

RESEARCH REVIEW
AMSTERDAM INSTITUTE FOR
HUMANITIES RESEARCH

AHM
AMSTERDAM SCHOOL FOR HERITAGE, MEMORY AND
MATERIAL CULTURE

UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

QANU
Catharijnesingel 56
PO Box 8035
3503 RA Utrecht
The Netherlands

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

Project number: Q0691

© 2019 QANU

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

**REPORT ON THE RESEARCH REVIEW OF THE AMSTERDAM SCHOOL FOR HERITAGE,
MEMORY AND MATERIAL CULTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM.....5**

1. FOREWORD BY COMMITTEE CHAIR..... 5

2. THE REVIEW COMMITTEE AND THE PROCEDURES 7

3. ASSESSMENT OF THE AMSTERDAM SCHOOL FOR HERITAGE, MEMORY AND MATERIAL
CULTURE 9

4. RECOMMENDATIONS..... 23

APPENDICES 25

APPENDIX 1: THE SEP CRITERIA AND CATEGORIES 27

APPENDIX 2: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT 29

APPENDIX 3: QUANTITATIVE DATA 31

This report was finalised on 27/03/2019

REPORT ON THE RESEARCH REVIEW OF THE AMSTERDAM SCHOOL FOR HERITAGE, MEMORY AND MATERIAL CULTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

1. FOREWORD BY COMMITTEE CHAIR

De commissie die de opdracht kreeg het onderzoek van de Amsterdam School for Heritage, Memory and Material Culture (AHM) in al zijn facetten te evalueren, kon dat in ideale omstandigheden doen. Zij beschikte over de nodige documentatie en kon tijdens haar werkbezoek in december 2018 in een diepgaande discussie met de AHM onderzoekers treden. Zij waardeerde de correcte redactie van de documentatie en vooral ook de open en constructieve sfeer tijdens het werkbezoek.

Onderzoekers in de geesteswetenschappen wordt vaak aangepraat dat hun disciplines in een 'crisis' verkeren. Het onderzoek dat de commissie in Amsterdam leerde kennen en moest beoordelen, toont een realiteit die veel minder somber is. De commissie trof een krachtige, dynamische en optimistische onderzoeksgemeenschap aan. Tegelijk kon zij met deze gemeenschap tot een vruchtbare gedachtewisseling komen over aspecten van het onderzoek en de onderzoekscultuur die inderdaad zorgwekkend zijn op het niveau van de geesteswetenschappen als geheel: de moeilijkheid robuuste financiering te bekomen, de versnippering van de onderzoeksinspanningen, een publicatiecultuur die afwijkend is van de dominante biomedische wetenschappen en wetenschap & technologie, een geringer maatschappelijk prestige.

De commissie raakte onder de indruk van de sterkte van het in AHM verrichte onderzoek en is ervan overtuigd dat de reflexieve, kritische en niet-defensieve ingesteldheid van haar onderzoekers ten aanzien van de heersende wetenschapscultuur in en buiten de geesteswetenschappen een wissel op de toekomst is.

Prof. dr. Jo Tollebeek,
Committee Chair

2. THE REVIEW COMMITTEE AND THE PROCEDURES

2.1. Scope of the review

The review committee was asked to perform a review of the Amsterdam School for Heritage, Memory and Material Culture (AHM) at the University of Amsterdam (UvA). The review was part of the assessment of the Amsterdam Institute for Humanities Research (AIHR). This assessment included the research units AHM, Amsterdam School for Cultural Analysis (ASCA), Amsterdam School of History (ASH) and Amsterdam School for Regional, Transnational and European Studies (ARTES), as well as the national research schools Netherlands Institute for Cultural Analysis (NICA), the Research School for Media Studies (RMeS), the Onderzoekschool Literatuurwetenschap (OSL), and the Research Institute and Graduate school of Cultural History (Huizinga Institute). The assessment was performed by two committees in two separate site visits. AHM was assessed as part of Cluster II, which also included the Huizinga Institute, ASH and ARTES.

In accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) 2015 – 2021, amended version, for research reviews in the Netherlands, the committee was asked to assess the quality, the relevance to society and the viability of the scientific research of the research unit as well as the strategic targets and the extent to which the unit is equipped to achieve these targets. Furthermore, a qualitative review of the PhD training programme, research integrity policy and diversity was part of the committee's assignment. Finally, in the Terms of Reference (ToR), the committee was asked to discuss AHM's further profiling. Also, the committee was asked to assess the viability of the research: is the strategy of the school sufficiently solid? What further measures could be taken to ensure the strength and scope of the AHM-research?

2.2. Composition of the committee

The composition of the committee was as follows:

- Prof. dr. Jo Tollebeek (KU Leuven)
- Prof. dr. Anne-Laure Van Bruaene (Ghent University)
- Dr. Gijs van der Ham (Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam)
- Prof. dr. Alun Jones (University College Dublin)
- Prof. dr. Johannes Paulmann (Leibniz-Institut für Europäische Geschichte, Mainz)
- Prof. dr. Maria Patrizia Violi (University of Bologna)

The committee was supported by dr. Els Schröder, who acted as secretary on behalf of QANU.

2.3. Independence

All members of the committee signed a statement of independence to guarantee an unbiased and independent assessment of the quality of AHM.

2.4. Data provided to the committee

The committee received the self-evaluation report from the unit under review and some supporting material on research data management, its integrity policy, international benchmarking and available funding opportunities within the UvA.

It also received the following documents:

- the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP);
- the Terms of Reference (ToR);
- the Quality and Relevance in the Humanities (QRiH) manual;

2.5. Procedures followed by the committee

Prior to the site visit, the committee members independently formulated a preliminary assessment of the units under review based on the written information that was provided by AIHR. This documentation also included quantitative data (see Appendix 2). The final review is based on both



the documentation provided by AHM and the information gathered during the interviews with management and representatives of the research unit during the site visit.

The site visit took place on 12-14 December 2018 in Amsterdam (see the schedule in Appendix 1). At the start of the visit, the committee was briefed by QANU about research reviews. It also discussed its preliminary assessments and decided upon a number of comments and questions. The committee agreed upon procedural matters and aspects of the review. After the interviews, the committee discussed its findings and comments in order to allow the chair to present the preliminary findings and to provide the secretary with argumentation to draft a first version of the review report.

The draft report by committee and secretary was presented to AHM for factual corrections and comments. In close consultation with the chair and other committee members, the comments were reviewed to draft the final report. The final report was presented to the Board of the UvA and to the management of AHM.

3. ASSESSMENT OF THE AMSTERDAM SCHOOL FOR HERITAGE, MEMORY AND MATERIAL CULTURE

3.1. Introduction

The Amsterdam School for Heritage, Memory and Material Culture (AHM) was established at the University of Amsterdam (UvA) in its present form in 2015, after research groups from conservation, restoration and archaeology joined the Amsterdam School of Heritage and Memory Studies (ASHMS). The School has no clear frontrunner, but its domains of research existed in several educational programmes within the UvA.

AHM is an interdisciplinary research school committed to the analysis of the remnants and narratives of the past in the present, as well as of the remaking of pasts into heritage, memory and material culture. The School fosters a dynamic, interdisciplinary and transnational approach across several fields, including heritage and memory studies, art and cultural studies, museum studies, conversation and restoration, archaeology, Holocaust and Genocide Studies, media and information studies, religious studies, book studies, literary studies, cultural history, European studies and digital heritage and humanities.

AHM is currently home to a community of 106 scholars (including PhD researchers and postdocs), comprising 40fte in total (2017). In addition, 13 special chairs are endowed at AHM. These scholars are all active in 29 research groups.

AHM's ambitions comprise:

- to take the lead in the scholarly study of heritage, memory and material culture;
- to function as an expertise centre for a broad spectrum of research, projects and cultural institutions and public partners;
- to set itself up as a centre of excellence with an international PhD programme and networking agenda.

3.2. Profile, strategy and management of the school

Profile and strategy

According to the self-evaluation report, AHM's profile integrates all branches of research focusing on the material and intangible remains of the past, the reciprocal relations between objects, meanings and representations, and the dynamics of memory, from diverse theoretical and methodological perspectives, concept-oriented, object-oriented and user-oriented approaches. The integrative, interdisciplinary and critical approach of problematizing, conceptualising and analysing heritage and memory acts and material culture practices, policies and politics on all levels in Europe and beyond is its defining feature. AHM has streamlined its research agenda into five research themes, which serve as umbrellas for the actual research taking place in the research groups: 'Art, Museums & Memorial', 'Digitality & E-Memories', 'Materiality & Material Culture', 'Identity, Heritage & Conflict', and 'Transnational Memory Narratives'.

In order to meet its ambitions, AHM formulated a clear pathway to ensure meeting these goals. To strengthen its position within the field of heritage, memory and material culture, AHM encourages the principles of interdisciplinarity and bottom-up and proactive organisation and research strategy while also downscaling the total number of research groups and themes in order to stimulate new research cycles. This would further define and hone AHM's specific profile and mission. To foster its status as expertise centre, AHM actively looks to stimulate further academic-societal interaction and valorisation by formalising and expanding relations with non-academic partners by means of research projects, the endowment of special chairs and co-matching of projects, e.g. with 4D research laboratories, museums, heritage institutes, NGOs and private companies and the creative industry.

The School's function as an international platform is consolidated by establishing academic collaborations and interfaculty research with the university priority areas. AHM collaborates with the



Amsterdam Centre for Cultural Heritage and Identity (ACHI), the Amsterdam Centre for Globalisation Studies (ACGS) and ACCESS EUROPE at the UvA. Its research fits the routes of the National Science Agenda on heritage, big data and conflict and cooperation. Topics of research addressed in collaboration and with social and life sciences faculties include digital heritage and memory, emotions, trauma in justice, forensics and dead bodies. Furthermore, the School often initiates projects with comparable foreign centres and universities from a critical and creative heritage approach, including Cambridge, Bologna UCL and Göteborg. For the development of its PhD programme, AHM promotes an active relationship between research and education by developing EU exchange programmes and joint PhD degrees, through establishing international Marie Curie training networks and by creating PhD seminars for several Dutch national research schools. It hopes in the long run to initiate a Research Master's programme in Heritage, Memory and Material Culture.

The committee is impressed by what has been achieved in the last years. With a lot of enthusiasm and zeal, a school has been established that combines research groups and researchers who did not cooperate much before, but who were encouraged and able to find a common identity and mission. According to the committee, AHM's profile is well defined, daring, highly innovative, coherent and consistent with the School's general mission. The way in which its targets and remit are formulated also allow for flexibility, which is considered sensible at this stage of the School's development. AHM seems to have extensively discussed its role, its function and its future, and has paired modesty to targets that are stimulating and ambitious, that could give this school its own strong and visible place within the field of humanities and culture studies. While young, AHM is already acknowledged in the international context of memory studies as an important research school and it has a good reputation within both the academic and international field.

For its profiling, AHM's theoretical orientation and conceptual approach take centre stage, which is considered very positive by the committee. Memory and heritage are essentially interdisciplinary themes, thus AHM is very open to interdepartmental collaborations, especially with Literary Studies, Media Studies, Religion Studies, Archaeology. The committee considers the recent addition of 'Materiality and Material Culture' as research theme promising for widening up the perspectives in research by the School. The committee also considers this approach attractive for potential partners and new collaborations, given the key role that materiality today plays in heritage practices and memory studies, the so-called 'forensic turn' in memory studies. In the near future, AHM will have to work on the integration of its research lines on material culture with its other domains of scientific engagements. Various perspectives on material culture should be embraced and combined to create a new approach on materiality, next to archaeological approaches.. Notwithstanding this observation, the committee supports the direction taken which is, in its eyes, refreshing and viable.

Organisation of research

AHM has streamlined its research agenda into five research themes. Each of these themes is directed by two 'theme leaders', who stimulate research and networking activities. The theme leaders are closely involved in the evaluation and evolution of the themes in relation to the School's profile and they build bridges between AHM research, the university priority areas and other research schools in the Faculty. The five themes function as general umbrellas for the 29 bottom-up organised research groups wherein the actual research activities take place. These groups have a dynamic relationship with the themes, allowing for interdisciplinary collaboration and network creation across and between the various themes. In this way, a bottom-up approach of research is encouraged while simultaneously channelling progressive and creative initiatives and connecting these to the School's profile. The committee concludes that this organisation seems to work well for AHM. It has already resulted in a resounding profile in a relatively short period of time. The committee also approves of AHM's aim to limit the amount of research groups in the future as this will further sharpen the School's scope of research and result in a clear, recognisable profile. As mentioned above, the addition of material culture as a part of the School's remit also needs some further consideration within the organisation.

Organisational framework

AHM is firmly embedded within the organisational framework of the University of Amsterdam Faculty of Humanities, from which it receives an annual budget. From 2014 onwards, the Research School has been one of five research schools organised under the umbrella of the faculty-wide Amsterdam Institute for Humanities Research (AIHR). The other four schools are: the Amsterdam School for Cultural Analysis (ASCA), Amsterdam School of History (ASH), Amsterdam School for Regional, Transnational and European Studies (ARTES), and the Amsterdam Center for Language and Communication (ACLC). Within the AIHR framework, AHM develops shared policies with the other research schools in the areas of funding and support for grant applications, assessment of research output, appointments and career development, and doctoral policies (recruitment, funding, supervision and training of PhD students).

During the site visit, the committee discussed the added value of AIHR, an extra management layer adding to the complexity of the organisational structure with representatives from AIHR and all five research schools (ARTES, AHM, ARTES, ASCA and ACLC). It found out that as an administrative body located between faculty and research schools, AIHR effectively acts as a go-between. AIHR influences the research schools' strategy so that it aligns with faculty- and university-wide ambitions. It helps the schools to formulate goals that align with the National Science Agenda, both in terms of themes and public engagement. Additionally, the AIHR umbrella allows for a more effective organisation, in particular with respect to organisational support. As a result, financial cuts on the total amount of support staff were adequately compensated by a more effective organisation. This limited the negative effect of financial cuts for research staff and research allowances in the period under consideration.

Conversely, AIHR is able to defend the interests of the research schools in a faculty-wide setting. In conversation with representatives of ARTES, AHM and ASH and AIHR, the committee was told that the AIHR Research Council plays an active role in protecting the research time (40%) allocated to AIHR scholars. In a time of cuts, the Research Council managed to protect the total amount of research time (100 FTE) available for the schools, which is commendable in the committee's view. AIHR also facilitated that the research schools and their demands have gained influence in the hiring process of new faculty. Previously, teaching duties were the faculty's only priority; now, a research perspective has been added to the process. Due to AIHR, the recurrent problem of friction between teaching obligations and research opportunities has been resolved (as far as possible) in a more structural manner and through AIHR, the research schools are now able to influence hiring strategies more effectively.

The committee concluded that AIHR provides valuable support to the research schools under its umbrella, including AHM. It awards extra scholarships to talented scholars in order to complete grant applications or build their CV. AIHR has a grant team, which assists designated scholars in writing funding applications, and allows for researchers to be relieved from teaching duties while writing an application. Furthermore, AIHR has the resources to appoint five researchers each year who have been awarded a substantial grant. It also assists heads of departments in making HR decisions. The committee saw that this umbrella structure is effective. It is pleased to see that the more top-down strategic agenda stimulated by AIHR complements and gives direction to the various research schools' bottom-up approach. This more centralised direction is considered important by the committee for the creation of a clear stand-out identity for the individual research schools.

AHM management and community building

AHM is headed by a Director. In operational matters, the AHM Director is assisted by a Vice-Director in all principle, practical and budgetary matters. They are supported by a Coordinator and Office Manager and advised by the AHM Advisory Board. The Director is a member of the AIHR Research Council chaired by AIHR's Director, which discusses the implementation of faculty policies in the research schools. The Director is responsible for the quality of research, its overall coherence and output and the implementation of Faculty policy. More specifically, the Director and Vice-Director monitor the activities of the different research groups, consider funding applications, advise about



vacancies and promotions, sit on all the School's appointment panels and review the progress of PhD projects. The Board convenes at least twice a year and consists of AHM academics and representatives of the PhD community. AHM also has an International Scientific Committee, which is consulted for the evaluation of a state-of-the-art vision of the field of heritage, memory studies and material culture.

Since its establishment in 2014, the AHM has been in a constant state of change. At the moment of the assessment, this development had not yet ended. This process reflects both the ambitions of this School and its search for channelling these in the best possible way. Both in its self-assessment report and in the discussion with the committee, the representatives of AHM showed responsibility towards these developments and awareness that the end of the creation and establishment of the School has not yet been reached. AHM representatives acknowledged that bringing together so many groups from various departments had been a challenge. Staff members indicated that the bottom-up approach is highly valued by all. Balancing staff wishes with a visionary approach and strong leadership is therefore a challenge. The committee considers the way in which AHM can now present itself a credit to all those involved. The School is the outcome of a successful balancing act between a professional and directive approach based on conceptual agreement and respect for the non-hierarchical structure of AHM's research organisation. The encountered enthusiasm for and commitment to AHM testify the young school's success, its management's drive and the members' team spirit.

Furthermore, the many enthusiastic AHM members met during the site visit also represent the School's vitality, its innovative force in the field and its strong human resources. A clear advantage of AHM is its young, dedicated staff and its large cohorts of PhD candidates. These scholars bring fresh thinking and young esprit to AHM's research, rejuvenating existing research. The reflective attitude and awareness of the continuous need to refine the School's scope and research direction also stood out. Accordingly, challenges were mostly defined in terms of personnel. The School is aware that they need to continuously attract young and innovative scholars to fulfil its mission. Simultaneously, staff involved in AHM's establishment need to be acknowledged and rewarded. AHM also lacks a fully endowed chair to its main area of expertise, and this is, with reason, deplored by its representatives. For such a promising research school, a professorship is needed to be internationally recognised in the long term. All these areas of attention present financial challenges.

The committee wishes to underline that AHM's organisation, structure and governance are still vulnerable, certainly when realising that two out of three of the School's 'founding fathers' will soon retire. Due to budgetary problems within the Faculty, AHM has difficulty in keeping promising junior staff attached to the School. This problem is not unique for AHM, but considered more of a risk for this particular research school than for more established schools, as AHM tries to cover new ground and needs time. The management indicated that it is now the time for consolidation, rather than for continued growth. Staff's energy is limited and the School needs time to establish itself and for new research lines to start bearing fruit. This view is shared by the committee. In this respect, much still needs to be done – as also representatives of the School acknowledge. The committee asks for the Faculty's support to allow the AHM management, and the School it represents, to further develop and mature within the next years.

3.3. Profiling of the school and viability of research

The committee was asked to assess specifically AHM's profiling and the viability of its research. Its views on these aspects have been stated above as well as in the section below on research quality, social relevance and viability. In brief, the committee considers AHM's mission and strategic aims very strong, offering the School an excellent perspective to establish itself as a highly innovative and unique centre of research with the potential to be of world-leading quality. The committee highly appreciates AHM's conceptual take in the development of its profile, while at the same time also investing in the creation of strong connections with the non-academic world. The School's interdisciplinary approach and pioneering combination of materiality and material culture with heritage practices and memory culture is viable and exciting. The committee reminds the School that

it should carefully consider its scientific engagements in the future to create an optimal integration between its various research strands to avoid a solely archaeological approach of materiality.

Another of AHM's strengths is the attempt to pursue two different objectives at the same time: excellence in research and an active presence within a wider societal dimension. The School's international links with the most interesting institutions in the field as well as its interdisciplinary approach makes AHM well-placed to become a centre for highly original research. The cooperation with museums, foundations and heritage institutes makes AHM not only a qualified research school, but also a professional expertise centre relevant within a wider social environment. The combination of academic research and non-academic support for societal partners is equally relevant for the School's future, and has already proven to be viable. AHM has also an impressive number of professors by special appointment, which creates visibility of research within society and attracts money from societal partners. AHM's international, professional, societal and academic connections paired with its original research approach serve the School well in order to realise its ambitious objectives. The committee believes that AHM is well-placed to become a unique, pioneering and world-leading centre of excellence with a clear rooting in and relevance to society.

The School's current challenges are mostly defined by its development stage and budgetary threats: as a very young school, it has asked for a lot of investment of its establishing members to reinvent research lines and to rejuvenate its personnel. Energy of staff is limited, however, especially without an endowed chair. Visibility might soon become an issue without a dedicated professorship. In the committee's view, it is important that the School now gets the opportunity to mature; the possibility of an endowed chair should be considered and AHM's management needs to be supported in its aim to consolidate the existing structures, including rewarding the School's staff members with the necessary advancements and by providing opportunities for new scholars.

3.4. Research quality

Publication output at AHM has been very high, proving a strong and quite dynamic research line of very good quality. Between 2014 and 2017, AHM's publication record is strong, both in numbers and in quality. The School published 29 monographs, 121 book chapters, 69 refereed articles in leading publications, 91 non-refereed journal articles, plus a number of other publications aimed to a more general audience and other research output (153). The committee considers the research output impressive and notes that it has been growing as well. This growth is mostly translated into articles, book chapters and hybrid publications; monographs are less present.

The School stresses that its research forms a new field both within the university and internationally. Its publication record substantiates this claim. It is clear from the output that the School embraces new approaches and forms of research, and creates in this way its own 'playing ground'. This is noticeable in the creation of two international peer-reviewed book series at two good presses, one at Palgrave MacMillan on 'Cultural Heritage and Conflict' (18 titles published and contracted), the second on 'Heritage and Memory Studies', at Amsterdam University Press (10 titles published and contracted). The two series can undoubtedly create visibility both in the Netherlands and internationally for the School. They also are important instruments to monopolise this type of research line, and give both direction and flavour to the School's research aims. There is however a risk, namely that researchers will prevalently publish in the two series of the School rather than in other, more internationally acclaimed and well-known, top-level publishing houses. An effort should be made to publish in those publications as well in order to further increase the level of publications in terms of quality to establish AHM as the principal and leading centre for memory and heritage studies of its ambitions in Europe. The committee acknowledges that AHM has the potential to reach this ambitious goal and to become a world-leading expertise school based on its promising research of very good standard.

The School is remarkably strong in its digital output. AHM developed a large number of data sets, software tools and digital publications. Strong examples include its digital VR/AP tools for museum exhibitions and experiences, the Amsterdam Time Machine of the CREATE project at the Amsterdam



Centre for Cultural Heritage and Identity (ACHI) and digital tools and databases including those for the EYE Museum 'Mapping Desmet' and 'Cinema Parisien 3D'. The committee is very impressed with these and other examples as presented in the report, which also feed into the School's societal relevance. In discussion with the committee, the School's Director indicated that it becomes more and more difficult to manage AHM's digital publications due to the sheer number and the variety of the output. This shows, in the committee's view, the success of AHM's initiatives but also demonstrates the challenge that comes with diving into the deep end of the quickly expanding field of the digital humanities. A comprehensive view on the way in which this research output must be measured and managed is necessary for the following years to continue guaranteeing the high quality of current initiatives.

Another clear indicator of AHM's strong research quality is the amount of funding it has attracted in the past years. While operating with a very small budget and generally modest resources, AHM has obtained a large amount of research funding, including some European research grants. AHM participated in various large-scale European projects as a collaborative partner (for example within HERA-JRP, Marie-Curie-ITN and Horizon2020 Rise). Next to funding for collaborative projects, AHM simultaneously encouraged the obtainment of individual grants, both in Europe and at home. Its scholars secured 1 ERC Consolidator, 1 Marie Curie IF, 1 HERA and 1 Creative Europe as well as 1 VIDI, 3 VENI and an Aspasia grant, next to attracting 1 PhD in the Humanities grant and 2 NIAS Fellowships. A similar double strategy appears to be quite successful with respect to collaboration with heritage and societal partners, allowing for many matching funds. The School also attracted some contract research, growing from 36% (2015) to 45% (2017) of the total amount of available funds. The committee noted that research grants have been growing in percentage within the total amount of obtained funding, but that in absolute numbers they have remained more or less stable, although the sources of these grants differ throughout the years. This is indicative of a healthy funding strategy.

AHM is also a sought-after collaboration partner, emphasising its good reputation and witnessing to its very good research quality. AHM is involved in many international collaborative projects with other institutes and school. These collaborations both occur on a broad scale and are at the same time constant and therefore reliable. The School is frequently represented in international programmes and network meetings, in which it often takes the lead. This is testified, for example, by the Campscapes-project, in which AHM partakes and of which it hosts the meetings. Through these significant international links, AHM is also able to attract qualified researchers from all over the world to Amsterdam. In addition, the School periodically organises important international conferences. Furthermore, AHM has strong human resources. Although indicators are not listed systematically in the self-evaluation report, it is clear to the committee that some of the School's staff members are at the top of their field. AHM scholars are regularly invited as keynote speakers, guest lecturers and visiting professorships, notably at institutions for advanced studies. Also, its scholars are well-represented at editorial boards and asked as scientific/peer reviewers at research institutions, publishers and funding agencies. All these marks of recognition by peers add to AHM's standing in the field and are considered impressive by the committee for such a young school.

In sum, the committee considers AHM a very strong and promising research school that, despite its limited budget, has been successful in the past years in attracting significant funding and in establishing very valuable networks and collaborations. Some of its individual scholars are top-notch researchers of often very new and exciting fields. The research output has been very good, as exemplified by its excellent record of hybrid publications and very good academic publications – both in numbers and in quality. The School still has some way to go towards establishing itself as the world-leading centre of memory studies and material culture, which is partly due to its newness and the junior status of many of its scholars. The committee recommends focusing on consolidation and on making even more of a mark on the field through a further strengthening of its publication record, bearing in mind that AHM's output should be distributed through a variety of channels, journals and series. However, it is exactly the potential that the School presents, especially as represented in its human resources, that also sets it up for a bright future. The objective to become a leading expertise

centre for a broad spectrum of researchers, with strong international collaborators and cultural and public partners for its projects and research, seems to be well on its way.

3.5. Relevance to society

A very important strength of AHM is its engagement with societal issues. These issues are central to its scientific mission, part of the School's 'DNA', which is centred on the analysis of traumatic pasts, transnational perspectives, memorial transformations and heritage – all topics very relevant to society. The output of such an engagement can be seen in a strong cooperation with non-academic partners in research projects and various community building activities such as annual conferences, lecture series, network and social meetings that also include many societal partners and heritage institutions. Examples include the organisation of the bimonthly Valorisation Seminars, digital heritage labs and CREATE Salons at Spui25 and the Amsterdamse Academische Club where professionals from the creative industry, heritage institutions and other societal partners collaboratively underscore research valorisation in society.

With its approach to interdisciplinary research themes that are based in the present, strong ties with society and societal organisations are core business for the AHM. This is two-way traffic, which should be regarded as being very positive. The School stands open to requests from society and non-academic institutions, while much of its research is connected to debates held within society and to the position of organisations in society, for instance museums and other heritage institutions. Many of these meetings are also open to the general public and result in publications for a general audience. The School has been very successful in developing and strengthening these links on a structural basis (as partnerships for instance). The many special professorships (13) are just one indicator of this trend. They bring in specific expertise that would otherwise stay beyond the School's direct remit and allows the School to feed research directly into society. Other examples include its strong representation in board memberships and advisory roles of professional journals and sectoral policy. Through these links and connections, AHM stands in the middle of society and can simultaneously react to developments in the academic field and to needs and demands in societal institutions.

AHM plays its pivotal role within cultural networks and heritage institutions well, in particular within the City of Amsterdam. AHM developed close cooperation with many Amsterdam museums (EYE, Allard Pierson, Rijksmuseum), foundations, heritage institutes in particular with the City's Monument & Archaeology service, and the KNAW-institutes NIAS, NIOD and Meertens Institute. In this respect AHM has a unique position and an established reputation in the international research landscape as an institute that pursues both innovative scholarship and socially relevant research. Amsterdam connections are very important, but also at a European and global level (Unesco, Icomos) the School is very successful and has received several marks of recognition.

The quality, scale and success of AHM's valorisation strategies are illustrated by the three case studies, studied by the committee ('Digital heritage', 'Material culture from the sea' and 'Campscapes'). What stands out in these examples is the innovative interdisciplinary approach, the strong academic-societal partnerships and the commitment to reaching a wide audience with state-of-the-art research. The value of digitalisation stands out and is very important. Naturally, AHM's strong record in publishing 'hybrid' products also testifies to its societal relevance. Examples range from the creation of digital tools, experimental designs for creating a digital infrastructure, exhibition catalogues and policy reports. AHM strives to develop its societal relations even more, and as its strong links are also an important life line for the School, this aim certainly is very important and of great added value to its research and to its societal prominence.

The committee concludes that in terms of societal relevance, AHM operates on a very strong network basis. The School has successfully created a very strong and highly relevant network of heritage institutes, relevant societal organisations and international schools around it that are well-placed and eager to work together with AHM. Its position is, due to a strong commitment to societal outreach and to its unique combination of expertise, fundamental for public engagement with memory studies, digital humanities and cultural studies. In this respect, AHM has already established itself as an



excellent, pioneering and prominent expertise centre that is approached by societal organisations and institutes for advice, input and collaboration. This result is particularly impressive taking AHM's relatively recent formation into consideration. Subsequently, the committee concludes that AHM is operating regarding its societal relevance at an excellent level.

3.6. Viability

Matters of viability have already been discussed above, as AHM's viability is very much interlaced with its ambitions and innovative, daring profile. Overall, AHM seems to be well equipped for the future and its viability appears to have been secured by the strength of its results and its excellent record of financed projects (both EU projects and local grants), as well as the high numbers of Research Master (ReMA) students and PhD candidates which the school developed in the past four years. AHM has built a large network, set up exemplary new forms of collaboration with national and international partners, and the school made good use of its proximity to the City of Amsterdam, its museums and other cultural institutions. AHM seems well placed to develop into the country's largest research school for interdisciplinary research in heritage and memory studies and material culture, and given its good connections, flexibility and reputation the school will potentially remain successful in anticipating the changes of an increasingly competitive national and international research funding.

From the self-assessment report and meetings during the site visit, it is clear that the AHM staff and management are aware of the necessary steps that still have to be taken towards a fully established school and of the threats that can be encountered on this road. This critical awareness, AHM's well-defined vision and clear profile, and the prominent place it has already obtained within the international academic world as well as in society, give much confidence for the future of the School. For the committee, it was also clear that about the leadership of the School, there is unrest as well as some obscurity. This has to do with the stepping down of two of the three founding members, and with the absence of a full chair for the central research fields of AHM's research. These uncertainties impact the School's visibility and may also affect its reputation in the field, and should therefore be addressed.

The need for more structural funding must be fulfilled, in order to keep young, promising and potentially top-notch scholars within the School. With the growing recognition of AHM's reputation and its proven appeal to funding bodies, the danger presents itself that staff members who gain prestigious grants may be lost due to the limited perspectives for advancement, since their grants would allow them to go elsewhere and gain a full professorship. Although these budgetary challenges are not unique for AHM, they are considered more of a risk for AHM than for some of the more established schools within the Faculty, as AHM tries to cover new ground in order to be a trailblazer in the field with its daring, innovative research line. These issues are therefore not only a responsibility for the School and its management, but also, and even above all, for the AIHR and the Faculty of Humanities. For the committee, it is clear that it is very worthwhile and important that AHM will get their full support. It considers AHM's academic perspectives and research potential excellent, yet assesses its current viability as very good due to the vulnerable constellation in which the School operates.

3.7. PhD programmes

According to the self-evaluation report, AHM has a population of 63 PhD candidates with 29 members of scientific staff in December 2017. Of these PhD researchers, 37 are self-funded PhD students and 26 are employed. The committee considers these numbers very impressive and further proof of AHM's dedication to its mission of building a school that rejuvenates, and in some sense could even be said to revolutionise with its forensic turn, the field of material culture and memory studies. The committee appreciates this strong dedication to PhD training, which will also in its eyes be the key to AHM's success for establishing itself as a prominent and outstanding research school in these fields in international academia.

Directly-funded PhD students are hired upon application by their project, and are supervised by a team of two supervisors. At the start of their PhD trajectory, they set a time-table with aims and

goals. The PhD candidates, their supervisors and the AHM Director agree upon an individual Training and Supervision Plan, which is signed by all. The first year of the PhD trajectory is dedicated to writing a pilot study, which is assessed by the supervisor and the AHM Director (or Vice-Director) and an external reader. A negative assessment can result in termination of the PhD contract. After the first year, annual reviews are held with AHM's Director (or Vice-Director) to monitor progress and signal problems. Internal PhD students also appreciate the fact they are given an annual research fee of €1200 to cover costs of conferences and travel.

Many of AHM's new PhD candidates are hired on external grants, funded by NWO and EU projects and private partners. The committee learnt during the site visit that this created some challenges for the PhD candidates involved. Sometimes, these projects only allow for 3 years of research, are only 0.8fte or involve additional project work, which is not compensated with additional research time. The committee learnt that this issue was now being addressed with new PhD researchers, but understands that this setup created tensions and problems for those involved. Just as non-funded PhD candidates, PhD candidates funded on project basis have full access to AHM's activities and facilities and are encouraged to participate in and organise events.

Whereas PhD candidates used to have an appointment of 4 years 0,8fte, with the possibility to have an extension of 0,2fte for teaching in the second and third year, the standard is now 4 years 1,0fte. Teaching is done within their appointment. PhD candidates are in general not allowed to teach during their first and fourth year of their appointment so that teaching will not stand in the way of getting started with or finishing the dissertation. The topic of teaching in the second and/or third year is discussed during the yearly progress meetings with the supervisors and the research director. If PhD candidates are willing to teach, the department will take into account their particular field and expertise in order to ensure that whatever they will teach is in line with their research, so that teaching reinforces rather than hampers their own research. The PhD supervisor(s) will be informed of the particular courses and teaching load and the research director has to give consent. As a rule, PhD candidates will only teach courses that are part of the fixed curriculum of a bachelor degree and will be guided by experienced lecturers. PhD researchers that teach are supported and encouraged to qualify for a Teaching Qualification ('BKO').

Currently, two-third of AHM's PhD candidates are self-funded, clearly stating the attractiveness of the School for new researchers as well as exemplifying the ways in which this new research school tries to solve its budgetary troubles. Their admission and trajectory is arranged in a less formal manner than that of internal PhD students. They usually apply directly to AHM and can apply throughout the year. The Director of the Research School assesses the quality and feasibility of the proposal together with the Vice-Director and accepts or rejects the proposal, if necessary after consultation with the prospective supervisor. Prospective supervisors usually meet up with the PhD student before embarking on the project, but this is no formalised rule. External PhD candidates also write a pilot study at the start of their project, and can also be told to stop the project when it does not meet the standard. The pilot is either assessed at the end of the first year, or at a time previously agreed upon by the PhD candidate and his or her supervisor. Self-funded PhD students also get a basic allowance for travel and conference attendance (with a maximum of €3000) and are enrolled by the Faculty in national research schools of their choice; the membership fee (€500) to the national research school of choice is deducted from the received allowance.. They also receive desk space and have access to the same research facilities as directly funded PhD researchers. Self-funded PhD researchers also have the possibility to apply for a finishing scholarship of 0.5fte for one year to complete their thesis. This initiative is appreciated by the committee.

Despite the diverse funding systems (internal, external, self-funded), the committee learnt during the site visit that there is a strong community spirit among students. Students identify with and are loyal to the School and consider it a safe environment. The committee is pleased about AHM's inclusion of self-funded PhD candidates as members of its research community. The committee learned during the site visit that supervisors receive 300 hours of supervision per PhD candidate. In the case of internal PhD projects, half of this amount is received at the start of the trajectory and



the other half after its completion. In the case of self-funded PhD candidates, the 300 hours are only received if and when the candidate finishes his or her thesis. This means that supervisors have to invest in self-funded candidates without being guaranteed a reward for their effort. This policy should be reconsidered, since the risk of taking on a self-funded PhD candidate should not lie with the supervisors alone. Due to its large number of self-funded candidates, AHM supervisors are particularly vulnerable under this rule as AHM is still a very young school and its investment in young scholars can only pay out in a couple of years.

Supervision can vary greatly between projects, but monthly contact between the candidate and the supervisors is a requirement and part of the Training and Supervision Plan. Supervision is evaluated annually. In case of problems, PhD candidates would approach the School's director for help and support, although nobody had any experience in doing so. AIHR and AHM have procedures for mental support or conflict mediation, but these could be communicated better to both students and staff. PhD candidates mentioned that their fellow scholars at the School and supervisor also regularly checked whether they were doing and feeling well and felt cherished and safe. They noted that compared to heritage institutions, from which many arrived, AHM provided a far better monitored and therefore rather safe environment. For the committee, this observation hints towards the good practices in existence at AHM but also raises the question whether these young scholars, who still often closely collaborate with heritage institutions, are sufficiently protected when reaching out beyond the university, especially as AHM is keen on outreach activities. It therefore advises to make this an explicit point in the training of AHM's young scholars.

The training programme followed by PhD candidates is offered by the faculty's Graduate School of Humanities (GSH). Here, academic skills courses are offered on such topics as academic writing, presentation skills or building a career. The PhD candidates appreciated the fact that they met other PhD researchers in these courses, beyond their disciplinary scope and beyond the remits of the Research School. It helped them to learn as well from the practices within other schools and groups. For more content-oriented courses, PhD candidates can turn to a national research school.

AHM itself developed several strategies to train its cohorts of PhDs. The School developed several Research Master (ReMa) and PhD seminars at various national research schools, including the 'Heritage and Memory Theory' seminar at the Huizinga Institute and the 'Violence and Postcolonial Remembrances' seminar at the national research school for Literary Studies OSL. It also offers platforms for its PhD candidates to gain some teaching experience, for example in the Bachelor's honour programme 'Competing Memories' and the course 'Competing Heritages and Memories' in the Bachelor's programme in Cultural Studies. It also dedicated a portion of its operational budget towards funding workshops and activities coordinated by PhD students that help to expand their scholarly network and enrich their CVs. These initiatives all feed community building amongst PhD candidates, who really feel engaged in setting and building AHM as a research school.

The committee was impressed by AHM's dedication to training PhD candidates for the wider field with its focus on employability in its training programme. AHM actively supports its PhD candidates to take up training in education, teaching and project management in order to enhance their chances on the job market, also beyond academia. AHM's training is not only aimed at training outstanding researchers, but its PhD programme is also offering several opportunities for training and outreach to the professional sector. This dedication feeds again into AHM's societal relevance and makes its PhD programme highly attractive for bright creatives with relevant skills and ambitions, who may not necessarily target an academic career but who are very relevant for establishing AHM's network and connections with the public sphere.

The School seems able to train all of these young scholars in a consistent and coherent way and the programme is considered strong by the committee. A serious point of concern is, however, AHM's low graduation rates over the period under consideration. Although AHM had a substantial number of successful defences between 2014 and 2017 (n=19), there seems to be a real problem with completion rates, with in total only 27% of all enrolled PhD candidates having graduated. Only 20%

finishes in the typical range of four to five years. During the site visit, the committee heard that AHM shares the committee's concerns and has paid serious attention to this issue in the last years. Measures have been and are taken in order to ensure PhD candidates graduate within more or less four years. These comprise, amongst others, formalised procedures for supervision, a system of co-supervisors and pilot studies, measures to reduce teaching loads and some financial support for self-funded students. Current PhD candidates reflected with appreciation on these measures.

The reaction by the School to these low completion rates seems apt by the committee. Nevertheless, the committee also realises the pivotal role envisaged for these PhD candidates in AHM's vision for the future and their contribution to the School's financial position. As a result, these low success rates may hamper AHM's long-term plans. The committee therefore emphasises the need for structural and careful reflection on measures that can be taken to further support PhD candidates at all stages of their training to continue to strengthen the programme's success rates. This includes formulating tailor-made measures specially aimed at self-funded PhD candidates as well as efforts made to ensure that self-funded PhD candidates continuously have access to the same support networks and research facilities as funded candidates, considering their prominence within AHM's PhD community. Knowledge on this issue may also be available within other schools within AIHR, and the committee therefore recommends looking for support within this overarching structure.

3.8. Research integrity

AHM researchers are bound to the Netherlands Code of Conduct for Academic Practice. PhD students are informed about this code in their first meeting at the Graduate School for Humanities. Furthermore, research integrity is addressed in one of the optional skills courses for PhD students offered by the GSH. The Faculty of Humanities has an ethics committee which uses a documented review procedure with clearly defined criteria. The ethics committee approves all interviews or experiments with human test subjects before the research commences. Research data management takes place according to university policy. Research data are managed in a data management system called UvA Figshare.

Prior to the site visit, the committee received some further information regarding RDM at AHM relating to AHM's various big data projects, often conducted in collaboration with international and societal partners. The committee was pleased to read that AHM is very aware of the need for a more tailored approach in its digital heritage projects. For this reason, AHM appointed a committee of big data experts to explore the ways in which data can be secured, both safely and financially viable. For some current projects, data management was arranged externally with other partners. The School maintains two of its own servers within the UvA-network, one is used for testing and one as a production server. Regular backups are made by the University's ICT services. SURF, the collaborative ICT organisation for Dutch education and research, also supplies some HPC-servers for calculations. These data are not backed up. Research data for current and finished projects at AHM is stored on the University's Network-attached storage (NAS), with copies on private computers of the Principal Investigators as the NAS currently has no backup system.

For projects with research teams, AHM necessarily draws Service Level Agreements (SLAs) specifying the responsibilities of the parties involved, including server uptime, response time in case of queries and such. The School acknowledges that there are several challenges regarding its data management under these agreements. Often, researchers still work with temporary solutions for implementing protocols according to the new EU data law and different national laws and rules. Legal rights, Introduction and Terms of Use rights, copyright and ethical protocols regularly create tensions, in particular between principal investigators and associated partners, especially as internationally, UvA protocols are sometimes not accepted or deemed incomplete. In addition, several of AHM's projects work with non-academic partners, and some of these may be considered contested. Some of the School's projects have been financially supported by governments (the Czech Republic, Norway, Croatia and probably also Republic Skrpska), resulting in extra funding for memory works through consortiums. This additional funding allowed for unexpected problem solving, important collaborations (for example with Westerbork-Bergen-Belsen-Falstad), and discoveries (notably the



gas chambers Treblinka), and shed light on political issues (for example, the Gulag uranium camp). Nevertheless, AHM acknowledges that data management becomes more political with some of these 'contested' partners involved and this presents huge challenges – both politically and financially.

All these examples convincingly show that AHM is very aware of the complications it faces regarding data management next to the tremendous opportunities big data offer for the School's research. Attention is given to the way digital information and research results should be managed in a safe way, though a definite solution has not yet been found. The committee is aware that this is not AHM's sole responsibility but a wider Faculty and University challenge that needs commitment and funding in the coming years. Considering AHM's position as frontrunner within the Faculty regarding this issue, the committee acknowledges its dedication to the topic and recommends the Faculty to make use from the gathered expertise, knowledge and experience of leading big data AHM scholars, and to pass on this knowledge to the next generation of AHM scholars.

3.9. Diversity

AHM adheres to the Faculty policy on diversity, which was provided to the committee. AHM is dedicated to promoting active policy of equal representation and women's career advancement. AHM has been awarded 1 of the 7 Aspasia grants within the Faculty, promoting female scholarship. Currently, 70-80% of its PhD candidates and 50% of its theme leaders is female. In the School's management, equal representation is not (yet) visible. With the impending change of leadership, a clear opportunity arises. AHM has a very international staff and PhD community. This is a reflection of the international culture at AHM and its attractiveness for scholars from all over the world. The committee feels that AHM currently uses a rather limited definition of diversity; diversity transcends the issue of gender and nationality. In the future the committee would like to see a broader definition of diversity to include other categories such as migration background, ethnicity or disability. Policy forwarding this issue should probably be designed at Faculty level.

3.10. Conclusions

The committee concludes that AHM is an innovative, exciting and aspirational research school with great potential to fulfil its ambition to become a world-leading centre of expertise on heritage, memory and material culture. Its profile is well-defined and attractive, its vision and mission are both ambitious and realistic and the chosen research themes relevant and refreshing. It offers a dynamic and challenging environment to its scholars and PhD community.

Scholars at AHM have produced very good research in the period under consideration. AHM published extensively and widely, set up two series that could positively impact on the School's visibility, and developed an extensive network of collaborative partners, both internationally and locally. AHM scholars are well-represented at editorial boards and often invited as speakers at platforms in both the academic and professional field. Its publication record is strong and consistent. The committee noted that monographs are currently slightly underrepresented and emphasises the need to continue publishing in well-known and established peer-reviewed journals while trying to establish the school's series as the go-to place for publications on material culture. The committee considers in particular AHM's hybrid output as of excellent standard and congratulates the School on its ability to maintain and obtain funding levels while operating on a very limited budget. Notably, third stream funding is very successful and the School secured many matching funds.

AHM seems to have a clear vision of its future, being aware of threats but also of opportunities. With support by the Faculty and AIHR, the School should be capable to cope with possible problems of which it seems equally aware. These challenges entail its current development stage and staff concerns, which impact on AHM's viability. The School needs a dedicated chair to its main area of expertise with strong network and societal links to further establish the School's standing. Also, clarity about the future of the School's management is needed with the upcoming changes ahead. At the same time, with the growing recognition of AHM's reputation and its clear appeal to funding bodies, staff may choose to move to other institutions offering better opportunities for advancement. This last concern is not unique for AHM, but is considered a greater threat to AHM's viability as it

tries to set itself up as an innovative and daring school that makes a claim to become leading in this new field. It is now time to consolidate AHM's successes and to allow the School to mature in the coming years.

One of AHM's most important strengths is the attempt to pursue two different objectives at the same time: excellence in research and an active presence within a wider societal dimension. The combination of academic research and non-academic support for societal partners is relevant for the School's future, and has already proven to be viable. AHM has also an impressive number of professors by special appointment which creates visibility of research within society and attracts money from societal partners. AHM's connection to society and its public engagement are outstanding and commendable. The committee in particular liked the fact that many of its initiatives are truly two-way in orientation and developed in a very natural way. AHM's position is in this sense secured and fundamental in its platform function and therefore assessed as excellent.

AHM's PhD programme is considered attractive. The committee commends in particular its attention to professional training. Nevertheless, the programme has struggled in the last years in terms of graduation rates. Considering the large group of self-funded PhD candidates at AHM, the committee considers further attention to their needs necessary in the coming years. AHM is very aware of the complications it faces regarding data management. Attention is given to the way digital information and research results should be managed in a safe way, though a definite solution has not yet been found. Research integrity and data management policies therefore need to be revised and updated in the coming years, and knowledge of good practices should also be passed on to the School's next generation of scholars. AHM adheres to the Faculty policy on diversity, which was provided to the committee. These policies are currently rather limited; diversity transcends the issue of gender and nationality. A broader definition of diversity should be embraced and policies revised to include other categories such as migration background, ethnicity or disability.

3.11. Overview of the quantitative assessment of the research unit

After having assessed the research quality, relevance to society and viability, and comparing that to the developments and standard in the field, the committee comes to the following quantitative assessments:

Research quality:	very good	(2)
Relevance to society:	excellent	(1)
Viability:	very good	(2)



4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- Discuss the place of material culture within AHM's research lines; rethinking and further broadening of the research themes could result in giving more room to material culture. A successful integration of current scientific engagements and its research on material culture could become a defining feature for the School.
- Further downscale the number of research groups while strengthening the interdisciplinary character of the School.
- Create one full chair directly connected to the central research fields (memory, material culture, heritage), with strong societal connections. Recommended would be to look for someone who can reflect on the key terms of research, e.g. heritage and memory.
- Resolve as soon as possible the question of leadership and direction of AHM to secure the necessary consolidation and maturation of the School.
- Secure more structural funding, so the critical mass of AHM can be strengthened and guaranteed.
- Put more effort in reaching top-level international publications. Ideally one of the AHM series should become a reference series for memory studies in Europe.
- Create a programme allowing for sabbatical leave for staff members.
- Formulate a strategic vision regarding AHM's digital publications to be able to guarantee their quality in the long term.
- Define diversity in broader terms to include other categories such as migration background, ethnicity or disability. Policy forwarding this issue should probably be designed at Faculty level.
- Reformulate policy on supervision hours for external PhD candidates. The risk of taking on a self-funded PhD candidate should not lie with the supervisors alone.
- Communicate existing procedures for mental support and conflict mediation more structurally amongst PhD candidates and staff.
- Support PhD candidates and continue to monitor their progress in order to strengthen completion rates. Attention should be paid to self-funded PhD candidates in particular, considering the composition of the School's PhD community.
- Update the current ethics code and formulate a more integrated policy on data management in due of the advancement of digital humanities. Communicate these policies structurally to both PhD candidates and staff members and pass over best practices.



APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: THE SEP CRITERIA AND CATEGORIES

There are three criteria that have to be assessed:

- Research quality:
 - Level of excellence in the international field;
 - Quality and Scientific relevance of research;
 - Contribution to body of scientific knowledge;
 - Academic reputation;
 - Scale of the unit's research results (scientific publications, instruments and infrastructure developed and other contributions).

- Relevance to society:
 - quality, scale and relevance of contributions targeting specific economic, social or cultural target groups;
 - advisory reports for policy;
 - contributions to public debates.

The point is to assess contributions in areas that the research unit has itself designated as target areas.

- Viability:
 - the strategy that the research unit intends to pursue in the years ahead and the extent to which it is capable of meeting its targets in research and society during this period;
 - the governance and leadership skills of the research unit's management.

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



APPENDIX 2: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

Day 1: 12 December 2018

Time	Who/What	Where
<i>10:00-10:30</i>	<i>coffee</i>	<i>E1.01D</i>
10:30-12:30	Private meeting for committee members only with secretary QANU	E1.01E
12:30-13:00	Prof. Fred Weerman (dean), prof. Thomas Vaessens (director AIHR and vice-dean), dr. Elske Gerritsen (head of research)	E1.01E
<i>13:00-13:45</i>	<i>Lunch</i>	<i>E1.01D</i>
13:45-14:15	Meeting on the educational programme for PhD's: dr. Carlos Reijnen (director Graduate School of the Humanities), Thomas Vaessens, and Elske Gerritsen	E1.01E
14:15-15:00	Prof. dr. Liz Buettner (director of ASH), Simon Speksnijder and Brigit van der Pas (coordinator of ASH)	E1.01E
<i>15:00-15:30</i>	<i>Tea break</i>	<i>E1.01D</i>
15:30-16:15	Prof. dr. Rob van der Laarse (director AHM), dr. Ihab Saloul, Rene Does (coordinator AHM)	E1.01E
16:15-17:00	Dr. Christian Noack (director ARTES), Paul Koopman (coordinator ARTES)	E1.01E
<i>17:00-18:00</i>	<i>Drinks committee, secretary Qanu, Fred Weerman, Thomas Vaessens, Carlos Reijnen, Elske Gerritsen, directors schools and coordinators</i>	<i>F1.01</i>
<i>18:30-21:00</i>	<i>Diner committee, secretary Qanu</i>	<i>Restaurant De Compagnon</i>

Day 2: 13 December 2018

Time	Who/What	Where
9:00-9:30	Private meeting for committee members only with secretary QANU	E1.01E
9:30-10:00	Meeting with PhD students of ASH, ARTES and AHM: Laura van Hasselt (ASH), Arjan Nuijten (ASH), Nanouschka Wamelink (ASH), Nour Munawar (AHM), Inge Kallen-den Oudsten (AHM), Milou van Hout (ARTES), Enno Maessen (ARTES)	E1.01E
<i>10:00-10:15</i>	<i>Coffee break</i>	<i>E1.01D</i>
10:15-11:00	Meeting with Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors of ASH: Moritz Föllmer, Charles van den Heuvel, Geert Janssen, Vincent Kuitenbrouwer, Manon Parry, Gerard Wiegiers Justyna Wubs-Mrozewicz, Djoeke van Netten	E1.01E



11:00-11:45	Meeting with Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors of AHM: Patricia Lulof, Maartje Stols-Witlox, Frank van Vree, Maarten van Bommel, Carolyn Birdsall, Nanci Adler	E1.01E
11:45-12:30	Meeting with Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Professors of ARTES: Luiza Bialasiewicz, Barbara Hogenboom, Matthijs Lok, Marleen Rensen, Yolanda Rodríguez Perez	E1.01E
<i>12:30-13:15</i>	<i>Lunch with members of the research schools</i>	<i>E1.01D</i>
13:15-13:25	Private meeting for committee member only with secretary QANU	E1.01E
13:25-14:00	Meeting with Elske Gerritsen, Thomas Vaessens, Christian Noack, Liz Buettner, Ihab Saloul	E1.01E
14:00-16:00	Private meeting for committee member only with secretary QANU	E1.01E
16:00 - 16:30	<i>Transport to Amsterdam Museum</i>	
16:30 - 18:00	Visit Amsterdam Museum	
<i>18:30-21:00</i>	<i>Diner committee members, secretary Qanu</i>	<i>Brasserie Ambassade</i>

Day 3: 14 December 2018

Time	Who/What	Where
9:30-10:30	Private meeting (committee members only)	E1.01E
10:30-11:30	Meeting with representatives of the Board of Huizinga, including PhD's: Judith Pollmann (UL), Arnoud Visser (UU), Jan Hein Furnée (RU), Anjana Singh (RUG), Michael Wintle (UvA), Michel van Duijnen (PhD), Tymen Peverelli (PhD), Larissa Schulte Nordholt (PhD), Paul Koopman (coordinator)	E1.01E
<i>11:30-11:45</i>	<i>Coffee break</i>	<i>E1.01D</i>
11:45-12:15	Meeting with director and coordinator of Huizinga for further questions	E1.01E
<i>12:15 - 13:00</i>	<i>Lunch</i>	<i>E1.01D</i>
13:00-15:00	Private meeting (committee members only)	E1.01E
<i>15:00-15:30</i>	<i>Tea Break</i>	<i>E1.01D</i>
15:30-16:30 VOC	Presentation of preliminary conclusions by the Committee	V.O.C. Room
<i>16:30-</i>	<i>Drinks</i>	<i>V.O.C. Room</i>

APPENDIX 3: QUANTITATIVE DATA

	2015	2015	2016	2016	2017	2017
	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte
AHM						
Scientific staff	26	5,8	31	12,8	29	11,9
Post-docs	7	4,2	11	6,3	13	7,0
PhD student (employed)	22	16,7	20	16,2	26	21,1
PhD student (self funded)	20		27		37	
Total Research staff	75	26,8	89	35,3	105	40,0
Support staff		0,4		0,9		0,9
Professors by special appointment	13		13		13	
Total staff	88	27,2	102	36,2	118	40,9

Output category AHM	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total in category
Refereed articles	10	14	19	26	69
Non-refereed journal articles	8	19	33	31	91
Books	7	7	3	12	29
Book chapters	35	18	36	32	121
PhD Theses	4	6	3	6	19
Conference papers	7	8	22	24	61
Professional publications	5	5	13	11	34
Publications aimed at the general public	9	8	13	9	39
Other research output	21	30	52	50	153
Total publications	106	115	194	201	616

	2015		2016		2017	
	fte	perc	fte	perc	fte	perc
Funding AHM						
Scientific staff	5,49		11,63		10,87	
PD	1,78		1,38		1,54	
PhD	9,88		8,91		8,91	
Direct funding	17,15	64%	21,92	62%	21,32	56%
Scientific staff			0,80		0,80	
PD	1,95		2,43		3,50	
PhD	1,52		3,24		4,86	
Research grants	3,47	13%	6,47	18%	9,16	24%
Scientific staff	0,34		0,38		0,20	
PD	0,50		2,50		2,00	
PhD	5,32		4,05		5,67	
Contract research	6,16	23%	6,93	20%	7,87	21%
Other						
Total funding	26,78	100%	35,32	100%	38,35	100%
Expenditure:	€				€	
Direct Personel costs	1.788.533	56%	1.364.748	59%	1.930.335	60%
Indirect Personel costs	1.244.931	39%	772.983	33%	1.137.743	35%
Other costs	152.574	5%	184.038	8%	147.722	5%
Total expenditure	3.186.038	100%	2.321.769	100%	3.215.800	100%



Number of grants AHM	2014	2015	2016	2017
Authorized				
<u>NWO</u>				
VICI			1	
VIDI				
VENI	2	1		
Aspasia				1
Rubicon				
PhD's in the Humanities	1			
NIAS Fellowship (KNAW)	1	1		
<u>EU Funding</u>				
ERC Advanced				
ERC Consolidator		1		
ERC Starting				
ERC proof of concept				
Marie Curie IF			1	
Jean Monnet				
HERA			1	
Creative Europe		1		
Reasoned				
<u>NWO</u>				
Investment		1		
Gravity (Zwaartekracht)*				
Free Competition			1	1
Creative Industry	5			6
Internationalization in the Humanities				
Graduate Programme				
Smart Culture				
NWO thematic research	1	2	3	
NICAS Seed Money				1
NWO other				
KNAW Other				1
<u>EU Funding</u>				
Calls FP7/ Horizon2020*		2	1	1
Other				
NWO	9	4	5	9
European Funding		4	3	1
Contract Research		1		
Others	1	1		1
Total	10	10	8	11

PhD Candidates

Starting year	Enrolment			Success rates					Total		
	Enrolment (male/female)		Total (M+F)	Graduated after (≤) 4 years	Graduated after (≤) 5 years	Graduated after (≤) 6 years	Graduated after (≤) 7 years	Graduated after (>) 7 years	Total graduated	Not yet finished	Dis-continued
	M	F									
2010	1	2	3	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 33%	0 0%	1 33%	1 33%	1 33%
2011	1	3	4	0 0%	1 25%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	1 25%	3 75%	-
2012	4	1	5	1 20%	1 20%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	2 40%	3 60%	-
2013	3	0	3	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	0 0%	3 100%	-
Total	9	6	15	1 7%	2 13%	0 0%	1 7%	0 0%	4 27%	10 66%	1 7%