

RESEARCH REVIEW
AMSTERDAM INSTITUTE FOR
HUMANITIES RESEARCH

HUIZINGA INSTITUTE
RESEARCH INSTITUTE AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF
CULTURAL HISTORY

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 HUIZINGA INSTITUTE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM5

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

2. THE REVIEW COMMITTEE AND THE PROCEDURES 7

3. ASSESSMENT OF THE REPORT ON THE RESEARCH REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH INSTITUTE AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF CULTURAL HISTORY 9

4. RECOMMENDATIONS..... 15

APPENDICES 17

APPENDIX 1: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT 19

APPENDIX 2: QUANTITATIVE DATA 21

This report was finalised on 27/03/2019

REPORT ON THE RESEARCH REVIEW OF THE HUIZINGA INSTITUTE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

1. FOREWORD BY COMMITTEE CHAIR

De commissie die de opdracht kreeg de werking van het Huizinga Instituut 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 bestuursleden en 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 aangepreemd dat hun disciplines in een 'crisis' verkeren. Het onderzoek dat de commissie in het Huizinga Instituut 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 gedachteswisseling 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 de werking van het Huizinga Instituut en is ervan overtuigd dat de reflexieve, kritische en niet-defensieve ingesteldheid van zijn 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 undertake a review of the Huizinga Institute, Research Institute and Graduate school of Cultural History (Huizinga Institute) 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 Amsterdam School for Cultural Analysis (ASCA), Amsterdam School of History (ASH), Amsterdam School for Heritage, Memory and Material Culture (AHM), 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 Huizinga Institute. The assessment was performed by two committees in two separate site visits. The Huizinga Institute was assessed as part of Cluster II, which also included ASH, AHM and ARTES.

The committee followed the Terms of Reference (ToR) provided by the Huizinga Institute, which were based on the Terms of Reference for the assessment of National Research Schools in the Humanities as decided by the Deans of the Dutch Humanities Faculties (DLG). Following these ToR, the committee was asked to assess the quality of the education of PhD candidates provided by the Huizinga Institute and the added value of the Huizinga Institute as a national forum for the discipline in the period 2012 up to and including 2017, in relation to its own mission statement and formulated goals.

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 the Huizinga Institute.

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;
- an appraisal report by prof. dr. Jay Winter, prof. dr. John Brewer and prof. dr. Ulinka Rublack based on a review of the Huizinga Institute's self-assessment report.

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

3. ASSESSMENT OF THE REPORT ON THE RESEARCH REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH INSTITUTE AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF CULTURAL HISTORY

3.1. Introduction

The Huizinga Institute is the Dutch national research school for cultural history. Ten universities participate in the Huizinga Institute: the University of Amsterdam (UvA; host institution), Utrecht University (UU), Radboud University Nijmegen (RU), Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR), Leiden University (UL), Maastricht University (MU), University of Twente (UT), VU University Amsterdam (VU), the University of Groningen (RUG) and Tilburg University (TiU). Affiliated institutions are the Open University (OU) and Huygens ING. The Huizinga Institute offers PhD candidates and research master (ReMa) students from all these institutions scholarly training in cultural history. For this assessment, only the training offered for PhD researchers will be reviewed.

The Huizinga Institute was established in 1995, and has been hosted by the UvA since its creation. In 2015, the Deans of the Dutch Humanities Faculties (DLG) decided that the hosting of national research schools in the humanities should rotate between participating universities. As a consequence, the Huizinga Institute is relocating to UU per 1 January 2019. The Huizinga Institute's funding derives from two sources. Its office is maintained by a contribution from the DLG, and its teaching activities are supported by funds paid for each PhD researcher (€ 1,000 in 2017, paid by the local university faculties) and research master student (€ 400 in 2017, paid by the Regieorgaan Geesteswetenschappen) registered with the School by their local universities. The Huizinga Institute does not have financial resources for the funding of research activities that go beyond its research master and PhD training programme.

The Huizinga Institute provides high quality national training for PhD candidates and ReMa students. The teaching programme serves to familiarise the trainee researcher with various approaches to and methods used in cultural historical research today. It caters for cultural historians in a broad sense, including historians, art historians and literary scholars. At the same time, it shapes successive cohorts of young researchers and helps creating networks between members and between them and national as well as international scholars. The Huizinga Institute sees this cohort-building function as of special importance, allowing for professional connections and personal links that may last a lifetime.

The Huizinga Institute's mission is therefore to:

- provide high-quality academic education for PhD researchers and Research Master (ReMA) students;
- optimize the research culture and environment in which PhD researchers and Research Master (ReMA) students operate;
- provide a platform for national co-operation in cultural history research;
- act as a sounding board, contact point, agency and international bridgehead for cultural history in the Netherlands.

The Huizinga Institute is a relatively large national research school. In 2017, 24 PhD researchers and 57 ReMa students were newly enrolled in the Huizinga Institute.

3.2. The quality of the education for PhD candidates

The Huizinga Institute has a long and highly regarded history and offers a diverse programme, combining more traditional courses with symposiums, summer schools and master classes. The curriculum for doctoral candidates comprises three mandatory courses: 1) a course on Research into Cultural History (Year 1) and a follow-up course on Research into Cultural History (Year 2). In addition, PhD candidates participate in the annual Graduate Symposium, first as auditor (Year 2) and then as presenter (Year 3). In addition, PhD researchers are invited to attend the Summer School,



whose topic changes annually, an annual course on Oral History, master classes, workshops and *ateliers* that are presented throughout the year.

For PhD researchers, the training provided by the Huizinga Institute is a valuable supplement to the training received at their home university. Local training is usually either general, oriented towards academic and professional skills such as grant application and presentation skills, or very specialised and tailored towards a PhD candidate's specific research area or interest. The Huizinga Institute offers a disciplinary training, paying particular attention to cultural-historical approaches, theory and methods in particular. In this respect, it bridges the gap between general academic skills and specific niche research skills tailored to individual research. The Huizinga Institute's programme also offers doctoral candidates incentives for further progression in their individual research journey. PhD researchers are, for example, invited to present their research to their peers at the Huizinga Institute's annual Graduate Symposium in their third year. This is considered a strong feature by the committee as it supports doctoral candidates in a helpful and encouraging way.

Also, the Institute's training opens up the field of cultural history in other ways. PhD researchers in cultural history are usually embedded within a larger faculty or research group with a range of disciplinary orientations. This is particularly true for cultural historians who are based in other disciplinary departments than history, for example art historians and literary scholars, or for cultural historians with a position at a university that focuses in its historical research on other disciplinary approaches. At the Huizinga Institute, young researchers are submerged in the broadness and diversity of cultural history and meet researchers from other subdisciplines that they may otherwise not have encountered. Therefore, the scope and focus of the training offered here is vital in connecting the PhD candidates to the diversity of the field, approaches and methods of cultural history.

The quality of the teaching staff is very high and the course material appears solid. The Huizinga Institute seems to be handling the recent challenge of the enrolment of a large group of ReMa students relatively well. Some courses are primarily aimed at ReMa students, for example, and some are exclusively open to doctoral researchers. In this way, the quality of education of PhD candidates is safeguarded. Monitoring the balance between ReMA students and doctoral candidates remains, however, of importance in the near future. The courses are generally well evaluated by participants. Nevertheless, the committee wonders whether the ambitions of the Huizinga Institute should not be set higher in this area; comparable research schools in the Netherlands also seem to raise the bar. The introduction course, for example, could be made more intensive by offering a deep immersion in sources, methodologies and concepts. This could be coupled with, for example, in-house learning in heritage institutions and archives. This would offer PhD candidates exposure to sources and techniques with which they are often unfamiliar, while also providing a welcome introduction in the cultural (work)field.

In addition to training, the Huizinga Institute also provides opportunities for PhD researchers to organise symposia, workshops and conferences. Doctoral candidates are encouraged to organise workshops and to formulate collaborative initiatives with like-minded researchers from other universities within the field. These options are greatly appreciated by PhD researchers, who enthusiastically gave examples of graduate initiatives during the site visit. This bottom-up approach, which offers PhD researchers the opportunity to suggest themes and to discuss the curriculum, is certainly considered promising and a positive aspect of the Huizinga Institute. It shows that the Huizinga Institute successfully embeds and supports initiatives and creates an environment for doctoral candidates in which they feel free to organize and contribute.

The committee wants to express, however, that this approach needs a counter-weight. It acknowledges that PhD candidates have in a number of cases been engineers of their own training destiny. They have come together, identified gaps in their training portfolio and run particular workshops to address training deficits. Initiatives for renewal and changes to the programme have thus come, by and large, from doctoral candidates themselves in recent years. As a result, the

Huizinga Institute gives the impression of being mainly receptive rather than a (pro)active trailblazer for the discipline of cultural history. The Huizinga Institute's Board members explained that their resources are limited and that they are dependent on their members for supplying good quality teaching. The Governing Board, which succeeded in 2016 the Advisory Board as the Huizinga Institute's main body, also felt that change should follow the upcoming move to Utrecht. According to the panel, the training in cultural history could benefit from a more proactive approach by the Institute itself in terms of planning and reviewing its programme on a more thorough and regular basis.

The committee considers that with the move to Utrecht, the time is now indeed appropriate for the Institute to embark upon comprehensive discussions among its institutional participants about the current and prospective nature of postgraduate training in cultural history, as well as the contemporary trends and developments in the discipline that will require a strategically coordinated rather than ad hoc response from the Institute's leadership. The move to Utrecht is, in this respect, an opportunity to enhance its initiatives for renewal in order to remain an innovative force for the discipline of cultural history. Crucial, in this regard, will be the Institute's ability to provide refreshed and innovative training despite rather limited budgets. The committee recognises that much of the Institute's success to date has been dependent upon individual commitment, graft and the goodwill of others to contribute to its mission. The move to Utrecht also implies change in this respect. Changes in personnel could have serious implications for the viability of the Institute's programme of training. To date, the burden has not been shared equally among the Institute's participating institutions. Going forward, this will present issues regarding the sustainability of unequal commitment and fairness of participation practices. Also, in this respect the committee welcomes the opportunities that a fresh start in Utrecht presents.

The committee summarises the Huizinga Institute's challenges as follows: First, the continuous need for renewal of the programme should strike a balance between bottom-up initiatives, the availability of members willing to teach at the Huizinga Institute and strategic agenda-setting for cultural history as a discipline by the Institute. The committee feels that in particular the Institute's Programme Committee should be asked to take in this the lead, together with a proactive programme management team (or board). The committee noted that some governing board members during the site visit were very keen to look afresh to the current curriculum, which was appreciated. Therefore, the review panel encourages active involvement of the governing board in rethinking the structure of the programme, next to a more actively involved Programme Committee. In addition, the committee appreciates the active participation of members of the PhD Council during meetings of both the Governing Board and the Programme Committee, as the Institutes' young researchers have demonstrated to be a strong, innovative force within the Institute. The committee was pleased to learn that meetings of both the Governing Board and Programme Committee are already structurally attended by representatives of the Institute's PHD/ReMa Council. Of course, the committee trusts the Institute to take these remarks as suggestions only. It hopes that these suggestions will result in some internal reflection on the way how to direct and manage the Institute most effectively.

Second, attention should be given to training methods and approaches that provide the tools and employment opportunities for the next generation of cultural historians, including the rapid development of Digital Humanities. The committee strongly recommends the Huizinga Institute to structurally introduce young scholars to the methods, opportunities and limits of the methods of the digital humanities. Also, collaborations with societal partners and institutions, such as archives, museums and libraries, could be explored in this context.

Third, the committee suggests broadening the Institute's current focus, which is mainly Eurocentric in orientation, into other cultural spheres and jurisdictions. This is not only clear from the subjects offered as part of the Institute's curriculum, but also from the offered masterclasses. Most invited scholars are now primarily from an Anglo-Saxon background, by and large male and often well-established scholars. Widening the perspective and range of speakers, including inviting young



international scholars who test the boundaries of the field with exciting new theories and methods, would enhance the Institute's role and standing in international context and may also strengthen its national position as a forum for the discipline.

3.3. The added value of the Huizinga Institute as a national forum for the discipline

The Huizinga Institute is committed to cohort building within the field of cultural history. It allows researchers and students in cultural history to meet, create links, co-develop ideas and co-organise workshops. These initiatives benefit all doctoral candidates and ReMa students in making them reach out beyond their own supervisors, research groups, schools and universities. This is particularly the case for members from smaller institutions, which cannot provide the education on the same level and to the same extent. As a result, the Huizinga Institute is of vital importance for many PhD candidates.

From the statements by its student members, the Institute offers a good platform for creating networks between candidates from the different universities. These networks are also valued. This is witnessed, for example, by the fact that also external PhD candidates actively seek the connection with the Huizinga Institute and by the, more incidental, enrolment of Flemish doctoral candidates in the Institute's programme. These examples reflect the recognised standing and the experienced added value of the Huizinga Institute for PhD researchers. Also, the keen interest for membership and active participation of scholars from affiliated institutions – Huygens ING and the Open University – reflect the Huizinga Institute's vital role as a platform for the discipline. With the influx of ReMa students, cohort-building amongst doctoral candidates may be or may become less evident and natural than currently is the case. The committee therefore strongly supports the Huizinga Institute in reserving certain courses and events for PhD researchers only, as it considers it important that doctoral candidates continue to recognise themselves as an entity, a proper cohort, within the community.

The Huizinga Institute is also a sought-after partner for national collaborations. Institute members have, for example, provided input for the development of the Dutch National Research Agenda, in particular with respect to the Horizon 2020 themes. They were invited to formulate research questions relevant to the field of cultural history, the humanities and social sciences alike. Also, the Institute was regularly consulted as a national body for matters concerning the profession. For example, the national statistics agency, the Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (CBS), asked for advice on its report on Dutch identity and the Scientific Advisory Council to the Government (WRR) invited Huizinga contributions to a report on 'Identification within the Netherlands'. Also, the Huizinga Institute has been involved in the development of a systematic instrument for describing and assessing research, the Quality and Relevance in the Humanities (QRIH), that is now used in the review of research output in the Humanities. In the international community, the Huizinga Institute is also a valued partner. It is a member of the International Society for Cultural History and regularly hosts events, at which leading scholars in the field bring their expertise to the Huizinga Institute. These marks of recognition are testament to the significant role of the Huizinga Institute in the field.

In addition, the Huizinga Institute digitally offers a platform for its community through its website and its newsletter. It also supports some expert meetings of national research groups in oral history, ego-documents, history of the humanities, periodicals studies, history of science and visual culture. These activities and initiatives bring together cultural historians from the academic field and seem effective. The committee heard that cultural historians by and large identify with the Huizinga Institute as a national platform. Again, the committee noted some opportunities for further development in this respect. The committee feels that initiatives of the Huizinga Institute currently stress too exclusively relations between universities. Cultural history is an interdisciplinary field and it should therefore also embrace its relevant societal partners. Heritage institutions in particular are the obvious social partner currently missing out on the Huizinga Institute's initiatives and discussions. The committee considers it therefore wise to open up the Institute, by approaching a select group of societal institutions. They could be incorporated in the governance structure (perhaps as special affiliated members) or other forms of formalised collaboration could be considered. This would

certainly strengthen the Huizinga Institute's reputation and recognition as a national forum for the discipline. As noted above, a widening of perspective (e.g. becoming less Eurocentric in orientation) would also enhance the Institute's role and strengthen its role as national forum for the discipline.

3.4. Conclusions

The committee concludes that the Huizinga Institute offers PhD candidates from the field of cultural history a valuable disciplinary training. The structure of the current curriculum is appropriate and the quality of the staff involved is excellent. The Huizinga Institute seems to have managed the influx of ReMa students reasonably well and the committee supports the current practice of reserving some courses for PhD candidates only, to allow for in-depth disciplinary training and cohort-building amongst PhD students. The current curriculum is diverse and interesting, yet the committee recommends reviewing it with respect to skills-training in the light of the advance of the digital humanities. Additionally, opportunities present themselves in widening the current range and take on cultural history; structural attention to non-western perspectives would strengthen the curriculum and may also raise the Huizinga's Institute's international reputation even further. The innovative force represented by the Institute's PhD candidates, is highly valued by the committee and also testifies to the way in which the Institute manages to foster and advance these young scholars' talents.

The Huizinga Institute offers PhD candidates, ReMa students and scholars a place where they can experience the diversity of the field, which is all the more necessary since many of them operate in relative isolation. The national research school is therefore of clear added value to the field. The committee approves the Institute efforts to act as a national forum, e.g. by promoting inter-university research groups. Its role can be enhanced by bringing focus into its strategic agenda. Additionally, the Huizinga Institute should invest in societal collaborations in the coming years. The committee considers it adamant that the Huizinga Institute actively seeks and promote these kind of collaborations as part of their training programme. The committee feels that with the move to Utrecht, an excellent opportunity arises to update the curriculum, take a fresh approach to the Institute's educational focus and its role as platform within the discipline.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- Formulate a clear, research strategic agenda for the Huizinga Institute and engage in long-term planning. In this respect, a balance between initiatives, personell and demands needs to be struck with a clear view for the field.
- Open up the platform to external partners (e.g. heritage institutions, archives) which may be given a special affiliation.
- Look for new financial injections in collaboration with the universities and external partners by entering into training partnerships (e.g. archives, libraries, heritage institutions).
- Diversify the masterclasses on offer in terms of perspectives. Strike a balance between introducing young scholars to big names in the field and to new, innovative and challenging perspectives. Also, try to raise the number of female speakers.
- Strengthen the current curriculum in terms of skill-training and bring it up-to-date with new approaches and tools, including Digital Humanities. Find ways to immerse students more fully.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

Day 1: 12 December 2018

Time	Who/What	Where
10:00-10:30	<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
13:00-13:45	<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
15:00-15:30	<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
17:00-18:00	<i>Drinks committee, secretary Qanu, Fred Weerman, Thomas Vaessens, Carlos Reijnen, Elske Gerritsen, directors schools and coordinators</i>	<i>F1.01</i>
18:30-21:00	<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
10:00-10:15	<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 2: QUANTITATIVE DATA

The quality of the education provided for PhD researchers

The table below shows the annual inflow of PhD researchers and ReMa students in the period from 2012 until 2017.³

<i>Inflow 2012 - 2017</i>	<i>PhD researchers</i>	<i>ReMa students</i>
2012	18	36
2013	17	46
2014	18	39
2015	22	58
2016	20	44
2017	24	57

With an average of 20 PhD researchers and 47 ReMa students, the Huizinga Institute is the second largest national research school in the Humanities in the Netherlands.⁴

Financial Overview 2012-2017

	Budget	Personnel Costs	Courses	Result
2012	€ 93.361	-€ 60.111	-€ 24.329	€ 8.921
2013	€ 88.351	-€ 59.051	-€ 44.229	-€ 14.929
2014	€ 107.141	-€ 61.590	-€ 47.069	-€ 1.518
2015	€ 101.965	-€ 71.670	-€ 38.473	-€ 8.178
2016	€ 127.656	-€ 73.160	-€ 48.936	€ 5.560
2017	€ 113.952	-€ 76.059	-€ 29.514	€ 8.379