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Preface

Reviewing a humanities research institute is different from evaluating a more disciplinary one. It requires a broader field of vision that appreciates a wider set of topics and practices than may present themselves in more conventionally organised research. It arguably makes it more difficult for the Committee to assess the kind of research being conducted. At the same time, it changes - for the good - the dynamics of peer review in this kind of evaluation, making the dialogue within the committee, and with institute members, less determined by the standard disciplinary markers and more open to the challenges and possibilities of multi- or interdisciplinary work.

The Institute for Historical, Literary and Cultural Studies has helped to make such an evaluation a joy. Despite its name, it wears disciplinary difference lightly. Its humanities scholars constitute a community of shared inquiry, even as each member remains devoted to her or his specialisation. Although the HLCS is of relatively recent vintage, the Committee is pleased to note that it has improved its position within the field of humanities research and that it has taken large strides since the previous evaluation. In order for the Institute to advance further we have made a number of suggestions that might help the HLCS optimally position itself in the future.

We express our profound gratitude for all persons at the Institute involved that made this evaluation possible and realize that this has required great effort. We also like to express our thanks for the way we were received at the HLCS during the site visit. I am grateful to my fellow Committee members as well as the secretary to this Committee for their dedication to this evaluation. As chairman of the 2018 Peer Review Committee, I could rely on three eminent colleagues from Belgium, Denmark and Great Britain with complementary disciplinary expertise. Their professional acumen, thoughtfulness and dedication to this task made completion of the report a true pleasure. The secretary worked hard to lighten considerably our load. We have worked together as an effective team and I am pleased to conclude that this Assessment Report is the result of consensus among the entire Committee.

With the very best wishes for your collective future,

Prof. James Kennedy (Chair)
1 Introduction

1.1 The Netherlands System of Quality Assessment of Research
The quality assessment of research of the Institute for Historical, Literary and Cultural Studies (HLCS) is carried out in the context of the assessment system as specified in the Standard Evaluation Protocol for Public Research Organisations by the Association of Universities in The Netherlands (VSNU), the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO), and the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW).

The primary aim of assessments under Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021 is to explore and confirm the quality and the relevance of the research to society and to have these improve where necessary. This includes:

• The improvement of research quality, including societal relevance of research, research policy, research management, education and training of doctoral candidates, academic integrity and the facilities.
• Accountability to the board of the research organisation, and towards funding agencies, government and society at large.

The present document is the report of an external Committee of peers who evaluated the research quality of HLCS of the Radboud University during a visit in November 2018.

1.2 The Members of the Evaluation Committee
The Board of Radboud University appointed the following members of the Committee for the research review:
• Prof. James Kennedy, Utrecht University, The Netherlands (chair);
• Prof. Rosamond McKitterick, University of Cambridge;
• Prof. Kirsten Drotner, University of Southern Denmark;
• Prof. Jan Baetens, KU Leuven.

More detailed information about the members of the Committee can be found in Appendix 1. The Board of Radboud University appointed dr. Annemarie Venemans of De Onderzoekerij as the Committee secretary. All members of the Committee signed a declaration and disclosure form to ensure that the committee members made their judgements without bias, personal preference or personal interest, and that the judgment was made without undue influence from the Institute for Historical, Literary and Cultural Studies or stakeholders.
1.3 Scope of the Assessment

The assessment was commissioned by the Executive Board of Radboud University. It covers research conducted by HLCS in the period 2012-2017, paying particular attention to the period after the reorganisation that began in 2017. The Executive Board of Radboud University provided Terms of Reference for the Committee (ToR). It asked the Committee to assess the quality and relevance to society of the research conducted by HLCS as well as its strategic targets and the extent to which it is equipped to achieve them. The Committee is expected to do so by evaluating the programme’s performance on the three Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) assessment criteria, taking into account current international trends and developments in science and society in the analysis. In addition, the Committee was also asked to evaluate critically, in qualitative terms, three other aspects at the Institute level: (1) PhD supervision and training, (2) research integrity, and (3) diversity.

Since Radboud University houses the National Research School in Classical Studies OIKOS and the National Research School for Economic and Social History N.W. Posthumus Institute, the evaluation of both national research schools will be embedded in the assessment procedure of HLCS.

The Committee was therefore asked to assess:

1. the quality of the education of PhD candidates provided by OIKOS and Posthumus, and
2. the added value of OIKOS and Posthumus as national fora for the discipline in the period 2012 through 2017, as measured by their own mission statements and formulated goals.

1.4 Data provided to the Committee

Two months before the site visit, the Committee members received a Self-Evaluation report. It described HLCS’s mission, profile and ambition, output indicators, academic and societal results, administrative context, a SWOT analysis, details on PhD policy, diversity, research integrity ethics, and research data management. Additional information was accessible on a restricted website. The Committee also received the SEP and Terms of Reference for the assessment.

1.5 Procedures followed by the Committee

Before the visit, Committee members were asked to read the self-evaluation report and send their preliminary findings on the Institute prior to the site visit, as input for the closed preparatory meeting on the evening before the visit.
During the site visit (for the programme, see Appendix 2), the Committee members were welcomed by the Rector Magnificus of Radboud University. They met with the Dean of the Faculty, the HLCS Director, the Principal Investigators (PI) of the theme groups, the post-docs and assistant professors of the Institute. They additionally met with a select group of PhD students of HLCS, the heads of the research schools and the Center for Parliamentary History, the PhD coordinator of the graduate school, and selected societal partners. To view manifestations of the Institute’s work, the Committee visited the new exposition ‘Ik, Maria van Gelre’ at the Valkhof Museum as well as the Humanities Lab. Between the interviews, time was available to the Committee to discuss its various findings. At the end of the visit, the Chair presented the main preliminary conclusions to the staff of HLCS and the Faculty Board; the President of Radboud University also attended this meeting.

After the site visit, the evaluation report was written, structured by a customised template provided by Radboud University. When all Committee members had included their additions and comments, a final version was drawn up and sent to HLCS for a check on factual errors. Finally, the report was delivered to the Executive Board of Radboud University.

1.6 Criteria and Assessment Scale

The Protocol requires the Evaluation Committee to assess the research on three main criteria of the Standard Evaluation Protocol:

- Research Quality (the level of the research conducted)
- Societal relevance (social, economic and cultural relevance of the research)
- Viability (strategy, governance and leadership)

The qualitative assessments are supplemented by assigning discrete categories (1-4): Excellent (1); Very good (2); Good (3); Unsatisfactory (4). The meaning of the categories in this four-point scale used in the assessment is described in the Standard Evaluation Protocol (see Appendix 4).
2 Assessment of the Institute for Historical, Literary and Cultural studies

Director of the Institute: Prof. Olivier Hekster
Academic staff in 2017: 76.4 fte
Assessment:
- Research Quality: 2
- Societal Relevance: 1
- Viability: 2

2.1 Mission and strategy of the Institute

The mission of the Radboud Institute for Historical, Literary and Cultural Studies (HLCS) is to make a significant contribution to the understanding of the changing place of Europe in the world, and to the changing world of which Europe forms a part. Two main questions that target the key societal issues of European contemporary humanities research of HLCS, are:

- How and under what conditions do different kinds of loyalties, communities and categories of people emerge and disappear in a changing Europe?
- What do art and creativity mean for people and society in a changing Europe?

In order to tackle these shared questions, researchers work in twelve multidisciplinary thematic areas (‘research groups’), which are understood by the Institute as ‘bottom-up’ initiatives. Though only one primary affiliation is allowed, many of the Institute’s scholars additionally belong to another.

The Committee perceived that the two overarching questions operate well as levers for the research and discussions within the HCLS. The extrapolation of the two questions within the various research groups was indeed a well-considered outcome of a combination of top-down and bottom-up efforts. The self-assessment report itself had raised some hesitation about the degree to which ‘Europe’ should serve as a shared research focus, stemming from a concern by some members that ‘Europe’ might be thought too parochial in a globalised world. The Committee noticed, not very surprisingly, some variation across the research groups in just how central these questions in practice actually are. At the same time, all parties within the Institute seem to agree on the importance of sharing the kinds of questions now posed by the Institute, and the current vision of HCLS on this score does not seem seriously contested.
The Committee noted the common sense of purpose that at the same time included sufficient freedom for individual creativity and productivity. The Committee also observed that there appeared to be effective multi-disciplinary communication within the research groups and contributions to the Institute’s research. Research group cohesion seems in general strong and a good balance is maintained between focus and breadth. Although there was clearly lively dialogue within research groups and many examples of productive collaboration between them, the Committee saw less evidence of sustained and systematic conversation across research groups.

Though understated in the written self-evaluation, the Institute’s strategy of the past six years was clarified to the Committee during the site visit: Seeking big grants, reorganising research groups, and investing in societal relevance. The Committee concluded that this strategy has been successful.

2.2 Research Quality

2.2.1. Scientific relevance and academic reputation

The Committee took note of HLCS’ reported research highlights. It has, for example, won substantial grants such as a Gravitation grant, two VICI grants, eight VENI grants and an ERC Consolidator grant. The Institute’s academic reputation is confirmed by the fact that a limited number of HLCS members have secured a significantly higher number of grants and prizes during the period under review. Many of its members spent a good deal of time in editorial work for journals and in monograph series.

The HLCS leadership has taken clear and systematic measures to increase the overall international standing and recognition of the Institute. There has been an increase in the number of incoming staff from other institutions and a modest increase of PhD candidates from other countries seeking to work at the HCLS. Still, international recognition continues to rest to a considerable extent on individual ‘flagship’ scholars. Broadening this recognition may depend on expanding the Institute’s reputation through more international relationships which, if already promising, still seems to be in an incipient phase.

The Committee noted that the number of publications has fallen throughout the reporting period. While the refereed articles remained stable (n=118 in 2012 and n=116 in 2017), the number of professional publications and publications aimed at the general public decreased (n=216 and n= 154 in 2012 and n=181 and n=142 in 2017). This seems to suggest a deliberate policy toward a greater emphasis on ‘quality’ though this possibly may be in tension
with ‘relevance’. The Committee took note of a high percentage of publications with prestigious international university presses, though this was not particularly easy to confirm. The Committee felt a bit impaired in assessing the publications as only an alphabetical and undifferentiated list of publications was available on the surdrive. Division by type of publication (monograph, type of journal, etc.) would have been more helpful in determining the range and quality of the corpus produced, possibly also with a number tag to indicate research group.

The Committee concluded that there were several outstanding publications, and that these are the work of a few individuals. A few were collaborative volumes which reflect the success of the research group collaboration, though more, given the emphasis in the self-assessment on collaborative research, might be expected in future. The record also shows that the greater majority of researchers in the Institute are actively engaged in their field and with very few exceptions meet the publication requirements of the Institute. The groups may well have served to enhance the quality of the published work, but this still needs to be reflected more obviously in the quality of the publications overall.

The Committee discussed HLCS’s publication strategy and noted that it published approximately 70% refereed and 30% non-refereed academic articles. An impressive number of articles is written in French, German, Italian and Spanish. The Committee appreciates the deliberate choice to publish in multiple languages.

Lastly, the Committee was impressed with the emerging visiting fellows programme and the distinguished scholars it has been able to attract. Though the profile of its scholars might be broadened to diversify the Institute (see recommendations below).

2.2.2 Research infrastructure and facilities

HLCS has a Research Office consisting of a policy adviser, a PhD coordinator, two grant advisers, and a secretary. The Research Office supports the research staff in obtaining grant funding, administering output, and by organising overarching research group events. The Committee was impressed with this Research Office; the infrastructure for supporting research appears to be very effective.

During the site visit, the Committee received a facilities tour to the Humanities Lab. This lab offers experimental and computer facilities. The Committee was very impressed with the support offered by the Digital Humanities Lab and the mixture of the technical knowledge and those who understood the purpose and substance of the research materials and research
questions. Lab personnel actively assist in the organisation of data sets and make the research groups aware of the potential of the digital humanities.

According to the self-assessment report, the University Library provides services and products that support research needs, such as a sufficient critical mass of academic information. However, when asked about library facilities those to whom the Committee spoke said they went to Amsterdam or Leiden for specialist materials.

2.2.3 Organisation

HLCS is one of the two research institutes at the Radboud University Faculty of Arts, the other being the Centre of Language Studies (CLS). At this moment, the Institute comprises twelve research groups:

- The Ancient World
- Categories Contested
- Creativity, Object, Materiality, and Practice of Art in Society (COMPAS)
- Cultures of War and Liberation
- Memory, Materiality and Affect
- Radboud Group for Historical Demography and Family History
- Repertoires of Representation
- Representations of the City
- The Seventies
- Studying Cultural infrastructure and Reception Across Borders (SCARAB)
- Tourism, Travel and Text
- Transnational Europe

The research groups have targets for two years, are regularly evaluated and, if necessary, groups change.

The Committee finds that the group organisation of the Institute, with its bottom-up support, does enhance research quality, promote research focus, and foster dialogue among junior and senior faculty and across disciplines. It was pleased to see much evidence of flexibility internally to merge, cease, or to form other more productive themes. However, it thinks twelve groups are on the outer limit of what is productive and manageable. The Committee appreciates the value of intimate discussion, but there is a danger of a loss of institutional identity or coherence if there are too many small groups. Small groups are also more vulnerable to illness, unavoidable absence due to administrative obligations and conferences etc, or research leave, potentially undermining their effectiveness.
Although the reorganisation in 2016 changed a former more conventional structure, the Committee believes that there would be benefit in even greater dynamism in the group structures and themes, to avoid the danger of a rigid archipelagic formation. It should seek instead to foster cross-group communication. In due course this might facilitate cross-faculty conversation with the sciences (on such topics as a Healthy Society and Water and Sustainability). Stability, to be sure, can be as important as flexibility, and it is important that each research group finds a balance between the two. But if the laudable ambition of the Institute to cross-pollinate is to bear more fruit, greater levels of collaboration may be necessary between and beyond the research groups.

### 2.2.4 Resources

#### Human resources

Appendix 3, table 1 shows that the total volume of research staff of HLCS including CPG has decreased slightly from 95.44 FTE to 84.42 FTE during the reporting period. While the number of academic staff and post-docs remained stable, (scientific staff n=109 and postdocs n=27 in 2012 and n=108 and n=30 in 2017), the number of PhD students has decreased (n=61 in 2012 and n=51 in 2017). This decline is due to heightened Graduate School monitoring which struck inactives from the list of PhD candidates more quickly than before in its efforts to bolster better supervision and on-time completion. It might be added that some of those interviewed, including but not restricted to the Posthumus Research School, worried about the critical mass of students and staff for future research projects (see below on viability and on the research schools). This may, then, threaten the future quality of the Institute.

#### Research funds

Income from competitive funding sources (NWO, ERC, EU), as the committee has noted, can rightly be seen as an indicator for the scientific quality of the research. HLCS relies half on direct university funding (covering 62% of its academic staff costs in 2017), while research grants account for a modest portion of the annual budget (18% in 2017). In absolute terms external funding has increased since the previous review period, which is impressive. In 2012-2017, the average was 35.38 FTE compared with 26.42 FTE in the period 2002-2011. A detailed overview of HLCS’s funding sources can be found in Appendix 3, table 2).

All in all, the Institute has improved noticeably in the last period, particularly with respect to its internal organisation and external grant-winning. Its scholarship across the board is of high quality, and in a few cases is exceptional.
2.3 Societal relevance

Compared to the previous review period, HLCS has substantially increased its focus on societal impact. It has appointed an impact officer to coordinate the efforts and to act as ambassador. An explicit aim of HLCS is to inspire a wider audience outside academia, both in the world’s media and at a national and regional level. To achieve this, it has selected three focus partners: museums, municipal and regional agencies, and secondary schools. Examples of projects in these target groups include the collaboration with a museum in the Hieronymus Bosch exhibition, the collaboration with stakeholders in the region in the project on war heritage in the province of Gelderland and the collaboration with secondary schools through the Pre-University College (PUC) for Humanities.

During the site visit, the Committee met a selection of societal partners of HLCS. It noted that HLCS was clearly a strongly appreciated entity as an Institute as far as the societal partners were concerned. They clearly valued the links with HLCS and all spoke warmly about the real added value of the shared work and projects. The Committee was impressed that important stakeholders are also approaching the HLCS staff with a problem or challenge rather than the initiative coming solely from the HLCS.

The Committee is very impressed with the efforts made to facilitate all kinds of one off and more structured commitments to societal partners, from exhibitions and websites to primary and secondary school teaching and learning experiences. In the Committee’s opinion, the Institute has responded very positively and with full commitment across all the research groups to meet the rising demand by society (and accreditation standards) for the relevance of its scholarly activity.

Although the Institute is well ahead of most research organisations in its approach to societal relevance, the Committee could not always determine how structured and sustained these relations are or will be in the future, or to what extent they will be expanded. In part that is because some activities, such as museum exhibits, sometimes offer only occasional and inevitably short-term opportunities. Nevertheless, a greater degree of documentation of structured and incidental activity and the possible impact would have been helpful.

During the site visit, the Committee learned that researchers are given the possibility to focus more on impact instead of scientific results; this seems to depend on each research group. Sometimes, as with the leadership of the Institute, the emphasis lies on the intrinsic integration of ‘quality’ and ‘relevance’. For other members of the Institute, the intellectual and academic quality of research and its social relevance were not necessarily compatible. The Committee appreciates the new emphasis on societal relevance but wonders whether the
Institute itself should take particular achievements in societal relevance into account when considering cases for promotion. Given its new commitment to relevance, it would seem a logical step.

In summary, the Committee discerns a new strong and uncommon commitment to societal relevance, and is prepared to give the Institute the highest mark for both effort and results. Full justification for this mark will depend on how this is further developed. The Institute demonstrably must consolidate its notable achievements in societal relevance. Sustained partnerships and processes must be promoted vigorously and its impact documented.

2.4 Viability

The Committee believes that viability of the Institute to be fairly secure. As noted above, steady signs of quality improvement could be observed across the review period; it has had very marked success in grant winning, it is securing added societal partnerships and it is fostering synergy and dialogue internally.

The Committee recognises that there are external challenges to some areas of viability due to the low numbers embarking on research degrees (as masters or PhD level, insufficient funding or budget allocation). Some aspects of a smaller Institute like HLCS may understandably be more vulnerable to such university and national changes than a larger Institute might be. For example, the success in grant-winning such as the OIKOS Gravitation grant and such events as the Bosch exhibition rightly raise questions about the extent to which this can be sustained in the future. As the Institute stated in its self-assessment report, there is increased competition on the limited number of institutions that offer grants and awards. The Committee appreciates the response of the Institute to increase the attempts to collaborate across faculty levels to enhance its national and international position in subsequent years.

One of the weaknesses stated in the self-evaluation report is the lack of career prospects for researchers at all levels, from starting PhD’s to UD’s having served many years. The Committee is heartened by the HLCS’s willingness to invest in small grants and inspiration breaks to encourage its faculty to make progress with their research. This indeed is an important element in keeping professionals engaged and raising their morale. It noted that the self-evaluation report makes reference to the importance of flowers as a currency of appreciation but the Institute should think about further ways of rewarding individuals and groups and of trying to give extra support or intervention to help those who might be having greater difficulties. The well-being of all members of staff requires systematic attention. The
HLCS will need to remain mindful of how it retains not only horizontal but also vertical forms of professional development in a context where lack of promotion opportunities for junior staff might generate disaffection in the long run. The Committee appreciates such decisions are partly taken elsewhere and not within the Institute’s control.

From 2012 onwards, the Faculty has increased the guaranteed research time (60% teaching time: 40% research time for professors and associate lecturers; 70% teaching time: 30% research time for assistant lecturers). The Committee is of the opinion that the research time could be enhanced. It realises that the Institute cannot grant all the research time it would wish to each of its members. However, an unequal distribution between junior and senior scholars may raise the question of the pressure and work load on more junior scholars, precisely at a career phase when scholarly achievement is most crucial. In addition, research-led teaching for the more advanced undergraduates and Masters’ courses should also be encouraged as a way to promote both efficiency and curricular innovation. Moreover, a more compressed university schedule might be one way of making time for more research. The long academic semesters may be having a deleterious impact on the time available for research.

The self-evaluation report states that HLCS has the ambition further to improve its institutional reputation. To achieve this, it aims to strengthen further its strategic bonds with the local, regional and international academic and non-academic world. The Committee noted that this future ambition seems rather underarticulated. In its meeting with the Committee the leadership of HCLS more explicitly set out a future strategy for reasserting the humanities in wider university and societal discussions. It further indicated the importance of international cooperation and research-led teaching as strategies for the future, although such strategies must necessarily be flexible given future contingencies. In the opinion of the Committee, it is important that, despite the uncertainties, the HLCS ought to think hard about how to promote its own future and safeguard the disciplinary integrity of the various disciplines represented among the research projects within the Institute.

With the reorganisation of the research groups in 2016, the Institute has essentially grown out of three distinct discipline-based groups it had been in 2012 and has become a more cohesive entity. The next challenge is to recognise that new cohesive identity and translate it into increased visibility nationally and internationally. As the Committee noted during the site visit, increased visibility already exists in the minds of the societal partners, perhaps even more than is felt internally within HLCS.
Last but not least, the Committee was impressed with both the energy and organisational ability of the leadership team. It has been able to encourage improvement and generate a genuine sense of intellectual vibrancy. It has attempted to be supportive of its faculty and to give its members room to thrive, even as it has encouraged them to excel. The Committee found no evidence during its visit of structural alienation among staff from the Institute. The stated accessibility of the leadership is admirable, although the Committee notes that an ‘open door’ approach may be too passive for everyone to feel heard. More proactive policy may be necessary.

HLCS has done a commendable job, in summary, in meeting the challenges it has faced by effectively competing externally and tending to its own internal organisation. It has shown that a relatively small research Institute can thrive within the limits imposed upon it. The distinct possibility of even smaller margins requires, of course, that the Institute continue to develop strategies to maintain this, and to identify resources to make this possible.

2.5 PhD programmes, training and supervision

In the period 2009 – 2013 a total of 57 PhD students enrolled in HLCS. Of 57 started projects, 8 projects (14%) were completed in 4 years, 14 projects (25%) were completed in 5 years, 4 projects (7%) were completed in 6 years and 4 projects (7%) were completed in 7 years. Another 23 projects (40%) were still pending by the end of 2017 and 3 projects stopped (see also Appendix 3, table 4).

The Committee noted that there is no clear policy with regard to applications. Most appointments result from what appears to be an informal network. This is not necessarily bad but does raise questions about the diversity of the candidate pool and thus also about the structural intent of HLCS to diversity itself.

The Graduate School for the Humanities (GSH) is responsible for HLCS’s PhD programme. It plays a role in the training and supervision plans (TSPs), the monitoring of progress and wellbeing of PhD candidates, and in facilitating the participation of PhD candidates in local, national and international research education activities. While PhD supervision devolves to the supervisor, the GSH does monitor the supervisory situation and plays a key role in annual evaluations and supervision training.

At the start of the appointment of PhD students, a training and supervision plan (TSP) is drawn up, which contains details of the composition of the supervision team, an outline of the research project, a planning of the research project and a list of training activities to be undertaken by the PhD candidate. A progress report is to be handed in with the Research
Office after 6 months, after 11 months, and every year after that (after 24, 36, and if necessary 48 months). A meeting takes place after 6 months between the PhD candidate and the coordinator, with the first progress report as a starting point. This meeting focuses on supervision and the candidate’s working environment, but the candidate’s career plans will also be discussed. The Committee concluded that the internal organisation of the PhD Graduate School of Humanities (GSH) is sound and constructive. The Graduate School is functioning well with very committed staff. The above arrangements, though, remain vulnerable to the allegedly lax supervision of “old school” supervisors, to inconsistent follow-up of progress reports and to the perfectionist impulses of doctoral students heightened by the fear of not being able to compete for post-doctoral awards or jobs.

The Committee interviewed current PhD students in various stages of development of their PhD research about their supervision, research facilities and possible constraints on their research. The Committee was pleased with the quality and enthusiasm of the students they met. The students the Committee spoke with during the site visit were positive about the training opportunities provided. They appreciated the range of Graduate School and Research School courses to which they had access. The Committee noted that the students are offered a number of options but it was not clear that it was always what they needed. Some obvious elements are taught in Research Masters courses but PhD students, especially those coming from abroad might not have benefitted from what might be needed by its research students, not least in training such specific technical skills as palaeography and the more generally applicable research tools such as digital humanities.

Based upon numbers in the self-evaluation report the time for completing a PhD thesis appears to be too long. The Committee was pleased to note that a number of measures have been taken during the review period to improve these submission rates, including the creation of the GSH and active monitoring. The Committee commended these initiatives, but recommends the Institute to keep monitoring completion rates and, if necessary, to take further measures to increase the numbers of postgraduates completing their PhD within four years (see recommendations below).

Of the PhD graduates roughly 50% is continuing in academic research and teaching posts after their PhD. In the Committee’s estimation, this is a very creditable record.

2.6 Policy on academic integrity

HLCS conforms to the Radboud University policy with respect to research integrity issues. In addition, HLCS has invested in the founding of the Ethics Assessment Committee for the Humanities (EACH) and is involved in a faculty research data management plan built on FAIR
principles implemented at central university level. The GSH teaches two mandatory courses for PhD students: scientific integrity and research data management. The Committee is pleased with the processes in place for ensuring research integrity, and that the faculty is well aware of the ethical dimensions of scholarship. The Institute seems highly professional in its programming, policies on data storage, attitudes and culture of openness.

2.7 Diversity
The self-assessment report states that HLCS employs 63 women and 95 men. The percentage of men is also higher among tenured staff (about 64%). It notes that the number of women in its ranks, if not yet attaining gender parity, compares favourably to its peer institutes. The Institute has members of staff from nine European countries and from Russia, Canada and The United States. The modest internationalisation of staff is the tangible sign of change toward a more varied community.

The Committee is convinced that HLCS recognises the importance of diversity as it eloquently articulates, and notes the relatively high number of women working at the Institute, including in the higher ranks. However, there appear to be no structural commitments or concrete policies to advancing diversity. This was the only area subject to the Committee’s review where the Institute seemed at something of a loss; the self-evaluation report chiefly articulated a broad set of good intentions. It might help as a start to define what kinds of diversity the institute finds most important – such as heightening the accessibility of the economically underprivileged as the Radboud University historically has done – rather than merely offering blanket statements of support for diversity of all kinds. It is entirely possible that such efforts to promote diversity will be difficult to crown with immediate success. But modest initiatives and experiments do not seem too much to ask and may even be helpful in having the Institute think about its long-term viability, for example, in defining future research or in new recruitment practices.
3 Recommendations regarding HLCS

3.1 The quality of the Research Institute as a whole

The Committee is convinced, as noted above, that the Institute has made a number of important steps in the past six years. It also sees little by way of structural problems that stand in the way of a strong future. Most of its recommendations, then, aim to help HCLS expand upon and consolidate its recent gains.

3.1.1 External Positioning

Change the Institute’s name. Now that HCLS is no longer merely the sum of its historically constituent parts, it is time to think of an appealing collective ‘brand’ – including a new name – that is at once more memorable and more representative of the Institute’s interdisciplinary identity. Though it may seem merely cosmetic, name assertion allows outsiders to better recognise the quality present in an Institute like this one more clearly. It additionally is important to the Institute’s continuing viability and ought to encourage faculty to identify with the Institute. Very few within the Institute actually mention HCLS in their publications, itself a pattern that merits correction. A stronger common identity advanced by the leadership and shared by everyone, could help make the Institute more visible.

Focus on Europe. The Institute should more boldly advance Europe as its research focus, shedding its current bashfulness and hesitancy. This is where the vast bulk of the research strengths of the Institute lie, and its smallness necessitates clear profile choices. The Committee is confident that the Institute members understand Europe in ways both open and critical, alert to its many complexities and to its contested pasts, and in ways that include interactions with other parts of the globe. The diachronic scope of HLCS, from the ancient world to the present, also offers good ways to make the most of the theme. Seizing upon this focus may make for more internal synergy and external cooperation, even as this focus is pragmatically applied so as not to restrict unnecessarily the work of some HLCS faculty.

Advance the humanities. One strategy of HLCS not fully discussed in the written report is the plan to cooperate with other faculties so that the humanities more fully can be part of a larger research agenda of Radboud University (and beyond). The theme of ‘healthy society’ is indeed a good initiative that deserves replication. This will obviously require the support of the Executive Board of the university and other faculties, but with interdisciplinary and interfaculty cooperation becoming increasingly important it is vital that HLCS be prepared to participate in
a sustained way. In doing so it must demonstrate the centrality of the humanities in university research.

**Develop international partnerships.** The self-evaluation report mentions several universities abroad with which HLCS aspires to collaborate with more intensively. The HLCS should now attempt to do through the development of joint research programmes, exchanges or possibly (with the help of other agents) joint degrees where feasible. Such forms of cooperation can be important to expand the boundaries of a relatively small research Institute.

**Systematise and document relationships with societal partners.** HLCS has shown real initiative with respect to expanding its societal relevance in several well-considered areas. It should now make these relationships more systematic and durable, finding ways where possible to enlarge them. It can take additional further steps towards the documentation of the societal impact of these relationships. In the opinion of the Committee, documentation is important, for example by qualitative impact case stories of the difference a particular contact has made. The Committee wishes to stress that documenting societal impact is not the same as measuring the number of people visiting an exhibition or looking at a website. Documentation is a good way to make visible the activities that have been undertaken, just as it facilitates strategic planning of future initiatives.

### 3.1.2 Internal Changes

**Further collaborate among the research groups.** It is important that each researcher get the time and space to conduct research in her or his own field, and it is good that the research groups allow for this. At the same time, it is important that these research groups do not remain islands and that they continue to probe the possibility of new research with each other. This can be done more systematically than seems to be the case at present.

**Ensure well-being and professional development of staff.** Including new promotion criteria. HLCS now does a good job of recognizing achievement and of giving a wide range of scholars the opportunities to recharge themselves intellectually. This must be maintained, and if at all possible, expanded. The workload of junior staff in particular needs to be carefully monitored and reduced where possible, in conjunction with the HR and educational wings of the faculty. A more explicit well-being policy might be desirable. Additionally, scholars doing excellent work in societal relevance should be given greater recognition in relation to promotion. This the HCLS can hardly do alone, but its commitment to such promotions, as the logical outcome of its commitment to relevance, would be an important first step.
Maintain your balanced proportion of senior and more junior researchers
The Committee was pleased to note the community of older and younger scholars within the Institute who appeared to cooperate well and appreciate what each had to offer. It hopes that this healthy balance can be maintained. The ‘top-down’ and ‘bottom-up’ approaches each are needed to direct and motivate the research community. Keeping the balance, though, will depend offering enough opportunities for younger staff (see above).

Increase research-led teaching but this should not diminish the theme-oriented work (in research as well as in teaching, for there are also plans to introduce theme-led teaching at bachelor level, as a bridge to supra-faculty approaches). Each should be compatible, provided the themes in question are clearly related to the (thematically organised) research groups. At least as important however is the fact that both research-led and theme-oriented teaching should not prevent the maintenance of solid disciplinary training at all levels. Two dangers are to be avoided: early specialization and lack of disciplinary foundations.

Maintain an appropriately diverse language policy – Although the extent to which English is used for post-graduate teaching and research publications is impressive, it is also important that Dutch be maintained. International students and staff from elsewhere should not only be encouraged to learn Dutch but provision should be made for teaching them. Dutch in any case has obvious value with respect to societal relevance.

Hone a more strategically-minded publication strategy. Members of the Institute should continue to aim for the most prestigious university and academic presses and leading journals. They should at the same time choose publication strategies that maximize contacts with identified publics, including both ‘traditional’ forms such as museum catalogues as well as unconventional ‘publications’ that promote active engagement with these publics (e.g., some form of Open Science). The Committee thus recommends a ‘both-and’ approach that requires strategic choices in publishing. In line with recent trends at the Institute, it means less ‘opportunistic’ publishing (i.e., publishing wherever one finds the chance), and more emphasis on relatively few ‘high-end’ publications combined with publications (and accompanying activities) that are most likely to engage the public. Ideally, funded research projects already contain both elements, but the Institute’s research groups may have to strike their own particular balance between these two emphases.

3.2 The Institute’s PhD programme

Improve the completion rate. The Institute clearly takes seriously the need to improve the quality of its programme for PhD students, and has already made significant strides. The
Institute should still find ways to raise the on-time completion rate of its doctoral students. Short progress reports every six months, with follow-up by the head of the research school (and not just the supervisor), is one concrete way to monitor more intensively this important process. The training of supervisors could also be further systematized so as to include all of them.

**Further develop the educational programme of PhD students.** Although an impressively large share of its graduates finds (temporary) university positions, it is important that the Institute offers more programmes for careers outside the academy. The Institute might also wish to offer a more focused programme to its students, moving from a wide 'nice to have' set of options to a more useful 'need to have' programming, relying always on the external research schools for more specialised courses.

### 3.3 The Institute’s research integrity

**Monitor integrity issues.** The plans in place seem to provide a good basis to prevent problems and maintain research at the highest ethical and professional standards. At the same time, it will be useful to assess over the next period of evaluation which ethical issues most frequently are articulated by researchers and to reflect about how these have or should be addressed.

### 3.4 The Institute’s diversity

**Develop a diversity policy.** HLCS can be and should be more active on this front. This should not result in a grand but unrealistic plan but it should think of more modest projects. Systematic leadership training in detecting biases in the academic culture of HLCS may be a good start. A very different kind of suggestion is to choose visiting scholars from time to time on the basis of advancing this theme, or developing exchange programmes with institutions that can help the HOLS with diversity. New research projects, possibly in conjunction with other Radboud partners, might take up this theme more centrally. Recruiting and selecting of PhD students, postdocs and faculty might more forcefully be articulated so as to promote diversity. Now is the time to experiment with policies to see which directions work best for the Institute.
4. Assessments of research schools and Centre for Parliamentary History

4.1 OIKOS

Leader: Prof. dr. André Lardinois (RU)

The mission of OIKOS is to promote and coordinate all research, both specialist and interdisciplinary, in the field of Greco-Roman antiquity in the Netherlands and at participating universities in Belgium (UGent), and to provide first-class academic teaching to MPhil (in the Netherlands known as “research master”) and PhD students.

The Committee is of the opinion that OIKOS amply fulfils its mission and goals. The number of staff and students give clear evidence that it has the size to constitute an academic community (53 registered PhDs and 105 research master students). The Committee was impressed by the activities enabling students to learn from some of the best researchers outside their own universities. OIKOS offers a broad range of challenging and innovative classes, seminars and workshops that play an important role in the training of PhD students needed in order to study the ancient world and the reception of antiquity on a scholarly level. An individual university could not provide this support in a comparable way on its own.

OIKOS is structured into six research groups:

1) Language of Literature, concentrating on the study of linguistic means to signpost the structure of Greek and Latin texts and mark the cohesion between segments of the text.
2) Hellenistic and Imperial Literature, focusing on Greek and Latin poetry and prose of the Hellenistic period and the Roman Empire.
3) Sacred and Profane in Ancient Greece, studying the literature, culture and religion of Archaic and Classical Greece.
4) Impact of Empire, looking at the interaction between state policy, culture and society under the Roman Empire.
5) Ancient Philosophy, focusing on the interpretation of philosophical texts.
6) Classical Receptions and Traditions, studying the various ways in which later times have interacted with antiquity.

The aim of these research groups is to bring junior and senior members with similar interests together through several activities such as expert meetings and conferences. The OIKOS
research groups are restructured in 2018 to align better with the research interests of the members. The Committee appreciates the bottom-up process in which the new groups have been selected.

In 2017, the OIKOS research programme Anchoring Innovation was awarded a Gravitation grant. The Committee confirmed that OIKOS has had outstanding success in the form of this grant. It has been a boon to HCLS as well, through the collaborative efforts of its members to heighten research activities in Nijmegen. The grant offers high quality programming that serves its students well, as the latter themselves confirmed.

As stated in the self-assessment document, the NWP and participating institutions agreed that teachers in the OIKOS courses are supposed to be compensated for their work at the local level, but this does not always happen. Many senior members fulfill important tasks for the NWP without any form of local compensation. The Committee encourages the OIKOS to raise this concern with the local institutes.

4.2 Posthumus
Leader: Prof. dr. Angélique Janssens

The mission of the N.W. Posthumus Institute (NWP) is as follows:

- creating a joint community of Dutch and Flemish scholars in which academic excellence is fostered and in which all scholars, both junior and senior, can grow to achieve high academic potential;
- educating the next generation of economic and social historians by offering high-level courses for Research Master students (equivalent to MPhil) and PhD students;
- promoting innovative and advanced interdisciplinary research in economic and social history by bringing together junior and senior scholars in joint research networks.

The Committee believes that the NWP provides not only an excellent instrument to boost the overall research quality of the PhD programme of a participating university, but also a great opportunity for the networking between senior economic and social historians from all over the Netherlands through the interaction of the various faculty members, who are involved as lecturers in this schools. From the Committee’s interaction with staff and PhD students during the site visit, it is clear that this school plays a very positive role in training PhD students on selected topics and in facilitating collaboration between research units across the Netherlands.
and Belgium. The NWP has a vibrant programme with Dutch and Flemish traditions strongly embedded in the Radboud University because of the demographic research.

However, the NWP remains vulnerable to low numbers of students coming into the programme or entering PhD programmes from other subjects (such as economics and sociology). A continued recruitment of master students in the field of Economic and Social History will be very important. There is also the potential for collaboration or at least communication with similar research concentrations elsewhere such as Germany (e.g. Münster and Bielefeld) or Britain (e.g. the Cambridge Group for the History of Population and Social Structure). The self-reported decline of an historical awareness and interest within Posthumus, even from students coming in from history, is a challenge. The Committee agrees that this threatens to undermine their mission to generate historically-minded scholars.

As stated in the self-evaluation document, the NWP and participating institutions agreed that teachers in the NWP courses are supposed to be compensated for their work at the local level, but this does not always happen. Many senior members fulfil important tasks for the NWP without any form of local compensation. The Committee encourages the NWP to raise this concern with the local Institutes.

4.3 Centre for Parliamentary History (CPG)
Leader: Prof. dr. Carla van Baalen

Alongside the thematic groups, the Faculty of Arts houses the separately funded Centre for Parliamentary History (CPG) which focuses on the post-war parliamentary history of the Netherlands. The CPG participates in HLCS and its researchers participate in the thematic groups. The key task of the CPG consists of conducting research into the parliamentary history of the Netherlands, particularly after 1945, and of publishing its results. The core publications of the CPG are the monographs, entitled Parlementaire geschiedenis van Nederland na 1945 (Parliamentary History of the Netherlands since 1945), of which nine volumes have appeared thus far, the Jaarboek Parlementaire Geschiedenis (Yearbook Parliamentary History) (since 1999), as well as studies about the characteristic Dutch political phenomenon of coalition formation. The CPG's meticulous studies of cabinet formations as well its other research forays – such as its historical investigation into royal income – is appreciated widely in political circles in The Hague. Its publications routinely receive extensive media attention and enjoy public interest, showing that the CPG has significant societal impact.
Lately, CPG’s research approach has changed, resulting in volumes comprising decades instead of consecutive cabinets. This allows for a broadening of the research questions and makes it easier to connect to the state-of-the-art in academia. The Committee appreciates this change, but the Committee noted that CPG board structure appears to hinder any expansion of their intellectual agenda. In its opinion, the group is unable to navigate or initiate change effectively. Links, both longitudinal (chronological) and comparative across Europe, should be strengthened in order better to fulfil its obligations to conduct Dutch parliamentary history. Seen this way, the CPG could well benefit from being more fully integrated into the Institute, allowing it to forge new ideas and new networks.
5. **Response of the institute**

In November 2018 the Institute for Historical, Literary and Cultural Studies (HLCS) was officially evaluated. In the resulting visitation report the evaluation committee turned out to be very positive about the progress that was made during the past six years. According to the criteria of the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP), the institute scored the maximum of 1 (excellent) on societal relevance, and twice a 2 (very good) on both research quality and viability. Although all people responsible for the management of HLCS are very pleased and content with the outcome, we are also aiming to take our institute to the next level by implementing the committee’s recommendations. We discuss these below, following the committee’s sequence.

**External positioning**

*Change the Institute’s name*

Although all members are attached to the familiar name of HLCS, we agree with the committee’s suggestion to choose a name that better reflects the institute’s interdisciplinary nature as well as adding to its visibility and recognisability. We plan to launch a new name at the institute’s biannual conference in the fall of 2019, accompanied by a communicative rebranding campaign.

*Focus on Europe*

We support the recommendation to sharpen our research focus on Europe. As an institute, we will stimulate and support initiatives that aim to reconceptualize Europe’s complexities, its contestations, and interactions with other parts of the world. These include international cooperation, peer-reviewed volumes, organisation of conferences.

One concretisation is the theme selection of our biannual conference. A case in point is the theme of the 2019 edition; *Is Europe inclusive? Politics, discourses and practices*. It challenges the idealized Eurocentric perspective that upholds the pre-eminence of Europe and seeks instead to bring together critical perspectives on...
European practices and discourses of inclusion and exclusion, both past and present. We also plan to prolong the biannual Frans Timmermans-lecture that explicitly focuses on Europe and will be held on the eve of the conference.

Furthermore, the focus on Europe will continue to part of our selection criteria regarding PhD-projects and hiring new staff who have research time.

*Advance the humanities via interdisciplinary and interfaculty cooperation*

Next to offering active support for individual grant applications, we consider participation of our researchers in interfaculty and interdisciplinary cooperation as an important goal to increase the visibility of our institute and the advancement of the humanities at large. Hiring a new valorisation officer has been a first step that, together with active promotion during PI meetings, has already resulted in a successful application for the Dutch National Research Agenda, Research along routes by Consortia (NWA-ORC) in 2019, and several new applications. Our researchers are also actively applying for grants within our university’s new interfaculty cooperation project and are participating in existing interfaculty projects like Healthy Society, the Radboud University Network on Migrant Inclusion (RUNOMI), and the Nijmeegse Kennisagenda Sport en Bewegen. There, our researchers actively represent humanities as an indispensable disciplinary asset. As an institute, we plan to further support such collaborative initiatives as a step in working towards applications for EU Framework Programmes.

*Develop international partnerships*

International partnerships are already existing and flourishing, yet we plan stimulate such cooperation more intensively. We stimulate and support the organisation of international conferences that can be the start of larger international cooperation. Concretely, we plan to ask all of our researchers to list those partnerships that are fruitful for theme. Building on that list, we want to establish more lasting cooperation projects and agreements.

In addition, we will continue to attract an international research fellow on a yearly basis, as well as stimulate our researchers to apply for the Radboud
Excellence Professors, as we successfully have done in the past few years. This has proven to be an excellent stimulus for sustainable international cooperation.

Systematise and document relationships with societal partners

We have started to systemise our good relationships with societal partners (museums, schools, festivals, municipal and provincial governments). Some of these partners are already visible on our website ([https://www.ru.nl/hlcs/societal-impact/recent-projects/](https://www.ru.nl/hlcs/societal-impact/recent-projects/)).

It is our goal to both enlarge the number of societal partners because in will enable us to work with these in more types of research (i.e. NWA-ORC projects), and to further document these relationships. In this, our new valorisation officer will play an important role. In addition, we will ask our researchers to document their relationships with societal partners more systematically, both in a quantitative and a qualitative manner.

Internal position

Further collaborate among the research groups.

We want to support the cooperation of research groups whenever researchers indicate that they want to do so. Simultaneously, our researchers have indicated that this should be a bottom-up development that should not be imposed upon them. Therefore, our aim is to keep our research groups flexible and dynamic. The latter includes outreach to other faculties, as is also promoted by the interfaculty cooperation plans.

Ensure well-being and professional development of (junior) staff, including new promotion criteria / address the workload of junior staff

We agree that this is an important point to take into consideration. Next to a continuation of our academic breaks and the support of researchers taking up a sabbatical, we have started more structural improvements. Together with our colleagues of CLS, as of September 1, 2019 we have increased the research time of all our assistant professors from 30% to 35%. In addition, all junior staff members
who have recently finished their dissertation will receive 60% research time till three years after their promotion. Thus, we hope to support the take-off of their academic career and their eligibility in acquiring both national and international research grants. Furthermore, senior researchers will act as their coach.

The extra teaching time resulting from these restructuring measures has led us to hiring new talented assistant professors. These as well as other new researchers (including PhDs) will receive an introductory meeting with the research director. Part of this meeting is receiving comprehensive information about their research tasks and how to systematically record their research output.

Finally, we are developing new performance indicators that are more in line with the SEP protocol (see below). In this way, we hope to increase our international visibility and hone a more strategically-minded publication strategy. We plan to finalise these indicators in 2020 and implement them in 2021.

* Maintain your balanced proportion of senior and more junior researchers*

We are pleased that the committee evaluated our community of older and younger scholars so positively. One of the ways to ensure opportunities for younger staff is granting the newly promoted extra research time, as explained above. Furthermore, we will seek to promote the instalment of tenure and career tracks in dialogue with our faculty board.

* Increase research-led teaching*

We agree with committee’s evaluation, but think that we are already doing this. On the one hand the educational demands make sure that we always need to have enough expertise to meet our core disciplines. On the other our researchers will only obtain permission to apply for external grants if their research plans meet our profile.

In addition, our faculty’s new minor-system that is based on thematic profiles will further strengthen our base of research-led teaching, while our major programme is based on solid disciplinary training at all levels.
Maintain an appropriately diverse language policy

We will continue our diverse language policy and explicitly stimulate our researchers to publish and teach in the language that is appropriate. This includes Dutch.

Publication strategies

We wholeheartedly support the committee’s recommendation to pursue a ‘both-and’ approach. This includes international peer-reviewed articles (see above), prestigious university and academic presses as well as ‘traditional’ forms such as museum catalogues as well as unconventional ‘publications’ that promote active engagement with these publics (e.g., some form of Open Science). Following the criteria of the Quality Indicators for Research in the Humanities (QIRH) we value quality over quantity, which comprises both scholarly and societal quality. This implies an emphasis on relatively few ‘high-end’ publications combined with publications (and accompanying activities) that are most likely to engage the public. We plan to engage with the research groups to develop publication strategies that will meet both goals.

PhD policy

Improve the completion rate of PhDs / Further develop the educational programme of PhD students

As an institute and in collaboration with our partners at the Centre for Language Studies and the Faculty of Philosophy, Theology and Religious Studies, we take this point very seriously and have already initiated several actions.

Firstly, from September 2019 onwards we will intensify the number and the quality of meetings with PhDs and their supervisors monitoring Phd projects. The evaluation at 24 months will be led by one the institute's coordinators (HLCS), who has more instruments to demand adaptations within the planning or the supervisory team. Secondly, the number of meetings between the coordinator of the Graduate School of Humanities (GSH) and the Phd-students will be increased. This will lead to a schedule of meetings at two weeks (GSH), nine months (GSH), fourteen months (the point of go/no go - HLCS), twenty months (GSH), 24 months (HLCS), thirty months (GSH), 36 months (HLCS) 42 months (GSH) and 48 months (GSH). In
addition, together with the GSH coordinator and the supervisors the director of the GSH will systematise the implementation and monitoring of the so-called academic services.

We will increase the quality of the supervisory team in two ways: firstly, by offering a mandatory course for new supervisors at the beginning of their project. Experienced supervisors will be asked to share their best practises. Secondly, our annual meeting of supervisors and PhDs will focus more on the quality of supervision, adequate planning as well as career planning (both within and outside academia). Regarding the latter, we have initiated a LinkedIn-group and will invite our PhDs to join after their promotion. This enables us to follow their career but also inform them about meetings of the current PhD-cohorts to share their experiences.

**Integrity**

To ensure the highest ethical and professional standards integrity issues will be tackled by our ethics committee. In the coming period of evaluation, we will evaluate which ethical issues most frequently are articulated by researchers and reflect about how these have or should be addressed.

**Develop a diversity policy**

In accordance with our university’s policy, we are investing in greater awareness of the social and cultural differences that might affect our research and in the development and implementation of a diversity policy. A systematic gender policy is already part of our recruitment and selection procedures regarding new faculty members, PhD students and postdocs. It is also integral to how we select our annual research fellows and the researchers that we put forward as candidates for academic prizes. We plan to expand this policy by offering systematic leadership training in detecting biases in our academic culture and by subjecting our recruitment procedures to scrutiny. In November 2019, under the title ‘Is Europe Inclusive? Politics, Discourses, and Practices’, our bi-annual HLCS conference will enable us to explore what kinds of diversity we find most important. As a follow-up, we want to invite visiting scholars from time to time on the basis of this theme and develop exchange programmes with institutions that can help advance diversity at the HCLS.
New research projects, possibly in conjunction with other Radboud partners, might take up this theme more centrally.

Posthumus Institute

A final point we would like to make regarding the evaluation report regards the evaluation of the Posthumus Institute. We do not recognize the committee’s evaluation of a decline of historical awareness amongst PhD students in Posthumus, particularly not amongst those coming from history. Regarding PhDs coming in from social sciences, we find that these develop the necessary historical awareness and sensitivity in the course or their Posthumus training and PhD trajectory. Therefore, it can be said that Posthumus functions satisfactorily in this regard.
6. Appendices
Appendix 1
Short Curricula Vitae of the Evaluation Committee members

James Kennedy (chair) is Professor of Modern Dutch History at the Universiteit Utrecht. Since 2015 he is also Dean of University College Utrecht, the university's selective bachelor's programme. Before that he served as Professor of Contemporary History at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (2003-2007) and Professor of Dutch History since the Middle Ages at the Universiteit van Amsterdam (2007-2015), after having taught at several American colleges. In addition to editing special editions of several journals, he is the author of 11 books and editions, and has been the chief applicant of large grants into the history of anticorruption, social inclusion and exclusion, the history of management, church-state relations, euthanasia, and drugs policy. Most of his focus has been on postwar history. He has been on the Board of Oversight in various museums, as well as serving on the board of some the Netherlands’ chief cultural organisations, including the Prince Bernhard Cultural Foundation. He is a regular contributor in the (inter)national media and writes a column in the Dutch national daily Trouw once a fortnight. A Fulbright scholar, he received his education in the United States, graduating from the School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University and receiving a PhD in history from the University of Iowa, in his home state.

Jan Baetens
Jan Baetens is Professor of cultural studies at the University of Leuven (KU Leuven, Belgium). He holds a PhD in Literary Studies (romance philology) from the University of Leuven. He has been teaching for several years at the University of Maastricht (Fac. of Arts), before his appointment in Leuven in 2001. The holder of the Franqui chair 2007-2008 in the field of “Culture and Communication”, he has been serving on various research and teaching assessment committees. In 2012-2013, he chaired the committee for the teaching assessment of all CIW programs (Communicatie & Informatie Wetenschappen) of all Dutch Universities, and in 2019 he will chair the committee for the teaching assessment of all “Arts and Culture” BA and MA programs of all Dutch Universities. He has been member (and eventually vice-chair and chair) of the “Arts and Literature” panel of FWO in the period 2010-2018 as well as member of the SHS3 Panel (Languages and Arts) of the FNRS. He has also served on various assessment rounds of AERES, later ANRES in France and been a frequent evaluator for many national and international research organisations (ERC, Québec, Israel, Portugal, France, Switzerland, Leverhulme UK, etc.). He has widely published on the two fields in which he is doing research: word and image studies (often in so-called “minor” genres such as comics, photo novel, novelizations) and French literature (mostly on poetry and constrained writing). A published poet, he has been the winner of the “prix triennial de poésie

Kirsten Drotner, dr.phil., is professor of media and communication studies at the University of Southern Denmark and founding director of the interdisciplinary research centres DREAM and Our Museum. Her research focuses on audience studies, creative and critical media and information literacies, and digital heritage communication. She has been a research fellow and visiting professor in Canada, Norway, Sweden, UK and the USA and at research institutions such as the Bodleian Library Oxford, UC Berkeley, U of British Columbia, London School of Economics and Political Science and MIT. She is on the editorial boards of leading, international journals in media and cultural studies and is (co-)author and (co-)editor of more than 30 books and over 200 scholarly articles and book chapters. She is an elected fellow of the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, of Academia Europaea and of the International Communication Association as well as recipient of the Association's Applied Research Award.

Rosamond McKitterick is Professor Emerita of Medieval History in the University of Cambridge, formerly Director of Research in the Faculty of History, a Fellow of Sidney Sussex College and, since 2011, Chair of the Faculty of Archaeology, History and Letters of the British School at Rome. She holds the degrees of MA, PhD and Litt.D from the University of Cambridge and also studied Palaeography as a graduate student at the University of Munich 1974-75. She is Fellow of the Royal Historical Society and Royal Society for the Arts, Manufacturing and Commerce in Britain, as well as being a Korresponderendes Mitglied der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Germany, a Korresponderendes Mitglied im Ausland, phil.-hist. Klass, Oesterreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, and ‘Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries’, and ‘Correspondant étranger de la Société nationale des Antiquaires de France. She has held short-term visiting Fellowships at the British School at Rome (2002); the Netherlands Institute of Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Science (Royal Dutch Academy) (2005-2006); Scaliger Instituut, Universiteit Leiden (2005-6 and 2010) and the American Academy in Rome (2011). She was the LECTIO Professor at KU Leuven in 2015. In 2010 she was awarded the Dr A.H. Heineken International Prize for History by the Royal Dutch Academy. Her publications, to date 26 books and edited books and 160 articles and chapters in books.
Appendix 2
Programme of the Site Visit

Day 1: Wednesday November 14, 2018

15.00 Chair and secretary committee meet with Steffie Hampsink for programme logistics and procedures
15.30 Site visit preparation by the Committee (Committee only)
17.30 Welcome reception and introduction with Rector Magnificus, Dean and vice-dean of the Faculty, Director of the Institute and Institute Coordinators
18.30 Dinner (Committee only)
20.00 Further preparation of the site visit (Committee only)

Day 2: Thursday November 15, 2018

8.30 Welcome, presentation and interview with Director of the Institute, Dean and vice-dean of the Faculty
9.30 Recording findings (committee only)
9.45 Meeting with PI’s theme groups ‘The Ancient World (Nathalie de Haan), ‘Categories Contested’ (Dries Lyna), ‘Representations of the City’ (Maaike van Berkel), ‘Repertoires of Representation’ (Wim van Meurs), ‘Radboud Group for Historical Demography and Family History’ (Jan Kok), ‘ Cultures of War and Liberation’ (Frank Mehring) (45’ interview, 15’ recording findings)
10.45 Break
11.00 Meeting with PI’s theme groups ‘Tourism Travel & Text’ (Jan Hein Furnée), ‘Memory, Materiality and Affect’ (László Munteán), ‘SCARAB: Studying Cultural infrastructure and Reception Across Borders’ (Helleke van den Braber), ‘COMPAS: Creativity, Object, Materiality, and Practice of Art in Society’ (Jan Baetens), and ‘Transnational Europe’ (Marguérite Corporaal) (45’ interview, 15’ recording findings)
12.00 Meeting Postdocs and Assistant Professors: Erika Manders, Hanneke van Asperen, Harm Kaal, Marc Smeets, Chris Louttit and Kati Inhnat (45’ interview, 15’ recording findings)
13.00 Lunch (Committee only)
14.00 Meeting PhD students: Aurora Raimondi Cominesi, Thoma Delpeut, Kristina Hodelin-ter Wal, Sam Heijnen, Martje de Vries, and Anna de Wilde (45’ interview, 15’ recording findings)
15.00 Meeting PhD policy: coordinator GSH (Peter van der Heiden) and coordinators HLCS (Marjet Derks and Stephan Mols) (45’ interview, 15’ recording findings)
16.00 Internal Committee meeting to discuss results & prepare dean meeting
17.00 Facilities Tour (Humanities Lab, University Library)
18.00 Walk to the Faculty Club/Huize Heyendael
18.30 Dinner Committee with Dean and Vice-Dean, Director of the Institute and four HLCS researchers

Day 3: Friday November 16, 2018

08.30 Short recap with Director of the Institute, Dean and/or vice-dean
09.00 Meeting research support officers, Lotte Hogeweg (grant advisor) and Mariëtte Verhoeven (societal impact officer) (15’ interview, 15’ recording findings)
09.30 Meeting National Research Schools OIKOS (André Lardinois), Posthumus (Angelique Janssens) + CPG: Centre for Parliamentary History (Carla van Baalen) (45’ interview, 15’ recording findings)
10.30 Break
11.00 Meeting with societal partners (45’ interview, 15’ recording findings)
12.00 Committee meeting to discuss results and preparation and writing of site visit report (incl. lunch)
15.30 Presentation of preliminary findings by the Committee
Appendix 3
Quantitative data on the institute’s composition and financing

Table 1: Research staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HLCS</td>
<td># fte</td>
<td># fte</td>
<td># fte</td>
<td># fte</td>
<td># fte</td>
<td># fte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific staff</td>
<td>99 31,73</td>
<td>84 35,23</td>
<td>110 36,31</td>
<td>112 33,52</td>
<td>104 29,90</td>
<td>101 30,69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-docs</td>
<td>25 9,69</td>
<td>22 7,43</td>
<td>18 7,10</td>
<td>17 7,73</td>
<td>21 8,22</td>
<td>26 11,61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD students</td>
<td>61 43,01</td>
<td>58 41,37</td>
<td>48 35,75</td>
<td>53 38,29</td>
<td>53 33,53</td>
<td>50 34,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total research staff</td>
<td>185 84,43</td>
<td>164 84,03</td>
<td>176 79,16</td>
<td>182 79,54</td>
<td>178 71,65</td>
<td>177 76,41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPG</td>
<td># fte</td>
<td># fte</td>
<td># fte</td>
<td># fte</td>
<td># fte</td>
<td># fte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific staff</td>
<td>10 9,08</td>
<td>10 9</td>
<td>10 8,16</td>
<td>7 6</td>
<td>7 6</td>
<td>7 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenured staff</td>
<td>2 1,93</td>
<td>3 2,67</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>4 1,01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD students</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 0,67</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total research staff</td>
<td>12 11,01</td>
<td>13 11,67</td>
<td>10 8,16</td>
<td>8 6,67</td>
<td>8 7</td>
<td>12 8,01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>fte %</td>
<td>fte %</td>
<td>fte %</td>
<td>fte %</td>
<td>fte %</td>
<td>fte %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct funding</td>
<td>52.35</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52.87</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53.96</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research grants</td>
<td>29.77</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.78</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total funding</td>
<td>95.19</td>
<td>95.90</td>
<td>88.36</td>
<td>88.54</td>
<td>80.95</td>
<td>84.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>K€ %</td>
<td>K€ %</td>
<td>K€ %</td>
<td>K€ %</td>
<td>K€ %</td>
<td>K€ %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>5,542</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5,308</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>5,351</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other costs</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure</td>
<td>6,288</td>
<td>5,852</td>
<td>5,806</td>
<td>5,937</td>
<td>5,620</td>
<td>6,776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 Main categories of research output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refereed articles</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-refereed articles</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book editor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD theses*)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional publications**)</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications aimed at the general public***)</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total publications</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*) Only PhD theses defended at the Radboud University are counted
**) in 2014 the exhibition catalogue Lief & Devotie was published with 128 HLCS contributions
***) in 2015 the book De leeslijst: 222 werken uit de Nederlandstalige literatuur was published with 183 HLCS contributions

Tabel 4 PhD candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Starting year</th>
<th>Enrolment (male/ female)</th>
<th>Total (male + female)</th>
<th>Graduated after (≤) 4 years</th>
<th>Graduated after (≤) 5 years</th>
<th>Graduated after (≤) 6 years</th>
<th>Graduated after (≤) 7 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Not yet finished</th>
<th>Discontinued*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*With the appointment of Hilde Bras as a professor at the University of Wageningen, three of her PhD students went with her.
# Appendix 4

## Explanation of the categories utilised

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