approves. Seeing European Studies as defined not only by its internal development but equally by its relationship with the non-European world, the Committee notes with appreciation the addition of a tenured professor in the history of Europe and its borderlands in the former Soviet Union, and in particular in the Asian Republics.

Productivity

The researchers are productive and influential players on the international level.

Relevance

The societal relevance of this work is evidently important, and is reflected in the approach of colleagues teaching in this section to their research and graduate teaching.

Viability

The one anomaly in this programme's profile is the absence of a research master's programme. This lacuna makes no sense at all to the Committee. It is evident that this failure to provide graduate students with the means of developing a research project with potential for becoming a doctoral dissertation must be rectified. The programme is not viable in the long-term without such a research focus. If necessary, the European Studies MA students should join in the History Research Masters' Programme, but a self-standing seminar makes more sense.

A more determined approach to find European and extra-European funding should be developed, alongside linkage with colleagues in the VU University and other national research institutes.

3.6. The Dutch Golden Age

Coordinator: Prof. dr. Lia van Gemert
Research staff 2011: 14.45 fte (5.82 tenured, 3.34 non-tenured, 5.29 PhD)

Assessments:	Quality:	5
	Productivity:	5
	Relevance:	5
	Viability:	5

Short description

The programme on the Dutch Golden Age explores the making of the Dutch Republic, its key role in the economy, politics and culture of Europe and the world, and its transition to a less dominant position. It pursues these goals by focusing on the art, culture and history of the Dutch Golden Age in an international and interdisciplinary context. Emphasis falls on the construction, dissemination and interpretation of artefacts as well as ideas in the 'long' Golden Age (c. 1550-1750).

Quality

The Dutch Golden Age is a very successful and rightly prestigious programme. It is leading at national as well as international level. Research in the Golden Age is of impressive broadness in subjects as well as approaches. Nevertheless, it can and should be enlarged by a core topic which is essential for the cultural as well as the social and economic profile of the Golden Age, especially in the city of Amsterdam. There should be research on the specific contribution of Sephardic and Ashkenazi communities in religious, intellectual, cultural and economic affairs as well as on their meaning for early modern globalisation by constructing transnational and global networks.

Productivity

Productivity is high, and the quality of publications amplifies the contribution this group has made to the field.

Relevance

The cooperation with the Amsterdam Jewish institutions and museum culture is essential, just as, in general, is the collaboration with distinguished colleagues of the VU University Amsterdam, especially with the group working on religious culture in the Golden Age. As to the collaboration within ICH it would be highly appreciated if the European dimension of Dutch experience in the Golden Age and its contribution to constructing Early Modern European Identity are included in the European Studies domain of ICH, to give it a deeper historical perspective.

Viability

It should be guaranteed that the programme will be saved whatever the new organisation structure will be, at least as a sub-division within a History Research Institute. In this respect it is also essential that when the senior professor in this field retires, he will be replaced by a scholar of the same national and international reputation and commitment in working together with the PhD researchers in this field.

Appendices

Appendix A: Curricula vitae of the committee members

René Boomkens is Professor of Social and Cultural Philosophy at the University of Groningen, Visiting Professor at the Franqui Chair of the University of Antwerp, Belgium (2011-2012) and Visiting Professor at the University of Bremen, Germany (2013). His work focuses on cultural globalisation, urban, popular and everyday culture, the philosophy of architecture and urbanism, Critical Theory and modernity, and on the philosophy of Walter Benjamin, Michel Foucault and Gianni Vattimo. From 2005 until 2010 he chaired a NWO-research project in the Humanities Programme 'Transformations in Art and Culture', entitled 'New Media, Urban Culture and Public Domain'. He published several books, among which 'De Nieuwe Wanorde' (The New Disorder) (Van Gennep, 2006), 'Topkitsch and Slow Science' (Van Gennep, 2008) and 'Erfenissen van de Verlichting (Heritages of the Enlightenment) (Boom, 2011), and articles in several international journals. From 2006 until 2012 he was member of the Raad voor Cultuur (Council for Culture), that advises the Dutch government on cultural and artistic policy. He was member of several programme committees of NWO-humanities and of the KNAW, and chaired several review committees on academic teaching and research. At present he is advisor of the Council for Culture on the future of Dutch cultural policy.

Elizabeth Deeds Ermarth is Saintsbury Professor emerita at University of Edinburgh (UK) and Professor and Founding Director of the PhD Programme in Cultural Studies at Trent University (Ontario). Her work has focused on history as an explanatory method with roots in early modernity and facing challenges today across the range of practice from philosophy and politics to science and art. She is the author of articles in *History and Theory*, *Critical Inquiry*, *Time and Society* and other journals, and six books: *Realism and Consensus* (Princeton 1983; 2nd ed. Edinburgh 1998) defines historical explanation as a late expression of insights first expressed in Renaissance modernity; *Sequel to History* (Princeton 1992) defines the alternatives to historical explanation as they have emerged since the late 19th century; *George Eliot* (Macmillan, 1987) studies the work of the novelist, including her translations of Spinoza and Feuerbach and her political essays. *The English Novel in History, 1840-1895* (Routledge 1997) takes a multidisciplinary approach to the methodology of historical narrative in its period of hegemony; *Rewriting Democracy* (2004, essays by Edward Said, Chantal Mouffe, Mark Bevir et al.) on the political implications post modernity poses for conventional understanding of democratic process; and recently, *History in The Discursive Condition: Reconsidering the Tools of Thought* (Routledge 2011), compares modernity and post modernity in terms of their systemic values and practical implications.

Simon Garrod is a Professor of cognitive psychology at the University of Glasgow. Between 1989 and 1999 he also directed the ESRC Human Communication Research Centre in Glasgow and between 2009 and 2012 he directed the ESRC Large Grant on "Social Interaction: A Cognitive Neurosciences Approach". He has published two books, one with Anthony J. Sanford, *Understanding Written Language*, and one with Kenny R. Coventry, *Seeing, Saying and Acting: The Psychological Semantics of Spatial Prepositions*. Additionally, he has published more than 100 research papers on various aspects of the psychology of language. His special interests include discourse processing, language processing in dialogue, psychological semantics, and graphical communication. He was elected Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh in 2001 and received the Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award of the Society for Text and Discourse in 2011.

Christine Geraghty is a Honorary Professorial Fellow, University of Glasgow/Honorary Research Fellow, Goldsmiths, University of London. She has published extensively on film and television with a particular interest in fiction, form and performance. Her publications include *Women and Soap Opera* (Polity, 1991); *British Cinema in the Fifties: Gender, Genre and the 'New Look'* (Routledge, 2000); and *Now a Major Motion Picture Film Adaptations of Literature*

and Drama (Rowman & Littlefield, 2008). She was Chairperson of the Media, Communications and Cultural Studies Association from 2001-2011, participated as a sub-panel member in the UK RAE 2008 and has extensive experience of external assessments. She is on the editorial board of the Journal of British Cinema and Television and sits on the advisory boards of a number of journals, including Screen and Adaptation.

Sabine Iatridou is Full Professor in Linguistics with a focus on Syntax and Semantics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), USA since 2001. Since 2007 she has been the Director of the Graduate Program in Linguistics; Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT, and she directed the 2005 LSA Summer Institute, hosted by MIT and Harvard University. Prior to her full professorship she has been an Associate Professor at MIT (1997-2001) and an Assistant Professor at the University of Pennsylvania (1991-1996). She has been a Visiting Professor in Europe (Spain, Russia, France) and the USA. Sabine gained her PhD in Linguistics in 1991 from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and was awarded the National Young Investigator Award, National Science Foundation (1994-1999). She is on the editorial board of a number of journals.

Ulrike Mosel is Professor emerita of General Linguistics at the University of Kiel and a specialist on linguistic typology, language documentation and grammaticography. After gaining her PhD in Semitic languages at the University of Munich (1974), she started researching South Pacific languages and became an expert in collaborative fieldwork. Before becoming the Chair of General Linguistics in Kiel in 1995, she was a Senior Lecturer at the Australian National University in Canberra. Her books include *Tolai Syntax* (1984), *Samoan Reference Grammar* (1992, with Even Hovdhaugen), *Say it in Samoan* (1997, with Ainslie So'o). Together with Christian Lehmann, Hans-Jürgen Sasse and Jan Wirrer she initiated the DoBeS language documentation programme funded by the Volkswagen Foundation since 2000. Currently she is working on the documentation of the Teop language of Bougainville, Papua New Guinea. She has compiled a digital corpus of annotated audio recordings of the Teop language and is writing a corpus-based grammar of the Teop language, which explores the use of corpus linguistic tools for the analysis of previously unresearched languages. She has worked as a reviewer for the NWO, Deutsche Forschungs Gemeinschaft, and the Volkswagen Foundation.

Heinz Schilling studied German literature, philosophy and history at Cologne and Freiburg/Br., where he gained his PhD in 1971. As an Assistant Professor (1972-1978) at the History Department of the University of Bielefeld he passed his habilitation at this Institute in 1977. Afterwards he held chairs as Professor for Early Modern European History at the Universities of Osnabrück, Gießen and from 1992 to his retirement in 2010 at the Humboldt University of Berlin. His fields of research and publications are 1. European Comparative History; 2. History of the Reformation and of "Confessionalization"; 3. Early modern migration and minorities; 4. History of political theory in early modern Europe; 5. History of the international system and foreign policy, 16th and 17th centuries; 6. Early modern Dutch history; 7. Social and mental history of Calvinism and Calvinistic communities in Germany and North-western Europe; 8. Urban history, territorial and regional history, mainly of the Holy Roman Empire. He is a Member of the Berlin-Brandenburgische (formerly Preußische) Akademie der Wissenschaften; Fellow of the Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen; the British Academy and the Academia Europaea. In 2002 he was awarded the Dr. A. H.-Heineken-Prize for History by the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences; in 2009 he was promoted by the Faculty of Theology of the Georg-August-Universität Göttingen to a Doctor honoris causa in Theology. He has been on the boards of various museums and journals.

Kristiaan Versluys holds a PhD-degree in Comparative Literature from Harvard University (1979). He is Professor of American literature and culture at Ghent University (Belgium) and the founding director of the Ghent Urban Studies Team (GUST). He published a study on city poetry and some sixty scholarly (book) articles in international journals and collections. His book, entitled *Out of the Blue. September 11 and the Novel*, was published by Columbia University Press in the fall of 2009. His specialties are urban literature (especially the literature of New York) and Jewish-American fiction. Versluys was president of the Belgian Luxembourg American Studies Association (1989-1992) and secretary of the European Association for American Studies (1992-1994). He was a Fellow at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Studies in 2004-2005. He taught at Fordham University as a Fulbright Lecturer in the spring semester of 1989 and he is a regular guest professor at Columbia University. In 2001 he was elected as a member of the Royal Flemish Academy of Belgium. In 2007-8 he was educational director of the Faculty of Arts and Philosophy. Since October 2008 he is the Director of Education of Ghent University.

Jay Winter studied history at Columbia University. He earned his PhD at the University of Cambridge in 1970, his Litt.D. in 2000, and was awarded a DPhil (Honoris Causa) by the University of Graz in 2010. Currently, he holds the Charles J. Stille Chair as a Professor of History at Yale University and is Visiting Professor at Monash University. He has been Member of bureau and comité directeur of the Research centre of the Historial de la grande guerre, Péronne, Somme, France, since its inception in 1989. Previously he was Lecturer in Modern History, Hebrew University of Jerusalem (1970-73), Lecturer in Social History, University of Warwick (1973-79), University Lecturer in British social and economic history, the University of Cambridge (1979-1997), Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge (1979-2001), Reader in Modern History, University of Cambridge (1997-2001), Professor of History, Columbia University (2000-2001) and Professor of History, European University Institute (2005-6). He has published numerous books, book chapters and articles. He is a member of editorial board of journals *History & Memory*, *Theory & Society*, and *Memory Studies*. Jay was Chief historian and co-producer of the award winning PBS/BBC television series 'The Great War and the shaping of the Twentieth Century'. He is a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society, Member of the Norwegian Academy of Arts and Sciences and Fellow of the Royal Irish Academy.

Appendix B: Explanation of the SEP scores

<i>Excellent (5)</i>	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.
<i>Very Good (4)</i>	Research is nationally leading. Research is internationally competitive and makes a significant contribution to the field.
<i>Good (3)</i>	Research is internationally visible. Work is competitive at the national level and makes a valuable contribution in the international field.
<i>Satisfactory (2)</i>	Research is nationally visible. Work adds to our understanding and is solid, but not exciting.
<i>Unsatisfactory (1)</i>	Work is neither solid nor exciting, flawed in the scientific and/or technical approach, repetitions of other work, etc.

Quality is to be seen as a measure of excellence and excitement. It refers to the eminence of a group's research activities, its abilities to perform at the highest level and its achievements in the international scientific community. It rests on the proficiency and rigour of research concepts and conduct; it shows in the success of the group at the forefront of scientific development.

Productivity refers to the total output of the group; that is, the variegated ways in which results of research and knowledge development are publicised. The output needs to be reviewed in relation to the input in terms of human resources.

Societal relevance covers the social, economic and cultural relevance of the research. Aspects are:

- Societal quality of the work. Efforts to interact in a productive way with stakeholders in society who are interested in input from scientific research, and contributions to important issues and debates in society.
- Societal impact of the work. Research affects specific stakeholders or procedures in society.
- Valorisation of the work. Activities aimed at making research results available and suitable for application in products, processes and services. This includes interaction with public and private organisations, as well as commercial or non-profit use of research results and expertise.

Vitality and feasibility. This dual criterion regards the institute's ability to react adequately to important changes in the environment. It refers to both internal (personnel, research themes) and external (developments in the field, in society) dynamics of the group. On the one hand, this criterion measures the flexibility of a group, which appears in its ability to close research lines that have no future and to initiate new venture projects. On the other hand, it measures the capacity of the management to run projects in a professional way. Policy decisions and project management are assessed, including cost-benefit analysis.

Appendix C: Programme of the site visit

Sunday 4 November 2012

14.00-16.00	Opening deliberations	Assessment committee
16.00-17.00	Opening conversation Dean	Frank van Vree, Dean Hotze Mulder, Senior research policy advisor Benjamin Rous, Research policy advisor
17.00-19.00	Reception with Dean	Frank van Vree, Dean Hotze Mulder, Senior research policy advisor Benjamin Rous, Research policy advisor

Monday 5 November 2012

8.30-9.00	Preparation ACLC	Assessment committee
9.00-9.45	Advisory Board	Paul Boersma Rob Schoonen Folkert Kuiken Roland Pfau Tuba Yarbay Duman Renee Clapham
9.45-10.30	PhD-candidates	Iris Duinmeijer Vadim Kimmelman Marlou van Rijn Tessa Verhoef Katerina Chládková Roos van der Zwaard
10.30-11.00	Break	Assessment committee
11.00-11.45	Staff members	Anne Baker, full professor Jan Don, assistant professor Eva van Lier, postdoc Hedde Zeijlstra, associate professor Otto Zwartjes, assistant professor Judith Rispens, lecturer Silke Hamann, lecturer
11.45-12.30	Management	Kees Hengeveld, director Marten Hidma, managing director
12.30-13.30	Lunch break	Assessment committee
	ASCA	
13.30-14.00	Preparation ASCA	Assessment committee
14.00-14.45	Advisory Board	Francisca Snoeck Henkemans Robin Celikates Patricia Pisters Murat Aydemir Jaap Kooijman Mireille Rosello
14.45-15.30	PhD-candidates	Marie Beauchamps Hanneke Stuit Pedram Dibazar Jenifer Chao Tim Yaczo Miriam Meissner
15.30-16.00	Break	Assessment committee
16.00-16.45	Staff members	Yolande Jansen, postdoc Tara MacDonald, assistant professor Niall Martin, postdoc Markus Stauff, assistant professor Dan Hassler-Forest, assistant professor
16.45-17.30	Management	Christoph Lindner, director Eloe Kingma, managing director

18.30-	Dinner	Assessment committee, Dean, research directors
--------	--------	--

Tuesday 6 November 2012

	ICH	
8.30-9.00	Preparation ICH	Assessment committee
9.00-9.45	Programme directors/ Advisory Board	Vladimir Stissi, Archaeology James Kennedy, History Jelle Koopmans, Literature Lex Bosman, Art Lia van Gemert, Golden Age Michael Wintle, European Studies
9.45-10.30	PhD-candidates	Tessel Bauduin Pepijn Brandon Frans Camphuijsen Sanne Frequin Muriel Louwaard Alice Taatgen Klaas Stutje Manon Wormsbecher
10.30-11.00	Break	Assessment committee
11.00-11.45	Staff members	Petra Brouwer, assistant professor Michiel van Groesen, assistant professor Joep Leerssen, full professor Jan Rock, postdoc Boudien de Vries, associate professor
11.45-12.30	Management	Michael Wintle, director (since September 2012) Irene Zwiep, previous director Paul Koopman, managing director
12.30-13.30	Lunch break	Assessment committee
13.30-14.15	Open consultation	Depending on registration
14.15-15.00	Research priority areas	Frans Blom, Cultural Heritage & Identity Henkjan Honing, Brain & Cognition Jeroen de Kloet, Cultural Transformation & Globalisation
15.00-15.30	Break	Assessment committee
15.30-16.15	Graduate School	René Does, managing director Jan Willem van Henten, director
16.15-17.00	Research directors	Kees Hengeveld, ACLC Christoph Lindner, ASCA Michael Wintle, ICH Irene Zwiep, ICH

Wednesday 7 November 2012

8.30-9.00	Concluding conversation with Dean	Frank van Vree, Dean Hotze Mulder, Senior research policy advisor Benjamin Rous, Research policy advisor
9.00-12.00	Internal reflection	Assessment committee
12.00-12.30	Presentation preliminary results	Open to all
12.30-14.00	Lunch buffet	Open to all



Faculty of Humanities

The Faculty of Humanities would like to thank the Committee for its intensive work and sympathetic enquiries into the research carried out by the Faculty's three research institutes, the Amsterdam Center for Language and Communication (ACLC), the Amsterdam School for Cultural Analysis (ASCA) and the Institute of Culture and History (ICH). The encounters at all levels with the Committee during the site visit were invariably cordial and thoroughly worthwhile.

I commend the Committee for managing to present such a clear view on research of such diversity, and feel confident that everyone at the Faculty benefited from the exercise and will undoubtedly profit from the advice offered in the final report. We are pleased that the Committee has assessed the faculty's research in general in such glowing terms, with perfect or near-perfect scores for the majority of the research institutes and research programmes. We are confident that most of the (potential) problems signalled and critique raised by the Committee, albeit severe at some points (e.g. the quality and the number of the publications in the fields of art and literature), will be taken care of by the developments in the organisation of research in the Faculty.

We fully acknowledge the concern the Committee expresses about the proposed reorganisation of the Faculty's research structure. This reorganisation will indeed be implemented with caution, and moreover, the structure will be given form by bottom-up initiatives whenever possible, for instance in the formation of new research groups. The Faculty firmly believes that the reorganisation will lead to an even firmer position of research within the overall Faculty structure.

At the same time, we will take care to protect the strong 'brands', making sure that the recognised overall excellence in most of the programmes is not sacrificed in the new structures, and that the sense of being part of a research community is maintained within the new structure. The main focus, completely in line with the Committee's suggestions, will be to foster the positive aspects of the current research climate, while creating a more open and flexible environment in which the Faculty's research will flourish even more.

The positive comments about the Faculty policy of supporting researchers in the application for and management of external research funds will surely lead to a secure position of such efforts in future policy, maintaining the high standard of overall research support within the central Faculty. Even now, concrete steps have been taken to invest substantially in more intense support for researchers in the application process.

We would like to thank the Committee for their report and the overall positive and constructive assessment of the Faculty's research contained therein. We will strive to develop new research policies in the future with the comments of this assessment in mind, and thus build an even stronger and productive research environment.

Prof.dr. F.P.I.M. van Vree, Dean
Faculty of Humanities, University of Amsterdam
Amsterdam, 12 March 2013