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1 Introduction

1.1 Scope of the assessment
The Review Committee was asked to perform an assessment of the Centre for Language Studies of Radboud University Nijmegen. The assessment covers the research in the period 2006-2011.

In accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 for Public Research Organizations, the Committee’s tasks were to assess the quality of the institute and the research programmes on the basis of the information provided by the institute and through interviews with the management and the research leaders, and to advise how its quality might be improved.

1.2 Composition of the Committee
The composition of the Committee was as follows:
• Prof. Geert Booij, Leiden University, Leiden, the Netherlands, chair of the Committee;
• Prof. Rachel Mayberry, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, USA;
• Prof. Jon Oberlander, University of Edinburgh, United Kingdom;
• Prof. Daniel O’Keefe, Northwestern University, Evanston, USA;
• Prof. Elizabeth Traugott, Stanford University, Stanford, USA.

A brief curriculum vitae of the Committee members is included in Appendix A.

Dr. Barbara van Balen of QANU (Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities) was appointed secretary to the Committee.

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

1.4 Data provided to the Committee
The Committee received detailed documentation comprising the following
1. Self-evaluation report of the institute, including all information required by the Standard Evaluation Protocol, with appendices.
2. Key publications of each of the Institute’s research programmes.
1.5 Procedures followed by the Committee

The Committee proceeded according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015. All members of the Committee assessed the Self-evaluation document in its entirety independently. In addition, the chair divided the key publications of the research programmes among the members of the Committee for assessment in relation to the relevant sections of the self-evaluation document. Each Committee member was assigned as a first reviewer to a programme. The first reviewer formulated a preliminary assessment. The final assessments are based on the documentation provided by the institute, the key publications and the interviews with the management and with the leaders of the programmes and individual researchers and PhD students during the site-visit. A list of the interviews is provided in Appendix 3. The entire Committee decided on the final judgements for all programmes. The Committee scored the programmes according to the procedures described in the Standard Evaluation Protocol. The final mark per criterion is the considered judgement of the Committee taking all the available information into account.

The site visit took place on 10-11 October 2012.
2 The Institute

Director of the institute: Professor van Kemenade (until 2012), professor Fikkert (as of 2012)
Academic staff in 2012: 75.27 fte
Assessment of the institute: 5

2.1 Organisation

The Centre for Language Studies (CLS) is one of the two research institutes of the Faculty of Arts at Radboud University Nijmegen and comprises all the research in the Faculty in the broad area of linguistics and communication. It conducts research into the understanding of the architecture of the language system and its interactions with processes at the individual cognitive level and the social cultural level. It studies cognitive processes at work in the production, comprehension and acquisition of language, the historical and social factors determining language variation and change, and the communicative effects of language. CLS is also part of a triangle of research institutes on the RU campus working on language and cognition; the other institutes are the Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour and the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics.

CLS has been organized in five programmes that all reflect the philosophy that language must be studied in context. Grammar and Cognition aims to explain the interaction of the architecture of the language system, cognitive constraints on acquisition and language use, and communicative goals. Language in Time and Space combines a theoretically grounded description of variation in language structure while aiming to identify historical and social factors related to this variation. Linguistic Information Processing distinctively combines psycholinguistic research methods with computational modelling to describe how people process and acquire language. Communicative Competences focuses on social and cognitive constraints that influence actual language use in multilingual and multimodal environments. Professional Communication employs theories on persuasion and intercultural communication to assess the impact of communication strategies in professional communication.

The director of the Centre for Language Studies is appointed by the Dean of the Faculty of Arts for a four-year term. During the period under evaluation, first Prof. Pieter Muysken (2006-2007) and subsequently Prof. Ans van Kemenade (2008-2011) was the CLS director. The current director is Prof. Paula Fikkert. The director is in charge of the institute
and has full responsibility for its research policies and research programme, with, however, restricted control over the budget. Hiring decisions are discussed in the Management Team of the Faculty of Arts, of which the CLS director is a member, and which meets every week.

The ‘triangle’ collaboration between CLS and the Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour and the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics is unique in the world. The Committee has established that CLS makes optimal use of this distinctive opportunity, which is highly appreciated by the Committee. The institute’s characterisation is broad; it combines language studies, linguistics, communication and neurolinguistics. The research of the CLS has in general a solid theoretical core. There are not that many institutes in the world that bring the aforementioned disciplines and departments together. Most linguistics departments are more inward looking, while the research done in the institute is all reaching out.

The self evaluation report and the interviews during the site visit informed the Committee about the restructuring of the institute, which has largely taken part in the last year and was set in motion by the prior director. The reorganisation is based on the acknowledgement of the decisive role played by PI-groups in the research of CLS, in discussing research, in generating output, and in acquiring grants. The PI-groups consist of one to three senior researchers (associate or full professors), with their PhD students, post-doctoral researchers, and assistant professors. PI-groups provide a daily working environment for junior researchers and the natural context for frequent (informal) research meetings. In lieu of the five thematic programmes, the PI-groups are now positioned within two overarching programmes: Language in Mind (LiM) and Language in Society (LiS).

The Committee is of the opinion that going back to the basis of PI groups is a wise step. Although it had doubts in the beginning, the subdivision into two ‘labels’ seems to work in practice. They seem useful labels with which to monitor the research, bring people together, and manage the administration of the research. They reflect orientation of the work within the PI group, and are certainly not a rigid distinction. The structure gives maximum flexibility. The lack of a job description for the programme leaders is a good thing at this stage; but later on, based on experience, the organisation should come to a more formalised description of responsibilities in relationship to the director and the PI groups.
2.2 Leadership and academic reputation
The Committee noticed that the institute is aware of the task of being a leader in this new multidisciplinary field of language and communication. The institute is leading in showing how multidisciplinary work should be done. The leaders of the institute, in the past as well as at present, had and have a clear vision of where they want to go. The policy for the future has been very clearly presented; the Committee has every reason to be confident about the leadership for the future. It is very positive that the domain of language and communication studies has been formulated as one of the priority research themes for RU. The institute has been able to attract young researchers and to hire new faculty. Important steps in the right direction have been made in the period the Committee had to review. The development of the new organizational structure for CLS can also be mentioned as one of these positive steps. Not everything has been achieved yet, but the institute took the midterm review seriously and took steps to remedy identified problems.

The academic reputation of CLS is very high. Some PIs and PI-groups are world class, many are at the top level from a European perspective, and a few may be qualified as being outstanding at the national level. This is evidenced by the level of publications (in high impact international journals and books of top publishers), and the high amount of acquired competitive national and international funding), and confirmed by what the individual members of the committee know about the standing of the PIs in the various subdomains in which CLS is active.

2.3 Resources
The Institute provided the following information on staff levels.

Table 1 Research staff at institutional level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>fte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19.87</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>20.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19.73</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18.32</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenured</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.76</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.04</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17.51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29.46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29.34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40.39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39.09</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>70.30</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>69.25</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>69.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>74.39</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>74.92</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>75.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows a gradual decrease of tenured staff in the review period and an increase of non-tenured staff. This decrease in tenured staff is caused by the changes in funding. The national funding policy brought a shift from direct research funding (1st stream) to research funds, in particular NWO (2nd stream), as can be seen in table 2. CLS has been very successful in acquiring more external funding.
Table 2 Funding of the institute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fte</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>fte</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>fte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct funding</td>
<td>34.53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>32.24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28.08</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research funds</td>
<td>31.96</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31.05</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32.75</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.98</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70.30</td>
<td>69.25</td>
<td>69.81</td>
<td>74.39</td>
<td>74.92</td>
<td>75.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee is impressed by the achievements of the institute in attracting 2nd and 3rd stream money. CLS has managed to expand, despite the decreasing direct funding. CLS has been successful with individual grants and projects financed by NWO as well as with individual grants from ERC. The Committee has some concern about the balance between permanent academic staff versus non-tenured staff; and would raise the question of what the minimum size of tenured staff should be. From a management point of view the advantage of the growing proportion of non-tenured staff, due to the successful acquisition of external money, is that it creates more flexibility and larger network of researchers. The drawback is the risk of losing resilience. The Committee cautions the Faculty and the institute to be vigilant in this respect. The institute should consider what minimum tenured staff level is necessary in order to maintain world leadership and the potential for acquiring new grants.

The institute and its representatives reported to the Committee that, despite the good achievements, there still is a need for additional funds to be able to finance all the plans.

The lack of research time is exacerbated by the currently under-developed research management infrastructure. Additional research management support will be crucial to expansion of research activities. The Committee is of the opinion that, on the one hand, this is a good sign, meaning that the institute has ambitions. On the other hand, the Committee would like to make some suggestions to enhance the possibilities for researchers to acquire research funding, which is essential to achieving the ambitions of the institute. The committee wants to emphasize that the technology and the multidisciplinarity of the research and the way researchers have to work on proposals to get grants has changed the way the Humanities in general and the research of the CLS in specific should be conceptualised within the Faculty

1 It is however somewhat confusing that ERC grants are reported under ‘contracts’, instead of under competitive research funds.
The first suggestion is to establish a structural revolving fund for writing project proposals. A very positive development is the appointment of a policy advisor for acquisition and valorisation, who helps researchers write research proposals. The Faculty is, however, not yet providing the administrative support for managing and spending the grant money. In particular, European money brings a heavy administrative burden which should be lifted from the researchers. We would recommend that CLS establish a kind of administrative interface, properly embedded in the institute and the Faculty, to monitor and aid the researchers with the monitoring of the finances of the grants.

Furthermore, a Human Subjects Review Board, or Research Ethics Board, which approves all research with human subjects is obligatory. It was not clear during the site visit that all researchers were aware of the existence of this obligation. The Faculty has the responsibility to the institute to appoint such a committee.

It is positive that more lab facilities will be created in the institute. But human technical support is essential for the running of the labs. The lack of sufficient support is a threat to the investment; this technical support cannot depend on grant money only. The committee therefore recommends that positions for technicians are created by regular funding.

The deaf research assistants are very relevant for the research into sign language. There is however no formal function or job description on the basis of which these assistants can be properly paid, since they do not have the right diplomas. This absence of the right job description is also problematic for the research funding. It is crucial to find a creative solution for this problem. Another recommendation is open up the deaf laboratory for the researchers and administration to find ways to help make the sign language laboratories accessible to additional interested researchers and students by facilitating sign-spoken language interpretation between the deaf and non-deaf researchers.

2.4 PhD training

PhD training has undergone a gradual improvement. One of the improvements is the introduction of the graduate school. The graduate school has created a structure for systematic monitoring of the progress of the PhD students. The coordinator of the graduate school plays an important role in that respect. The new protocol for assessing and tracking progress helps to prevent students falling through the cracks. The effects of these new developments in numbers of timely finished dissertation are not yet visible. The completion rate of dissertations can still be improved. The Committee has, however, seen remarkably happy PhD students. They reported that the staff is available for them on a ‘daily’ basis, meaning whenever necessary. This gives the committee confidence that the completion rate will indeed be improved.
The PhD students also exemplify the interdisciplinary character of the institute. PhD students seem to be a source of connection between the PI groups. Most of them have two supervisors from different departments. The Committee sees advantages in this structure, which could be made a rule. The PhD students have very different backgrounds; they establish that the foundation of the institute is interdisciplinary in nature.

The Committee finds it positive that PhD students initiate acquiring new skills on their own, and have the freedom to combine several fields and pick their courses. In the view of the Committee this is good for scientific creativity.

The role of the present Research Master in Linguistics and Communication as the source of new PhD students has become marginal. Therefore, the committee advises a rethinking of the role of this program for CLS.

Mentoring of Post-Doctoral Fellows requires more systematic attention. Although some post-doctoral fellows receive systematic advice about how to plan their careers for possible tenure-track positions, other post-doctoral fellows said that they had received no guidance at all, and feared that they were making decisions that would disadvantage their careers. The strong mentoring of the PhD students needs to be extended to the post-docs and newly qualified instructors.

2.5 Productivity

The institute provided the following information about publication output:

Table 3 output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refereed articles</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-refereed articles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books monographs</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book chapters</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD theses</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference papers</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional publications</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications aimed at the general public</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other research output</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total publications</strong></td>
<td><strong>381</strong></td>
<td><strong>322</strong></td>
<td><strong>351</strong></td>
<td><strong>365</strong></td>
<td><strong>371</strong></td>
<td><strong>303</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The strategy of the management of the institute in the review period was described as focusing on articles in refereed high impact journals. That strategy has achieved its goal. Nearly all programmes increased their number of refereed publications, and have been productive. CLS had done a good job in this regard.

In the Committee’s view the overarching goal of publishing should be that the research should have impact. In this regard CLS should reconsider if the high impact journals should be the main target. Monographs still seem to be appropriate. Conference proceedings are an important communication form in certain domains such as Linguistic Information Processing. The committee would recommend not to demand journals to be the only outlet. Refereed publishing is indeed very important, but impact is a more complicated thing than looking at high impact journals only. The institute and its researchers have to clearly define the intellectual goals and influence they want to achieve with their various forms of output. The Committee suggests setting productivity goals more in terms of impact of the publications of the individual scholar by making use of citation scores and other bibliometric indices such as the H-score. Such measures should be used judiciously, preferably avoiding reliance on single metrics, and they do not replace qualitative assessments of impact; but they may be useful in helping guide researchers towards forums where they can maximise their academic impact.

The data concerning output presented in the self evaluation report are not always easy to interpret. It is clear that the overall productivity is good, but is hard to tell from the presentation how evenly distributed the overall productivity is. The number of dissertations is, according to the self evaluation report, slightly increasing in comparison to the previous period. The measures which have been taken recently might have the effect of increasing the proportion of dissertations finished in four years in the next period.

2.6 Relevance

The potential societal relevance of the research in CLS is very high. But the committee is not sure that CLS is really aware how important it is, and it appears that not all possibilities are explored and used. For instance, the institute does not keep track of the careers of the graduated PhD students. These graduates are not only the ambassadors of the institute, but they also provide evidence for the relevance of the research and training done in the institute for society at large. The committee therefore advises CLS to monitor this aspect better.
The Committee noticed the small number of popular publications. The potential of CLS in this aspect is much higher than has materialized so far. Societal relevance did not really come through from the self evaluation report. CLS and indeed the Faculty might make use more intensively of a public information officer, and the opportunities offered by new social media.

2.7 Vitality and feasibility
It is very clear to the Committee that the management of CLS has a sound and successful strategy for the future. The Committee previously expressed its appreciation for the strategy above. CLS has very good opportunities. The Committee sees even more opportunities in promoting the PhD programme for candidates from abroad who have their own funding, although a risk could be that the PhD supervision rests on too few faculty.
A threat that CLS shares with many other academic institutes is the lack of guaranteed long term financing. Another point of concern is the high teaching load for some of the CLS researchers which hampers their productivity as researchers.

For the next years (2012-15) the research facilities and the financial resources are good. CLS has managed to attract the best researchers by its attractive environment. The institute is robust and stable. The Committee has a very positive impression of CLS’s future.

2.8 Overall assessment
The Committee assesses the quality of the Centre for Language Studies as: ‘excellent’. The research done in the institute is world leading, and has an important and substantial impact in the international field. The institute has a unique position in the field of language studies, which is made possible by the ‘triangle’ cooperation with the Donders Institute for Brain, Cognition and Behaviour and the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics.
3 Programme Assessment

3.1 Grammer and Gognition

Programme director: Professor de Hoop
Academic staff in 2011: 15.96 fte
Assessment: Quality : 4.5
Productivity : 4.5
Societal Relevance : 4
Vitality and feasibility : 5

By linking the linguistic and cognitive perspectives, the programme aims to strengthen the theoretical basis of linguistics as a cognitive science as well as the empirical basis of linguistics with respect to cross-linguistic variation, acquisition and processing of language. It combines methodologies from theoretical linguistics, corpus linguistics, and the behavioural sciences.

The programme is centred on the following themes:
(1) Getting Sounds in Mind: this group investigates the acquisition of phonological representations in the lexicon and the role of these representations in perception and production. Besides using existing databases on child language production, much of this research is carried out in the Baby Research Centre, where a variety of procedures to test children’s early language perception is used.
(2) Laboratory Phonology: the research is focused on the prosodic structure of spoken languages. This group has been dissolved after the retirement of Prof. Carlos Gussenhoven.
(3) Optimal Communication: this research embeds an optimization approach to language and communication in the broader field of linguistics. Cognitive processes of speaking and hearing are examined from a comparative, cross linguistic perspective.
(4) Cognitive Constraints on Levels of Form and Meaning: this theme group investigates cognitive constraints regarding the mapping relations between various levels in language. Morphology, prosody, and meaning are investigated, as is the relation between speech and spelling. It also studies the variation regarding linking elements in compounds in Dutch, Afrikaans, Frisian, English and German.
(5) Sign Language: the object of research is the structure and use of Sign Language of the Netherlands, the language of the Dutch deaf community. While the central focus is on linguistic research, this group also invests in innovative methodologies to develop and work with sign language corpora, with a strong commitment to making the research results accessible for a general audience and in particular for the deaf community itself.
Quality 4.5
The programme contributed to the study of the theme ‘Language in mind’ which is one of the two foci of the future research of CLS. The quality of the program is very good to excellent. Some of the PIs in this programme are world leaders in their field. Their work is read and appreciated across the world, and has influenced the work of other researchers in their domain. They also contributed to the debate on the architecture of the grammar of natural languages from various perspectives such as language acquisition, syntactic structure and case assignment, intonation, and sign language. The quality of the researchers in this programme is also shown by the high number of externally funded projects both at the national and the European level.

Productivity 4.5
The productivity of most groups in this programme is very high. They have managed to publish their results in high quality journals and books published by the leading publishers in the field of linguistics. We appreciate that they also publish their work in handbooks, which makes it possible for other researchers to build on their insights, and for students to learn more about their cutting edge research.

Societal relevance 4
The research results of this programme are potentially relevant for society in various ways. Fundamental knowledge of first language acquisition is essential for the proper treatment of children with language deficits. Work on intonation is essential for speech technology and second language acquisition. The study of sign language is essential for deaf persons. The study of the processing of Dutch compounds may be of relevance for future fine tuning of the spelling rules for Dutch compounds. However, the potential for this kind of relevance can be further exploited, a point that can also be made for other research programmes in CLS.

Viability 5
The language acquisition group has been able to acquire substantial external funding, and since the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics (MPI) also works on language acquisition, this group will be strengthened through its cooperation with MPI and can have a bright future.

The Lab Phonology group will not be continued in its present form due to the retirement of Prof. Gussenhoven. However, the work in the tradition of Lab Phonology will be continued in the group of Prof. Ernestus, which is part of the new Language in Mind program, and the group of Prof. Fikkert.
The Sign Language group is the leading group of experts on Dutch sign language, and the PI has been able to acquire a lot of external funding at the national and the European level. There is no doubt about the viability of this group.

The CLS effort to create more lab facilities is essential for the acquisition group and the sign language group, and this requires that proper infrastructure is guaranteed for the future. It will be important to find ways of getting deaf persons more actively involved in the research and use of results of this group. The administrative burden of PIs who are successful in acquiring external funds is too high, and should be reduced by the Faculty offering proper assistance in this respect.

Overall Assessment: 4.5
3.2 Language in Time and Space

Programme director: Professor van Kemenade, professor Los
Academic staff in 2011: 15.54 fte
Assessment:
- Quality : 4.5
- Productivity : 5
- Societal Relevance : 4.5
- Vitality and feasibility : 4.5

Within this programme, both comparative and historical approaches to language variation are employed. The aim of the programme, however, goes beyond a careful description of variation: it wants to explain the causes of variation. To achieve this, it focuses on the transmission of language from one generation to the next through first language acquisition, on language contact situations and on the linguistic responses to language contact as a result of second language acquisition. Finally, it studies the impact of the diffusion of those responses through language communities over time. Thus, the programme’s research combines linguistic description and typology with the linguistic and sociolinguistic effects of first and second language acquisition to explain language variation and change.

The programme is organized into four theme groups:
(1) Linguistic diversity: typologies, families, contacts. This group focuses on language description and typology as well as extensive research into transmission (genetic relatedness) and diffusion (language contact). The research aims to tease out which similarities result from genetic relatedness, which from typological laws and which from areal contact.
(2) Grammatical variation and historical change in the West-Germanic languages. This group studies the historical development of the Germanic languages with particular focus on Dutch and English. Themes and research questions include the relationship between morphology (verbal and nominal inflection), syntax (OV/VO orders, Verb-Second) and information structure (the rise of passives and clefts, the progressive form), as manifested in processes of change. Recent developments include a growing interest in the relevance of synchronic psycholinguistic research on first and second language acquisition to processes of change.
(3) The evolution of phonological systems. The theme group investigates the typology of phonological systems and the development of prosodic structure in a number of languages (mainly Latin, Dutch, French and Slavic languages). The research focuses on phonological theory and phonological change in the history of the Romance languages, phonological theory in relation to prosodic typology, and on experimental research and phonological representation.
(4) Language variation in the Dutch language area. The object of research is Dutch dialects and patterns of variation in standard Dutch. Aims are to develop a sociolinguistic experimentation paradigm that relates spontaneous speech to evaluative reactions, and to deepen our understanding of the role and meaning of accent variation and linguistic distance. A digital lexicographical database of the southern Dutch dialects has been designed as an important tool for different kinds of dialect investigations.

A fifth theme group, The languages of the Middle East, ceased to be part of CLS with the loss of the Arabic department in 2009.

Quality 4.5
The objective of the group on Language in Time and Space is to explain the diversity among the languages of the world. The approach combines theoretical work on language variation and change with work on typology, first and second language acquisition and language contact.

During the period under review it was organized in four sub programmes engaged in “core linguistic” research. A conscious effort was made to synergize work across the sub programmes in, conferences and lecture series. The quality of these four sub programmes ranges from world class to European international. New and widely used theoretical paradigms were developed in the areas of language diversity and the interface between information structuring and syntactic structure.

Productivity 5
Productivity is high. In the fields comprising the group, monographs, book chapters, and edited Handbooks have significant impact, in addition to refereed journal articles. Between 2006 and 2011 a total of 68 books were published as well as 30 articles in top refereed journals. New methodologies for semi-automatic corpus parsing were developed. The field of language variation and change is a vital one. Under the reorganization plan there are extensive possibilities for fluid interaction between researchers focusing on language in mind and those focusing on language in society. PIs can be expected to continue to be leaders in their fields and to develop new collaborations that draw on expertise in MPI (language evolution, typology, and acquisition) using new methodologies in quantitative and qualitative modelling. The potential for work with Donders on neuro-imaging of bilingual acquisition might be explored.
Societal Relevance 4.5
The societal relevance of the sub programmes includes research contributing to the preservation of endangered languages, understanding of issues of language identity and bilingualism among immigrant communities in the Netherlands and around the world, and development of a new methodology for semi-automatic corpus parsing. Work of this type can be expected to flourish and to be enriched in the new framework. Every effort should be made by the PIs and the Faculty to promote public understanding of the importance of this research for policy and information sciences.

Vitality and Feasibility 4.5
The new PI-group structure appears to split research on Language in Transition Stages and Cognitive Aspects of Multilingualism from Languages in Contact and Variation and Distance. This was initially a concern for the Panel, because these subareas should be integrated, but we have been reassured that the new structure is designed to remove existing barriers to collaboration, and that good collaboration among the relevant groups is not only in place but will continue to be fostered. The possibility exists for new collaborations.

The continued success of the programs research groups will, however, depend in the next review period on several factors. One is continued collaboration among the relevant groups across the two themes. Another is that appointments will need to be made to replace retiring and departing faculty. A third is that the administrative burden of obtaining and sustaining external funds will need to be reduced.

Overall Assessment: 4.5
3.3 Linguistic Information Processing

Programme director: Professor Boves, professor Ernestus
Academic staff in 2011: 18.23 fte
Assessment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Productivity</th>
<th>Societal Relevance</th>
<th>Vitality and feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal Relevance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitality and feasibility</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aim of the Linguistic Information Processing (LIP) programme is to develop theories of language learning and processing, and to test these theories under laboratory and real-world conditions by means of psycholinguistic experimentation and computational modelling. It deploys the resulting knowledge in real-world tasks such as language teaching and information extraction. It is the programme’s ambition to maintain and strengthen its national and international reputation as a leader in two specific areas: 1) speech comprehension under real-world conditions; 2) the use of computational techniques from the field of language and speech technology in the testing and development of theories of language acquisition and processing, and in the development of applications for real-world tasks.

The programme is organized in four closely related theme groups:

1. Models for human and automatic speech recognition build improved models for automatic speech recognition by integrating psycholinguistic insights about essential aspects of human speech processing. The group applies automatic speech recognition techniques to develop computational models of human speech recognition, and design computer-assisted systems for training and testing oral proficiency of (adult) learners of Dutch and of speakers with communicative disorders.

2. Lexical information processing. Every theory of language learning and processing must make crucial assumptions about the mental lexicon, and tools for speech recognition and language technology depend on a lexicon that defines the words of the language and their properties. This group investigates the details of the kinds of information stored in the mental lexicon, combining methods from lexical statistics with phonetic and psycholinguistic experiments.

3. Cross-fertilization of rule-based and probabilistic language models. This theme group investigates the limitations of existing language technology and aims at improving their performance by including powerful rule-based parsers, developed for English and Dutch.

4. Development and evaluation of language resources and tools. Each of the first three theme groups crucially depends on the availability of large corpora of spoken and written language, and on tools for processing corpus data. This group creates corpora and
lexical resources for spoken and written Dutch, and develops a range of corpus-based tools for novel applications of language technology.

During the review period the largest of these groups by far was (1), although the balance shifted with the acquisition of funds and the future course is significantly affected both by the retirement of Prof. Boves, and by new recruitment.

**Quality 4.5**

Taken as a whole, the programme has worked at an excellent level, making important contributions to improving the accuracy of speech recognition in noisy conditions, to the understanding of structures within the mental lexicon, to the uses that can be made of state-of-the-art speech and language tools (both in language teaching, and in linguistic research itself), and to the capture and annotation of large scale linguistic resources especially for Dutch. The key publications highlighted in the Self-Evaluation report represent a very healthy breadth of activity, although the selection of mostly recent publications makes it harder to assess their longer term individual impact; at least in the short term, the journal articles appear to have attracted a reasonable although not exceptional level of citation. However, in this connection, it is worth noting that in the case of corpus work, it is rarely the quality or prestige of the publication outlet that matters for longer term impact; rather, it is the quality and coverage of the corpus itself, and there can be little doubt of the significance of the work on both spoken and written Dutch.

Comparing against the background of the other programmes within CLS, LIP appears to have worked as a highly coherent group, which is reflected in its productivity. As stated, the largest of the four sub-groups by far was the Speech Recognition group, which functioned very effectively. However, the recruitment of new professors changes the balance, and we note a significant shift of emphasis given these and other new appointments, as well as the change in Institute structure.

LIP houses a unique resource regarding Dutch ASR, and while commercial organizations now dominate practical ASR, LIP's group has a role to play in training the next generation of Dutch ASR researchers, and should focus to protect its reputation in this area; the ongoing Dutch corpus work is both nationally and internationally important; and there are very few competitors internationally for the work on the processing of speech elicited under conversational, as opposed to formal, conditions. Earning capacity has been excellent, with much support from external resources, and success in ERC competition is especially to be commended. The technical and human support environment appears to have seen significant improvement since the time of the Midterm review.
Productivity 4.5
The programme has been producing publications at a respectable rate, with an average of 1 publication in the top 10% venues per staff FTE per annum. The proportion of the overall publication profile that falls within the preferred venues is very good, although it can no doubt be increased further. Not all of these publications make a large impact, and it is arguable that especially in the computational area, it is more important to publish in influential venues (such as highly selective conferences) than in journals with respectable impact factors by linguistic standards. We would therefore expect the new PI groups to critically review their continuing publication strategy.

Relevance 5
The societal relevance of the LIP programme is excellent; as noted, there is innovative science, competitive technology, significant resources for both research and application, and a range of applications for the technology (such as computer assisted language learning) that is enviable by European standards.

Vitality and Feasibility 5
The new PI-group structure splits the work on speech communication and the lexicon away from the work on speech recognition and other language technologies. This was initially a concern for the Committee, but we have been reassured that the new structure is designed to remove existing barriers to collaboration, and does not erect new ones, thereby addressing concerns raised by the LIP programme (about external collaboration), without hindering the good internal collaboration. Another concern was that the appointment within CLS of van den Bosch, with his computational linguistics and eHumanities expertise, was not to LIP, but to another programme. The new PI-group structure appears to rectify this, in that he is associated with the Language and Speech Technology group, and this also addresses two concerns raised in the Midterm Review, which were: that language and speech technology work was very heavily biased towards speech; and that ambitions to extend into eHumanities could not be realized without appropriate personnel resources and leadership. In sum, new appointments and organization appear to reposition the researchers associated with this programme in a very positive way, and given their track record, we expect them to continue to contribute at a very high level internationally.

Overall Assessment: 4.5
3.4 Communicative Competences

Programme director: Professor van Hout
Academic staff in 2011: 16.48 fte
Assessment: Quality : 4
Productivity : 4.5
Societal Relevance : 5
Vitality and feasibility : 4

The programme aims to analyse and understand how communicative competences develop and how they are maintained and used, focusing on interfering constraints, conflicting conditions, multimodality and individual differences. The programme thus aims to contribute to developing theories on human language use and learning and on the role of cognitive, linguistic and social factors in triggering and establishing communication. It takes a broad perspective on the interaction of communicative modes, for instance between bodily action and language and investigates more specific conditions. The programme has demarcated the following thematic theme groups:

(1) Second language acquisition: development and proficiency. The aim is to explain how the architecture of the first language can facilitate (or inhibit) the acquisition of a second language. A second aim is to explore the role of feedback on the acquisition of a second language, and also the use of Linguistic Information Processing and large L2 databases to investigate individual learner differences and the effects of linguistic distances. Extra attention is given to low educated second language learners.

(2) Bilingualism and processing. The theme group on bilingualism studies the direct interaction between languages and language varieties in their actual use. Various multilingual populations are studied, differing in both their L1 and L2 backgrounds and their proficiency levels. Emphasis lies on the development of models of code switching that bridge the gap between structural approaches and processing oriented approaches. An important line of research in this context is the emergence of ethnolects in the Dutch language area.

(3) Communicative modes. This theme group combines two lines of research. The first investigates the wider context of communicative modes given the interactions between bodily action, language, cognition, and communication. Two domains in which body and language interact closely are especially relevant: gestures that speakers use spontaneously, and sign languages. The second line of research studies sub-populations which need to develop communicative competences under restricted communicative modes such as language impairment, language disorders, deafness, or cognitive limitations. The core issue is to disentangle maturational, linguistic, and cognitive (information processing)
problems in explaining the language output observed. This group also develops technological tools for specific communicative modes.

**Quality 4**
A number of the groups’ papers make significant contributions to the fields of L2 learning and co-speech gesture. These contributions include research insights and methodologies into L2 learning, the nature of co-speech speech gesture vis-à-vis spoken language, and innovative methods to deliver speech therapy to neurological patients. The international rankings of the journals in which these papers appear range from the highest level to 2nd and 3rd tier journals.

**Productivity 4.5**
The group reports 100 publications, of which half being in referred journals over the past six years. This is an impressive record, but the number of faculty must be taken into account. For three out of the past five years (when the distinction between refereed and non-refereed publications was applied) the average publication rate has been two refereed journal articles per professor. This is not a high rate of publications considering that the group consists of nine tenured faculty and seven untenured staff. This suggests that the publication rate of the group is highly variable as a function of faculty member. The percentage of external funding for the group has remained steady with several large grants being awarded, despite the loss of a highly productive tenured professor (Gullberg).

**Social Relevance 5**
The bulk of this groups’ research is socially relevant both to the local and global context. Discoveries about L2 learning and methods to study it, the nature of the relation of gesture to spoken language, improved methods to deliver speech therapy, and the creation of a school for deaf children in Turkey all have had and will continue to make important and positive contributions to diverse individuals in society. A small increase in efforts to share the groups’ research findings with speech-language therapists, L2 teachers, and teachers of the deaf would yield large benefits.

**Vitality and feasibility 4**
The current organization of the sub-groups into one research programme does not make intellectual sense because the theories, paradigms, and technology used to study, for example, impaired speech perception on the one hand and the gesturing of deaf children and non-deaf adults on the other hand are quite disparate. It is hoped that the reorganization of CLS into basic PI units organized into two major themes, each with its own leader, will improve cross-group communication, and cross-fertilization of research collaboration and ideas. The intellectual assets of each sub-group will carry forward and likely be strengthened by the new organization.
Efforts to open research labs that investigate sign languages and gesture need to be fostered. Other scholars, both students and faculty, can profit from interacting with sign language and gesture researchers and conversely will have insights to offer these research endeavours. The dearth of contact between the two labs was noted as a weakness in the midterm evaluation and remains to be addressed. Also the loss of Prof. Marianne Gullberg is significant and the Committee notes that researchers at CLS who do related work will be hard pressed to fill the gap her departure leaves.

Overall Assessment: 4.5
3.5 Professional Communication

Programme director: Professor Hoeken, professor Starren
Academic staff in 2011: 9.06 fte
Assessment: Quality : 3
Productivity : 3
Societal Relevance : 5
Vitality and feasibility : 5

The aim of the research programme Professional Communication is to develop and test models of how and to what extent message characteristics such as content and style influence the outcome of the communication process. This is studied both in the Dutch context and in international professional contexts. To attain this aim, message-centred approaches developed in the humanities are combined with cognitive process approaches from the social sciences to generate hypotheses on how message characteristics can evoke and guide the cognitive and affective processes relevant to the outcome of the process. Hypotheses are typically tested by experimental research in which the impact of carefully manipulated message characteristics on the communication process are charted, yielding insights into how and to what extent these characteristics influence the communication process. These results not only shed light on the communication process itself, but also allow us to formulate evidence based guidelines for the design of professional messages, both in Dutch and international contexts.

The programme is divided in two related theme groups:

(1) Persuasive and instructional documents. The research focus in this theme group lies on the impact of argumentative, narrative, and stylistic characteristics on the persuasiveness of a message. It aims to uncover what criteria people employ to distinguish strong from weak arguments and at what point in the persuasion process this distinction determines the outcome of the process. With respect to narratives, it wants to chart what narrative characteristics evoke cognitive and affective processes that ultimately result in persuasion. The group studies stylistic features such as (verbal and visual) rhetorical figures, as well as irony or language intensity, in order to assess their impact on the persuasion process.

(2) Professional communication in foreign languages. The aim of this theme group is to shed light on the impact of using a foreign language in intercultural communication. This is studied from two perspectives: the first is that of the foreign language speaker, where the use of the foreign language is aimed at audiences for whom this language is not their mother tongue; the second is that of the audience’s evaluation of this non-native use. This theme group wants to explain whether and what aspects of communicating in a foreign language may hinder achieving a communicator’s goal.
Quality 3
The quality and scientific relevance of research in this programme appears to have been improving since the last assessment. In particular, these researchers have successfully focused on increasing the number of international refereed journal publications. There is still some way to go in this undertaking, however. Every year sees publications in high-quality outlets, but also a number of less significant publications; the number of excellent publications needs to be increased. In this the committee concurs with the midterm (2009) assessment: “high-quality output is unequally distributed over the staff” and “the number of publications is not very great given the size of the staff.”

Productivity 3
The relatively small number of high-quality publications contributes to a relative lack visibility of the programme. Programme members have received some national and international awards, and serve on appropriate editorial boards, but the international academic reputation of this programme is growing more slowly than might be wanted.

Relevance 5
The programme’s social relevance is both substantial and obvious. The programme’s research speaks to questions of how to improve communication effectiveness both in the Dutch context and in international professional contexts. Such research results can plainly be articulated in ways that reach beyond academic audiences. And there are correspondingly significant opportunities for external funding, at least for the Persuasive Communication group. This is most apparent in the realm of health communication; the committee was pleased to learn of the recent collaboration with the Radboud Medical Centre concerning how to encourage disease vaccination among resistant populations. At present the programme still relies quite heavily on direct funding, but the nature of this group’s research expertise is such as to equip them to pursue many such projects.

Vitality and feasibility 5
The prospects for this programme are excellent. This programme has contained two PI groups, one focused on the development of empirically-based guidelines for persuasive message design and a second focused on studying the effects of communicating in a foreign language in intercultural communication. Although there are some relationships between these, their placement together was perhaps more a matter of convenience than of deep substantive connection. The new CLS structure, in which these two PI groups have joined five others in the Language in Society programme, seems more likely to permit each of these two groups to make effective connections with other relevant CLS PI groups.
There is also the possibility of greater integration of this programme with other aspects of CLS. The programme has been relatively isolated (at least in part because the programme’s subject matter is the farthest from that of traditional linguistics), but the programme leadership has been alert to opportunities for remedying this problem. Several recent appointments may be said to bridge communication and linguistics in especially exciting ways. Similarly, because CLS is in a position to be a leader in the study of multilingualism, the Non-Nativeness in Communication group is particularly well-situated to profit from more extensive connections to other relevant CLS groups. In short, there is unrealized potential in this programme. But realizing that potential will be challenging. The primary research resource required by programme staff is time. It continues to be the case that a considerable number of tenured staff have very small allocations of research time. It is unrealistic to expect a staff member with eg. 0.20 fte research time to develop a significant international research profile. (Indeed, against the backdrop of those research-time allocations, the present accomplishments are rather remarkable.)

The lack of research time is exacerbated by the currently under-developed research management infrastructure. This matter is also addressed elsewhere in this report; here the point to be underscored is simply that additional research management support will be crucial to expansion of research activities in the PI groups in this programme. So the research groups in the Professional Communication programme have been improving, but there is still significant room for further progress – and important barriers to be addressed.

Overall Assessment: 4
4 Response of the institute

On behalf of all research program leaders of the CLS, and of the previous directors of CLS in the period 2006-2011, we would like to extend our sincerest appreciation and gratitude to the Evaluation Committee for its thorough and well-balanced assessment of our institute, our five old research programs and the two new ones. The Evaluation Committee consisted of international top researchers who combined their specific expertise in a particular field of interest with a broad expertise in language sciences. We believe that the Committee has worked in a highly professional, efficient, and conscientious way. We also believe its report to be well balanced and clearly formulated.

Overall the Evaluation Committee regards the CLS as an important and internationally very competitive player and a world leader in language and communication. Especially the overall quality of the institute – rated with a score of 5 – was assessed very highly. The old research programs (four programs with the score of ‘4.5’, one with ‘4’) were also evaluated very positively, but importantly, the score for the institute as a whole shows that CLS is more than the sum of its parts, and that the future direction of the CLS is clearly defined. We are proud that the other scores (for Productivity, Societal Relevance, Vitality and Feasibility) are also very positive (either 4.5 or 5). The Committee concludes that the CLS maintains a center of excellence in language and communication research.

Although the Evaluation Committee did not provide a specified list of recommendations, several suggestions were formulated for our research programs. All comments and advice received will be discussed in the Faculty Board/Management Team in order to support the necessary improvements in our research and education policies. One point that stands out throughout the report is the suggestion to improve the research management support, pertaining to both technical support (maintaining various lab facilities in the faculty), research support in terms of qualified assistants where necessary (particularly deaf assistants) and administrative support, including a structural revolving fund for writing project proposals and support in monitoring the finances of grants.

There are a number of suggestions that we will implement as soon as possible, which is the appointment of the ethical committee (which is now in place and had its first meetings), the monitoring of postdocs and graduated PhD students, and increased visibility of CLS research through new media.
The committee noted the unique interfaculty strength of CLS in being able to perform multidisciplinary fundamental and (applied) research. The close interaction particularly between researchers from CLS, MPI and the Donders Institute, bringing various disciplines together, is a unique asset that will be safe-guarded and exploited to its maximum in order to achieve the highest standards of research and education in the language sciences.

The coming years will be quite exciting ones for CLS. We are proud to take the next steps towards our vision of further enhancing the position of a top institute for language sciences within a dynamic and ambitious environment.

We would like to conclude by reiterating our gratitude to the Chair and members of the Evaluation Committee for their efforts and thoughtful assessment. Thank you very much.

With kind regards,

Prof. dr. Paula Fikkert
Research director of the Centre for Language Studies
Appendix 1  Curricula vitae of the Committee members

Geert Booij (1947) is professor emeritus of the University of Leiden where he taught from 2005-2012. From 1981-2005 he was professor of General Linguistics at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, and from 1971-1981 assistant / associate professor at the University of Amsterdam, where he also obtained his Ph. D. degree in linguistics. He studied Dutch language and linguistics at the University of Groningen (1965-1971). He was dean of the Faculty of Letters at the Vrije Universiteit (1988-1991, 1998-2002), and the University of Leiden (2005-2007), and member / chair of the Dutch Research Council for the Humanities (1997-2004).

Geert Booij is one of the founders and editors of the book series Yearbook of Morphology (1988-2005), which is, as of 2006, the journal Morphology. He is the author of The Phonology of Dutch (1995), The Morphology of Dutch (2002), The Grammar of Words (2005, 20123), and Construction Morphology (2010), all published by Oxford University Press, and of linguistic articles in a wide range of Dutch and international journals and volumes.

Jon Oberlander holds a Chair in Epistemics in the School of Informatics at the University of Edinburgh. He has a BA in Philosophy from Cambridge, UK (1983), and a PhD in Cognitive Science from the University of Edinburgh (1987), and has been an EPSRC Advanced Fellow at the ESRC Human Communication Research Centre. He was founder-Director of the Scottish Informatics and Computer Science Alliance, the £29M research pooling initiative bringing together leading researchers from all institutions across Scotland. Having also acted as Director of Knowledge Exchange for SICSA, he now leads an initiative on Smart Tourism, and is Co-Director of Edinburgh’s Centre for Design Informatics. He is also Director of Inspace, an instrumented living lab, designed to help explore the cultural significance of informatics and new media practice. His research lies at the intersection of computational linguistics and cognitive science, and aims at getting computers to talk (and write) like individual people. He has a long-standing interest in personalization via natural language generation, particularly in the field of cultural heritage. This has led to work on context-sensitive interpretation and navigation in both virtual and physical museums, and most recently to projects focusing on human-robot interaction.

Daniel J. O’Keefe is the Owen L. Coon Professor in the Department of Communication Studies at Northwestern University. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and has been a faculty member at the University of Michigan, Pennsylvania State University, and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
His research focuses on persuasion and argumentation. He has received the National Communication Association’s Charles Woolbert Research Award, its Golden Anniversary Monograph Award, its Rhetorical and Communication Theory Division Distinguished Scholar Award, and its Health Communication Division Article of the Year Award, the International Communication Association’s Best Article Award and its Division 1 John E. Hunter Meta-Analysis Award, the American Forensic Association’s Daniel Rohrer Memorial Research Award, the International Society for the Study of Argumentation’s Distinguished Research Award, and teaching awards from Northwestern University, the University of Illinois, and the Central States Communication Association. He is the author of Persuasion: Theory and research (Sage Publications).

Elizabeth Closs Traugott (PhD 1964, University of California, Berkeley) is Professor Emerita of Linguistics and English, Stanford University, California, USA. In the 1980’s she served first as Chair of the Department of Linguistics and then as Vice-Provost and Dean of Graduate Studies. Her research includes linguistics and literature, discourse analysis, and historical morphosyntax. She has coauthored books on grammaticalization (with Paul Hopper, 1993, revised edition 2003) and lexicalization (with Laurel Brinton, 2005), and is currently writing a book (with Graeme Trousdale) investigating how both can be incorporated in a theory based in a construction grammar perspective. Her most recent publication is The Oxford Handbook of the History of English (edited with Terttu Nevalainen, 2012).

Rachel I. Mayberry is a Professor in the Department of Linguistics of the University of California, San Diego, where she is also affiliated with the Cognitive Science Program, the Center for Research on Language, the Anthropogeny Program, and the Joint Doctoral Program in Language & Communicative Disorders. She received her Ph.D. from McGill University, Montreal, and has held academic positions at Northwestern University, The University of Chicago, and McGill University where she served as Director of the School of Communication Sciences & Disorders in the Faculty of Medicine. She investigates critical period effects on language and neural development, using sign language as the test case. In related work she investigates the psycholinguistic processes underlying word recognition in deaf readers, and the co-variation of spontaneous gesture with language development in bilingual children and with speech disfluency in children and adults. Her research has been continuously funded since 1982, in Canada by NSERC and SSHRC, and in the USA by NIH, NSF, and the Kavli Foundation.
Appendix 2   Site visit programme

October 9
16.00   Reception at hotel (Manna, Oranjesingel 2c) by Prof. Paul Sars, Dean of the Faculty of Arts, Prof. Ans van Kemenade and Prof. Paula Fikkert, CLS Director
17.00   Preparation of the site visit at the hotel (Committee only)
19.00   Dinner and Internal Committee Meeting to prepare site visit and assign tasks at hotel
20.30   Preparation of the site visit at the hotel – continued (Committee only)

October 10
9.00    Welcome by Prof. Sebastian Kortmann, Rector Magnificus of Radboud University Nijmegen, and Prof. Paul Sars (Erasmus building, Erasmusplein 1, room 20.05)
9.30    Meeting with Prof. Ans van Kemenade, Prof. Paula Fikkert, Lisenka Fox, MA, Policy Advisor of the Faculty of Arts, Laura Pander, Policy Advisor Valorisation and Acquisition and Tanja Dölle, MSc, Coordinator of the Graduate School for the Humanities (room 20.05)
10.30   Coffee break (room 20.05)
10.45   Discussion Committee with Programme Leader and member of Language in Time and Space (Prof. Ans van Kemenade and Prof. Pieter Muysken) (room 20.05)
11.15   Discussion Committee with Programme Leader and member of Linguistic Information Processing (Prof. Mirjam Ernestus and dr. Nelleke Oostdijk) (room 20.05)
11.45   Discussion Committee with Programme Leader and member of Communicative Competences (Prof. Roeland van Hout and Prof. Asli Özyürek) (room 20.05)
12.15   Lunch (Committee only) (room 4.18A)
13.30   Discussion Committee with Programme Leader and member of Professional Communication (Prof. Hans Hoeken and Prof. Margot van Mulken) (room 20.05)
14.00   Discussion Committee with Programme Leader and member of Grammar and Cognition (Prof. Helen de Hoop and dr. Onno Crasborn) (room 20.05)
14.30   Coffee break (room 20.05)
14.45   Discussion Committee with CLS PhD students (Inge Alferink, Christina Bergmann, Huib Kouwenhoven, Florian Kunneman, Thordis Neger and Stefanie Ramachers) (room 20.05)
15.30   Discussion Committee with CLS Postdocs and Assistant Professors (and other CLS staff the Committee would like to meet) (dr. Lotte Hogeweg, dr. Jos Hornikx, dr. Jetske Klatter, dr. Gerrit Jan Kootstra, dr. Eller Ormel, dr. Peter de Swart) (room 20.05)
16.15 Coffee break (room 20.05)
16.30 Virtual tour around campus plus 10 minute talks representing research collaboration with partners on campus (dr. Mark Dingemanse, dr. Reyhan Furman, Prof. Ton Dijkstra, dr. Esther Janse, Prof. Antal van den Bosch) (room 20.05)
17.15 Meeting Committee with Prof. Paula Fikkert and Leaders of the new CLS Programmes, Prof. Mirjam Ernestus and Prof. Hans Hoeken (room 20.05)
18.30 Walk to the Faculty Club / Huize Heyendaal (Geert Grootplein-Noord 9)
19.00 Dinner Committee with Prof. Paul Sars, Prof. Ans van Kemenade, Prof. Paula Fikkert and Programme Leaders at Faculty Club

October 11
9.00 Internal Committee Meeting to discuss results and preparation of site visit report (room 20.05)
12.30 Lunch (Committee only) (room 4.18A)
14.00 Preparation of site visit report – continued (room 20.05)
15.30 Presentation preliminary findings Committee for Prof. Gerard Meijer, Prof. Paul Sars, Prof. Ans van Kemenade, Prof. Paula Fikkert, Programme Leaders and CLS staff (room 2.55)
16.30 Drinks at the university pub
17.00 End of the programme