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Scope of the assessment
The Review Committee was asked to perform an assessment of the Institute of Culture and History University Utrecht. The assessment covers the research in the period 2005-2011.

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 this quality might be improved.

Composition of the Committee
The composition of the Committee was as follows:

- Prof. Rosamond McKitterick, Cambridge University, UK, chair of the Committee;
- Prof. Elleke Boehmer, Oxford University, UK;
- Prof. Jeffrey Muller, Brown University, USA;
- Prof. David N. Rodowick, Harvard University, Cambridge 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.

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.

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.

Remarks about the data provided
The self-evaluation report contained sufficient information to prepare the Committee members for the site-visit. All the details of staffing, however, were, as prescribed by the Standard Evaluation Protocol, done as totals of research time and had to be collated with the lists of staff given in each section. It was actually quite difficult for the Committee to work out from the report how many staff are currently in post in each section. The key publications selected by the institute provided a representative sample of the research and its quality. The interviews during the site-visits were very helpful in expanding and enhancing our knowledge of the research activity of the various groups in the institute as well as questions about structure and relations between the groups within the Institute. The site-visit was very useful and necessary to enable the Committee to form a comprehensive judgement on the quality of the research. It was only disconcerting to be informed at the beginning of the site visit of a new proposal to split the OGC into two with History and Culture on the one hand and Literary and Media studies on the other. We should also have appreciated greater clarity about the function of the Centre for Humanities in relation to the Institute, and also of the role of the Research Professors. We were able in part to compensate for the
lack of any advance information about library resources by a visit to the library that was added to our site visit schedule at our request, and by conversations with individual researchers. Unfortunately there was no time to visit the Special Collections (Rare Books, manuscripts and Maps) although these play such a crucial role for primary source materials and for graduate teaching for members of the OGC. We hope that expert curatorship of these internationally important collections can be maintained.

**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 (written in English, French, German, Italian and Dutch) of the research programmes among the members of the Committee for assessment in relation to the relevant sections of the self-evaluation document. Thus each Committee member was assigned as a first reviewer to three to four programmes, though individuals read books and articles from other programmes when they fell within the expertise or experience of a particular Committee member. The first reviewer formulated a preliminary assessment. Given the great diversity within the institute in terms of subject and discipline, and the very specific criteria of excellence and disciplinary expectations of technical excellence and originality that are maintained within the various fields represented, the intention in this division of labour was to ensure assessment by the committee member most familiar with the disciplines concerned. Collectively the Committee covered a very wide range of knowledge, experience and disciplinary expertise and we are confident that no research programme received anything less than an expert and informed judgement. The final assessments are based on the documentation provided by the institutes, the key publications and the interviews with the management and with the leaders of the programmes and individual researchers at both post-doctoral and doctoral level during the site-visits, 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 2-4 July 2012.
PRELIMINARY REMARKS

Although the Committee has rated the present quality of the research of the Institute very highly indeed, we would wish to emphasize firstly that this does not mean we have no critical comments to offer. On the contrary, we have used the text of our report to offer many specific and critical comments on the research programmes that despite our recognition of the quality of the research already achieved we hope will be heeded. Secondly, the maintenance of this quality in the future is in jeopardy. The current allocation of research time appears to be more of an ideal than a reality for the tenured academic staff because of teaching pressures. There may be a cosmetic allocation of research time but many out of sheer professionalism in relation to their teaching cannot take advantage of it. Staffing levels, including the recruitment of young scholars working for their PhDs, and more opportunities for young post-docs not dependent on applications to external funding schemes seem to be a crucial matter for both the maintenance of a high research profile and for the training of the younger generation. They cannot be separated. There was clear evidence from every section of very great commitment, hard work and intellectual energy, but this should not be taken for granted. We note on p. 28 in the SWOT analysis of the Self-evaluation document that this is acknowledged as a weakness but we would add that this appears to be a weakness inflicted by too little funding allocated to the OGC initially. We have also noted here and there in the reports (e.g. musicology, textual culture), of a certain element of ‘brain drain’ to research environments elsewhere perceived as more advantageous in terms of time. If Utrecht University is to maintain the position on the world stage in the Humanities it currently enjoys, and make the best of its excellent existing resources, it needs somehow to make sure the funding support is there in the future.
INSTITUTE

1. The Institute
The Research Institute for History and Culture (OGC) conducts and stimulates research in the area of history and culture. The institute is part of the Faculty of Humanities. It is governed by an academic director, appointed by and accountable to the dean of the faculty, and a managing director. The directors are supported by a secretary to the board, a part time coordinator of commissioned research, a part time ICT coordinator, two part time PhD mentors, the communication and marketing department of the Faculty, and administrative support.

The Faculty contains in addition to OGC, three other research institutes: Utrecht Institute for Linguistics/OTS, Utrecht Research Institute for Philosophy ZENO and the Research Institute for Theology and Religious Studies INTEGON. OGC is by far the largest research institute within the Faculty.

The Faculty offers 21 Bachelor's programmes (all in Dutch) and almost 12 Master's programmes, organized in 26 tracks, 11 Research Master's (Mphil) programmes and 4 educational Master's programmes, organized in 20 tracks, covering the full range of the Humanities' scope. The departments of the Faculty of Humanities are home to the Faculty's employees. Each department is responsible for human resources policy, budgets and the coordination of the faculty’s education and research duties. The Faculty of Humanities has six departments: Department of Dutch Studies, Department of History and Art History, Department of Media and Culture Studies, Department of Modern Languages, Department of Philosophy, Department of Religious Studies and Theology. Teaching is organised in the Departments.

During the site visit the committee was informed about the plans of the Faculty to restructure the research institutes. These would mean that INTEGON will be integrated in ZENO. Furthermore the intention was announced to divide the OGC into two separate institutes, one for history and art history and the other for literature and media studies. At the end of the process, therefore, the Faculty would have four disciplinarily-oriented research institutes, all of approximately the same size, which would be advantageous for the administration in terms of control and reduction in structural complexity.

Assessment
At present, the organisation and management of the institute functions very well. The management and coordination is greatly appreciated by the researchers working in the institute. The directors are very committed to the coordination and facilitation of the research in the Institute as a whole, and their efforts ensure that the researchers and research programmes are able to perform at a high level. The Committee evaluated the OGC as a whole and formed a strong appreciation of all the intellectual and academic advantages of the structure as it is and how much all members of the Institute thrive on the living interdisciplinarity that is a consequence of the conglomeration. The Institute represents an organic and dynamic means of fusing ten interrelated research programmes with very effective cross- and interdisciplinary communication. The Institute provides a very well organised, coherent and a stimulating environment for researchers with a structure that manifestly facilitates coordination. None of this would be improved by splitting the Institute into two. The committee could see no intellectual justification for the plans of the Faculty to split the OGC and advises strongly against this plan.

2. Quality and academic reputation
The Institute claims in the self-evaluation report that it has sought to stimulate quality by promoting international collaboration and projects, by supporting applications for various sources of outside funding, and by advising individual researchers how to structure their careers and publishing strategies. The OGC has helped to promote productivity by assisting in the selection of the best and most productive researchers, and through the development of instruments that would help set benchmarks for research output.
The institute is actively involved in research policy at the university level, to make sure that the Humanities have a voice in strategic discussions. The institute contributed to the formulation of the University’s focus areas and continues to contribute in the process leading to the strategic themes, that which will provide a framework for research in the Utrecht University in the coming years.

**Assessment**

The academic reputation of any research institute is for the most part determined by the reputation of the individual researchers and it is certainly the case that the OGC’s reputation rests on its members’ contributions to the particular fields in historical, literary, and cultural studies, from the Ancient to the Modern worlds, that it promotes. The task of the Institute is undoubtedly to create an environment where researchers are stimulated, facilitated and have the opportunity to excel. The OGC has certainly succeeded in creating such an environment. Many of the participating researchers as well as projects and programmes are internationally very well known and at the top of their discipline. Utrecht University is renowned internationally for its excellent research in the Humanities.

There remains a danger of policies beyond the Institute cutting off at source the possibility of ‘blue skies’ research. Academics have of course become adept at trying to retain intellectual ownership of their own ideas and research projects within the framework of national or European thematic research programmes. In the short term, all researchers have taken as much advantage of them as possible, and occasionally they have been sufficiently broadly framed to act as a genuine stimulus for original and exciting research. Nevertheless, predetermined national or university wide ‘themes’, not least the ‘Focus areas’, ‘Priority Areas’, ‘Citizenship,’ ‘Creative industries’ etc. may risk concentrating too exclusively on research that is reactive to trends in what is known already (perceived or imposed from outside) as distinct from creative research that pushes at the boundaries of knowledge. There is also the potential problem of independence from a commercial sponsor.

3. **Resources**

As mentioned above, OGC is the largest research institute of the Faculty of the Humanities. The number of researchers involved is considerable in relative terms, though very much smaller than the Institutions to which the Assessors belong. It makes the concentrated quality of the UU OGC staff all the more commendable.

The Institute provided the following information on staff levels.

**Table 1 Research staff at institutional level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>44.38</td>
<td>43.13</td>
<td>47.51</td>
<td>59.80</td>
<td>67.40</td>
<td>71.20</td>
<td>74.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenured</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>22.08</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>25.40</td>
<td>26.36</td>
<td>26.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>39.85</td>
<td>36.80</td>
<td>31.76</td>
<td>31.60</td>
<td>27.60</td>
<td>27.64</td>
<td>31.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>102.29</td>
<td>101.99</td>
<td>101.07</td>
<td>109.00</td>
<td>120.04</td>
<td>125.20</td>
<td>131.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research time has officially increased in the period under review. The number of PhD students will henceforth decrease due to a change in funding allocation by the national government, which has resulted in the cessation of local funding for PhD positions.

Research time is in the first place allotted by standard rules, but the Faculty has developed a policy for flexible assignment of research time for academic staff on the basis of performance; OGC followed this policy. As noted above the actual research time available can be lower than indicated, because of increasing teaching pressures. Between 2005 and 2011 the directly funded research time for tenured staff increased by more than 20fte (or 54%). At the same time, the contribution of external and contract funding for tenured staff has increased by almost 10 fte, in large part due to the active policy in this area with regard to advice, active support in preparing and writing proposals, coaching and the acquisition of research projects. The share of direct funding in the budget of OGC decreased from 67.7% to 56.1%, the share of 2nd stream money increased from 24.9% to 27.5% and contract research increased from 7.4% to 16.4%.
Assessment
The previous review committee was concerned about the constant pressure resulting from the high teaching burden of the OGC staff, and the necessity to prepare applications for external funding. In the review period the institute has managed to increase the total available research time substantially during the review period, which is very positive. The committee is also impressed with the increase of the proportion of 2nd and 3rd stream money in the total budget of OGC. The strategy of the institute has proven to be effective. Yet despite this effective policy to increase the research time of the staff and the high research productivity of the institute, the committee remains concerned. According to the teaching figures for Utrecht University with which we were provided on the first day of our visit, the teaching load is very high. Although it was not easy for external reviewers to understand the allocation system and the relation between allocated and actual research time, it is obvious that the pressure on the staff seriously threatens their ability to maintain their research at the current high level. If Utrecht University is to sustain its position on the world stage in the Humanities and make the best of its excellent existing resources, it needs to make sure the funding support is there. We wish to emphasize, furthermore, that the current evaluation and self evaluation documents were completed in response to the previous evaluation in 2004. There was clear evidence in every aspect of the Institute’s activity and within every research programme that all members had successfully achieved what they had set out to achieve and could not reasonably have been expected to do more.

4. Productivity
The institute provided the following information about the publication output:

Table 2 output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</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>116</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles in volumes/proceedings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book editorship</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book chapters</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD theses</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article in edited volumes/proceedings</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional publications</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The institute provided a table with average publication rates per group and per tenured staff member. The average range varies from 6.0 to 19.44 per research fte. The variation in publication rate can be explained by size of the different groups, involvement in teaching and different publication cultures. The Committee was also conscious of the very varied culture and publication practice among the disciplines represented in the Institute, with some favouring single-authored monographs, some with a greater emphasis on single-authored articles, and still others writing up multi-authored articles or edited volumes on collaborative research projects. We have taken this into account in our assessments of each group’s productivity.

Assessment
Overall the productivity of the OGC is of a very high level. The number of publications is impressive and concerns not only reviewed articles but also a considerable amount of books published with the best academic publishers. The committee is somewhat concerned about the decreasing number of PhD positions and the fluctuating number of PhD theses completed. The decreasing number of positions can be explained by the changed national policies concerning first stream finances, but nevertheless needs some attention. Although outside the scope of the review committee, the expensive Dutch system of appointments of PhD candidates is not very helpful here either. More about PhD training in paragraph 6.

5. Societal Relevance
Members of OGC actively participate in Dutch cultural, social and political life in a variety of ways, from public lectures to different kinds of advisory functions, providing expertise to private, public and governmental institutions, or contributions to festivals, exhibitions, and other cultural manifestations. The
Utrecht Centre for the Humanities has an important role in outreach activities and contacts with a wider public.

Societal relevance and valorization of the OGC research programme is evident from the numerous commissioned research projects. OGC has two part-time positions for the acquisition and coordination of externally funded projects and has additional researchers in each department to promote valorization activities. This policy has proven very productive: over the past five years the monetary value of the completed projects amount to more than € 4 000 000.

Moreover most OGC researchers and research projects actively communicate the impact of their research and results for understanding the past, present and future of diverse aspects in society.

Assessment
The committee observed that OGC puts considerable effort into communicating the results of its research to the broader society in the Netherlands. The Centre for the Humanities can be seen as a very effective instrument for the coordination and support of all these activities. There is nevertheless a worrying trend towards over-emphasis on immediate economic or 'societal' relevance in ways that are too narrowly conceived. In a country with as rich a history and of as great a cultural importance as the Netherlands, nationally, Europe-wide, and on the international stage, it would be hard to find any research project that actually lacks broad relevance in terms of overall stewardship and responsibility for this rich and diverse cultural inheritance. This used to be generally recognized so it now falls to University Rectors and administrators as much as the academics to fight hard for the Humanities as essential for the general health and cultural identity of their society at large.

The committee therefore, as already noted in the section on academic quality and reputation, sees some risks in concentrating too exclusively on research reactive to trends and to governmental strategies and policies as opposed to creative research.

6. Strategy for the future
Four developments are important for the establishment of a future strategy. First: the creation of Focus areas and subsequently Priority areas in National and University’s research policies create both challenges and opportunities for OGC. The creation of the named areas marks a shift from disciplinary to trans- and multidisciplinary research. Second: European funding will increasingly become a major resource for research activities. Third: knowledge valorization will increasingly play an important role in the allocation of research funding. Fourth: academic researchers are increasingly asked to look for partners in cultural institutions or in commercial enterprises.

OGC seeks to continue its role as a broker of multidisciplinary cooperation. The institute will continue to participate actively in the Focus areas and Strategic Themes and as an initiator of other collaborative projects. At the same time, OGC will continue to offer coaching at all levels to improve the quality of both PhD supervision, and of applications and acquisitions of commissioned research.

Assessment
The strategy of the institute to initiate collaborative projects and to participate in the Priority and Focus Areas and Strategic themes has proven to be effective and deserves commendation. The same applies to the policy of OGC to invest in coaching activities for PhD supervision and for writing funding and research applications.

The multi- and interdisciplinary collaboration made possible within OGC and across the borders of the OGC is according to the Committee one of the major assets of the institute. This has resulted in various innovative projects and has established the internationally renowned position of OGC. In this light and as stated above the committee does not support the plan to split OGC in two institutes.

The committee, furthermore, wishes to reiterate the importance of retaining the possibility of carrying out 'blue skies' research. Next to all thematic oriented and commissioned research, there should be room and
appreciation of research out of sheer academic curiosity and for the development of theory and theoretical insights to guarantee academic freedom leading to new insights and innovation.

7. PhD Training
OGC permanently employs about 70 PhD-students working on their theses. The composition of the PhD population has changed in recent years. There has been a significant increase in PhD students from abroad and a number of PhD candidates are teaching at Universities of Applied Sciences, who have received funding from the government to write a thesis.

There is a strict division of labour between the institute and the national research schools regarding PhD training. OGC is in charge of general skills courses and monitors the supervision process, while disciplinary training takes place within the research group. Every OGC PhD student has a training-and-supervision-agreement and is assigned to a PhD coordinator, next to the student’s supervisor. Progress interviews are held once a year. Professional individual coaching for PhD students is available when needed.

An important development in this area is the regular training sessions for supervisors that OGC introduced in 2008.

Assessment
The PhD students the Committee met were all very happy with their position and with the supervision and the training they get. The Institute very successfully nurtures young talent and enables new researchers to develop their research skills and their academic performance and level. The establishment of PhD mentors, as well as the training and manual for supervisors is laudable.

The completion rates of the PhD students however, need some attention. Only a few of the students (10%) finish their thesis within four years and a considerable proportion takes longer than seven years (14%).

The committee has also some concerns regarding the number of PhD students. As indicated above, this number has for several reasons decreased during the review period. The Dutch system of appointments of PhD ‘students’ makes it very expensive to attract PhD researchers, in particular in the present situation of decreasing funding. Of course a good contingent of international students who bring funding with them is advantageous. Nevertheless, a situation in which a leading Dutch University of international standing cannot support the young generation of potential PhD candidates unless they survive the lottery of project funding is not healthy for future research. Not only is it cutting off opportunities for the best Dutch students, many trained to a high degree of technical and intellectual achievement in Utrecht itself, but it is also further cutting off at source the possibility of the ‘blue skies’ research referred to above. PhD research is very necessary for the preservation of a high standard of research quality, for innovation and for the training of the next generation of scholars and trained experts in particular fields who will be able to have responsibility for the curatorship of the nation’s cultural inheritance. In order to give more academic talents the opportunity to complete their studies at doctoral level, the committee suggests thought be given to restructuring the system to designate those working on PhDs as students rather than staff. Further, for the proper recognition of research and teaching stints, supervision of PhD students needs to be counted as teaching time.

Concluding
The committee assesses the institute on the four standard criteria as follows:
Quality 5
Productivity 5
Relevance 5
Viability 4
Programme:  Art History
Programme coordinator: Prof. Peter Hecht
Research staff 2011:  8.83

The research of the Art History programme focuses on the art and architecture of the Low Countries in their European context. This is expressed in specific research projects like ‘Unity and Discontinuity’ and ‘The Impact of Oil’. The first project studies the unity and discontinuity in the architecture of the Northern and Southern Netherlands, the second the history (or legend) of the discovery of oil paint and the early studio practice in these regions. Another project concerns the history of public art collections in the Northern Netherlands from its origins to the present day. At the same time, various projects in Italian Renaissance art and European medieval art allow the group to keep a firm eye on the broader trends in European History.

The review committee studied the following key publications of this group:
- De Clippel, K. (2006), Joos van Craesbeeck (1605/6-1660), een Brabants genreschilder, Turnhout.
- Van Eck, X. (2008), Clandestine Splendor: Paintings for the Catholic Church in the Dutch Republic. Zwolle

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

Quality:
The research produced by this programme during the last six years is excellent. It meets the stated profile to focus on the art and architecture of the Low Countries in their European context. The committee very positively encourages and affirms this concentrated focus. Research and teaching positions in Dutch and Flemish art in the United States, for example, already face elimination under the pressure of massive student interest in contemporary art and as a result of the diversification of the art history field in response to a more global economy. The group’s research effectively connects the Art History Programme with the region’s overwhelmingly rich museums, resources, and vital cultural heritage. Art History at Utrecht, by maintaining its focus on the Low Countries, will come to occupy an increasingly rare and valuable position directly relevant to the society as it cultivates knowledge of one of the world’s greatest cultural traditions.
Within the framework of its stated focus, the programme’s research presents excellent examples of varied methods and issues current in art history. Published research spans the period from Middle Ages to the modern period, with the centre of gravity in the early modern period. Articles and books in each of these areas demonstrate great originality and mastery. An important trend that ties several contributions together is that they unite Dutch and Flemish art production. It is an approach that breaks down the exclusive study of one or the other that resulted from the nationalistic and confessionalized oppositions developed in the nineteenth century. Van Eck’s study of clandestine Catholic churches in the Dutch Republic exemplifies this broadened and open view. Ottenheym’s *Unity and Discontinuity*, edited in collaboration with Krista de Jonge at Leuven, builds this theme into the study’s basic questions and now offers by far the best available overview and guide to further research in Dutch and Flemish architecture from the sixteenth to the seventeenth century. De Clippel’s monograph on the Antwerp painter Joos van Craesbeek also grapples with the Dutch-Flemish connection through examining the legacy of the great artist Adriaen Brower who founded traditions in Haarlem and Antwerp. And she has published articles that argue for the dynamic interaction between the Northern and the Southern Netherlands. In the modern period, De Bodt has concentrated on the work of the Belgian painter Ensor. Contributions by Schmidt (medieval altar frontals), Stumpel (Dürer), Hurx (Ammanati), and Ottenheym all directly address the larger European context in directions that are also important in their own right. Ottenheym has brilliantly researched and lucidly established the fundamental historical connection between Italian architectural theory and the development of seventeenth-century Dutch architecture. Stumpel has clarified the iconographic interpretation of Dürer’s Death, Knight, and Devil engraving in a way that brings the method up to date.

More exclusively centred on the Netherlands, the two books by Peter Hecht and Annemieke Hoogenboom connect outwards and break new ground in different ways. Hecht’s from-the-ground-up history of the Vereniging Rembrandt, based on extensive research in the Association’s archives, actually works as a subtle historiography of Dutch art history from the nineteenth century to the present. It also documents the history of museums in the Netherlands as it demonstrates the central position of the Vereniging Rembrandt in the further growth of Dutch museum collections. Hoogenboom’s introduction and catalogue to an exhibition of the diary drawings by early nineteenth-century Amsterdam artist Christiaan Andriessen take a lovely ironic turn in revealing the vivid beauty of everyday scenes by an artist thwarted in his ambition to paint exalted history paintings. The introduction convincingly situates the drawings in the historiography of “ego documents” so important for the Dutch practice of history. Both these books connect to living institutions that make works of art accessible to the larger society through acquisitions and exhibitions.

The quality of dissertations written under the supervision of this programme is extremely impressive. These dissertations demonstrate an open approach to new methods in art history. They confirm the strong quality of guidance and insight exemplified by the publications of the Group.

**Productivity:**
The quantity of dissertations of this programme is also extremely impressive. The programme has published on a high level in the review period: 37 refereed articles and 27 books. The policy within the group to stimulate the researchers to choose their own topics and approaches results in an excellent track record of grants obtained from external funding sources.

**Relevance:**
The group wrote in the self-evaluation report that thanks to the non-academic population’s great interest in the built environment and the art that is preserved and displayed in museums, art history enjoys a considerable potential for wide public support. The group exploits this interest eagerly and for instance organised several exhibitions and made contributions to several other exhibitions. The group has a considerable record of publications aimed at professionals as well as at the general public.

**Viability:**
It is evident that the researchers are free to choose their own topics and approaches. They successfully seek and carry out collaborative projects with colleagues in other universities so that they branch out on
diverse paths. This lends vitality and flexibility to the programme. For the future, the best way to expand Art History’s coverage is to replace the position in contemporary art lost by illness. The field of contemporary art embraces the newest methods of art history and it will also answer the strong interest of undergraduates that has insured a high enrolment for courses taught in the field. That would create an important platform for future research in the group.
Programme: Culture of Classical Antiquity
Programme coordinator: Prof. Josine Blok
Research staff 2011: 3.54 fte

The research area of this group comprises the ancient Greek and Roman worlds from early archaic Greece to the end of classical antiquity in the West and from the Achaemenid Empire to the beginnings of the Islamic states in the East. The group has the following shared research themes:

- The history of ancient Greece, the later Near East and the city of Rome. Specific projects include the religious foundations of the polis in ancient Greece and of the empires of the Hellenistic Near East, the impact of religion on the construction and demography of Roman cities and the interactions between Jews and Christians in the Roman Empire.
- Linguistic and textual criticism.
- The cultural and political influence of classical antiquity on modern Europe with special interest in the development of classical scholarship.

The review committee studied the following key publications:


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

Quality:
This small group has a strong identity and outstanding research profile. They clearly work very well as a group and offered an exemplary account of their research in both the written self-evaluation and during the Visitatie. The group’s interests range over the period 100 BC to 500 AD but their work is concentrated in the specific areas already indicated; the Roman republican and imperial period, Latin philology, and literary studies are not represented. The overarching intellectual engagement within the group is the interaction between religion and socio-political institutions. This group’s work is characterized by meticulous and fundamental empirical research to underpin strong arguments and new perspectives. This research is multidisciplinary. It combines the expert study of epigraphy, art and sculpture, archaeology, texts and language with a strong and imaginative conceptual and theoretical approach which is very
effective. It is clearly an outstanding group of scholars producing path-breaking work with a well-deserved international reputation.

The Ancient History publications list is a strong set of submissions with an effective combination of imaginative conceptualization and rigorous empirical research. On the one hand there is the more philologically based work and on the other the scientific archaeology undertaken by Rutgers with a principal focus on the material evidence from the Jewish and early Christian sections of the catacombs in Rome, using radiocarbon dating and stable isotope analysis. His findings are certainly very interesting and suggestive, albeit on relatively small samples of evidence.

Blok’s contributions are outstanding pieces of scholarship. Her article on Pericles’ citizenship law offers indeed a new perspective. Blok stresses the participation in religious cults as an essential element of citizenship. This is a very important article in terms of its conclusions as well as its methodology. Blok builds on this further in her substantial paper on the appointment of the priests. Blok overall makes a powerful case for the fundamental role of religion in the definition of citizenship and identity in fifth century Athens. Lambert’s excellent article on Athenian priesthoods before Pericles’ citizenship law builds on the conclusions Josine Blok has offered and the important relationship between the city and the gods. Strootman is an instance of the wide range of the classical culture group for he offers a study of the Hellenic influence on the Seleukid court which in its turn influenced the development and character of Roman monarchy, royal ideology and court culture in both western Europe and the Islamic realms. It offers a very clear historical and historiographical context with excellent supporting empirical research.

Rutgers’ book shows how he is able to conceptualise the implications of his findings to offer entirely new suggestions about Jewish-Christian relations in the early Christian period. This is a well worked field but Rutgers has much that is important and original to offer. Making Myths. Jews in early Christian identity formation offers a very interesting contribution to the field of early Jewish Christian relations on the links, physical, theological, and mental, between Jews and Christians despite their new institutional separation. It is an excellent discussion of the ties between Christianity and Judaism, elucidated in terms of three case studies: the Maccabeean martyrs, Jews in late Roman (actually sixth-century) Roman law, and discussions of the synagogue in patristic literature. Rutgers’ earlier work documented the existence of interaction between Jews and Christians in the Diaspora communities of the Mediterranean and especially in Rome. Rutgers’ findings about the Jewish contribution to the development of catacombs are very interesting indeed.

All this work is conducted within contexts of international collaboration as well. Their strong international reputation is clear from the prizes and fellowships awarded (Blok), international conferences hosted, the Fellowships and visiting professorships members of the group have held in Oxford, Paris and Cincinnati (Blok, Rutgers and Stevens), the editorial boards of leading journals in the field on which they are active, the number of research advisory boards and international and national evaluation and funding committees on which they serve, and the academic leadership they offer (e.g. Blok’s headship of the European Network for the Study of Ancient Greek History).

Productivity
This group, though small, is impressive for its team spirit and the cooperative links in its well defined research projects on institutions (“formation of ancient states”) and cultural identities (“cultural renewal through cultural interaction”). It has a strong corporate identity based on the study of antiquity through very empirical methods and technologies in archaeology and linguistics resulting in a strong publication output. The number of books produced, books about to appear, and new projects, as well as of journal articles and chapters in books is impressive. The scholars in this group have a very high profile and are among the leaders of their respective fields internationally.

Relevance
The group addresses social questions that retain their centrality in modern society, namely political behaviour, identity, religious practice, and the interaction of political and religious institutions. They are also fully involved in the ‘Citizenship’ programme and the strategic theme on Institutions. They are notable for the development of innovative methodologies in their field, such as network analysis, statistical
analysis, and comparative analyses using digital databases. The research themes religion and institutions, and training scholars in Jewish Studies relate to strategic themes of the University Utrecht as well as the Priority Areas of NWO and KNAW.

In the self-evaluation report, the group describes the huge demand in society for expert knowledge on classical antiquity made available and accessible to a wider audience. Beside interested groups among the wider public, specific audiences are teachers of history and classics at gymnasia and other secondary schools. The group contributes substantially to journals and publications aimed at this audience.

**Viability**

The programme covers an essential research area. The lack of funded PhDs, however, may become a problem in the future. Another threat, resulting from the small size of the group is the erosion of research time by energies devoted to administration and seeking out external funding. Latin literary and cultural studies are not specifically represented in the group yet they are essential aspects of undergraduate and master’s degree teaching as well as research training; late antiquity is maintained manfully by Rutgers but he would benefit from the support of a late antique historian. The strength in archaic and classical Greece and the Seleucids would be greatly enhanced by the addition of an Assyriology specialist in the ancient Middle East. We note that the 2004 Visitatie recommended an appointment in classical languages to support the work of this group, and this is still desirable, not least as a way of augmenting the research time of every member of the group. There would be a case for strengthening the group with appointments in these areas.
Programme: Cultural History
Programme coordinator: Prof. dr. Joris van Eijnatten
Research staff 2011: 12.44 fte

The ambition of the Cultural History programme is to develop the following research lines: communication history and world history, history of science and the history of cultural modernity. The group works around four core themes:

- History of the Sciences and the Humanities
- Cultural Modernity
- Communication history, including media e-history
- World history in combination with history didactics.


The review committee studied the following key publications:


Assessments:

Quality: 4
Productivity: 4
Relevance: 4
Viability: 4.5

Quality
At the previous review this programme faced questions about its coherence, concerns which have been addressed to a considerable extent by the production of several substantial monographs and other solid supporting research-work from several individuals, thus giving a sense of bulk but also quality. The cultural focus is on the Netherlands, past and present, its intellectual and cultural history, and the endeavour has been to ‘connect to some of the most promising new research lines in the field, such as communication history and world history’. This enterprise seems to have succeeded in some respects, in particular in the strands looking at the history of cultural modernity as well as American studies. Elsewhere there may be some gaps, perhaps due to a relatively small number of contributors. A strong case is made by the publications collectively for the impact of cultural history on the political domain, as well as of political history on culture.
Several examples might be put forward to illustrate the programme’s range of historical themes and issues, extending from slave cultures of the American South to the history of science in Europe. Koch’s biography of the prominent Dutch intellectual Kuijper is an excellent case in point. It is a compendious traditional biography, narrating in detail the trajectory of a public life: in many ways, the production of a decade. Floris Cohen’s encyclopaedic yet sympathetically presented history of modern science, is another such weighty study. It too comprises the research of a decade, perhaps more.

Though its impact may be more specialized, the scholarly depth of Mijnhardt’s *The Book that Changed Europe* is also impressive. Ed Jonker’s *De Geesteswetenschappelijke Carousel* forms an extended meditation on new orientations to ethics and moral politics in the Humanities, post-post-structuralism, and might therefore be considered a contribution to a history of the unfolding present, though it clearly also relates to some of the other monographs’ concerns with cultural modernity.

As for other, again very good book publications, two of these were in American Studies, here termed world history: Damian Pargas in *The Quarters and the Fields* approaches the topical debate of slave agency through the commodities-based lens of crop cultures and their differential effects on work patterns, using regional and comparative perspectives to draw a fascinating shifting picture of slave family life. Rubin and Verheul’s essay collection offers a far-ranging and textured study of the impact on American multiculturalism of 9/11 and its aftermath. The two articles (de Kruif 2009 and Ruberg 2010) were interesting and well grounded in primary research, if slightly derivative of the writers’ earlier research findings. The images in de Kruif’s article powerfully counterpointed the text, as did many of the epistolary examples in Ruberg’s.

The list of dissertations written under supervision of this programme is extremely diverse, both in subject matter and period. Though the studies were impressive on their own merits, here and there the connections between the research of leading postholders and that of doctoral students were not always self-evident.

**Productivity**

The group has been very productive. In the review period it produced 36 books. It also edited 24 books and produced 48 book chapters and 13 PhD dissertations have been defended. Its newly-launched journal *International Journal for History, Culture and Modernity*, is a reflection both of the group’s energies and the way in which they are providing leadership in this field. The group has been notably successful in securing funding and has done sterling service on many scholarly and funding advisory boards, as well as holding visiting professorships elsewhere in USA, China, and Germany. In addition members of the group actively support their subject by serving as editors for academic journals and monograph series with international publishers (and this is also of course a mark of the esteem with which the Cultural History researchers are regarded world wide).

**Relevance**

The group has been directly involved in several very substantial projects financed by third parties. It has a strong reputation with regard to popularising academic scholarship, which is evident in the considerable number of professional and popularising publications it produced in the review period. Members of the programme regularly advise or cooperate with local and national media. The group’s professional outreach is excellent, not least in relation to teaching world history in Dutch schools, and the excellent contribution of individuals within the group in this respect has been rightly recognized with the award of prizes (Cohen, Bolt, de Goei) for bringing academic research to a wider public.

The group’s research focus on the global and transdisciplinary aspects of modernity should be ever more relevant in our globalised and interconnected society. Moreover, the group’s interests in developing methods and strategies for teaching comparative world history and cultural identities (for example within the forum of their new e-journal) should be encouraged.

**Viability**

The group still struggles with communicating a coherent research identity, in terms of a strong disciplinary identity or well-articulated theoretical and intellectual position, though individual members undoubtedly...
do important and interesting work with a correspondingly strong publication record, and they have clearly focussed on this area in the past six years. Although the Cultural History programme has many notable strengths, it may yet be in need of an overarching narrative to draw these strengths together. The Committee noted the group’s efforts to focus their research through the concepts of cultural modernity and global history. Interesting themes of “media e-history” and “world history didactics” seem underdeveloped. The Committee felt there was unrealised potential for further connections and scope for tighter integration with the other research programmes within the Institute. Links or even mergers of aspects of the programme with other institute programmes such as international and political history, social and economic history, or media studies, as well as some concentration of research activity in smaller group form, should be more actively explored. We note however the hopes centred on a new ‘E-humanities approach to reference cultures’ which does indeed represent an exciting new initiative.
Programme: Gender Studies
Programme coordinator: Prof. Rosemarie Buikema
Research staff 2011: 6.26 fte

The Gender Studies programme aims to be at the forefront of feminist and postcolonial theory formation. Its critical perspectives to the fields of literary and visual studies, new media, science, and technology studies; human rights and post-humanism; history and the colonial archive, and the ‘turns’ in the humanities, are offered from the group’s distinctive conceptual stance. The group is interested in the contextualised and processual study of gender in its entanglement with ‘race’/ ethnicity, sexuality, age, and class. Three thematic fields have been formulated: Art & Beyond; Postcoloniality and Social Justice; Contemporary Feminist Theory. Together those research strands focus on the ways in which instances of ‘gendering’ occur, that is, on how cultural practices and artefacts are able to perform and transform gender in a context that is thoroughly power-laden.

The review committee studied the following key publications of this group:
- Tuin, Iris van der (2011) ‘A Different Starting Point, a Different Metaphysics: Reading Bergson and Barad Diffractively’. In: Hypatia, 26 (1), 22-42.

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

Quality:
This world-class programme has continued, over the past six years, to produce the kind of dynamic first-class research for which it had already become well-known both nationally and internationally. The Utrecht Gender Studies programme is noted in particular for the theories of located and situated or situational feminism associated with several of its leading researchers and scholars, as well as for its critically reflexive approach to feminist history. These related theories and approaches, also shaped by engagements with multiculturalism and postcolonial studies, have placed the programme on the feminist intellectual map in a sustained and convincing manner. Gender Studies at Utrecht typically embraces perspectives from Cultural History, Postcolonial and American Studies, Comparative Literature, and cognate interdisciplinary approaches. These interdisciplinary points of connection are coherently pursued and managed and the research overall is excellent. The researchers’ concentrated gender focus and wide spectrum of research methodologies are evident throughout the submitted research publications. Most of the monographs and essays collections rise out of funded research projects and conferences. Most of the monographs are published by reputable Netherlands and international academic Presses. The key book publications all represent very good, indeed leading, work.
Rosi Braidotti’s *Transpositions* (2006), a thoughtful, thoroughgoing interrogation of what a post-humanist ‘ethical and political subjectivity’ might comprise, is already well-established as a key source in the fields of gender studies and moral philosophy. Its exploration of contingently grounded ethics is in line with standard feminist approaches, and it mounts a persuasive case, informed by post-structuralist theory, against the influential though essentializing moral universalism linked to ethical philosophers such as Martha Nussbaum. This is a key text for our times, by any reckoning. Further lines of critical reflection from the monograph are followed through in Braidotti’s ‘Theory, Culture and Society’ article (2008), and testify to this leading feminist thinker’s sustained ‘affirmative’ critique of the assumed link between ‘political subjectivity and oppositional consciousness’.

*Migrant Geographies*, edited by Sandra Ponzanas of UU and Daniela Merolla (2005), brings together a rich array of approaches (grounded in film and literary studies) to the subject of postcolonial and multicultural Europe, arising out of a 2001 conference. The collection is in some ways a reflection of its half decade, appearing before the events that brought what is now referred to as a crisis of multiculturalism (Theo van Gogh’s murder, 7/7, Anders Breivik, etc.). However, both the conference and the collection have been widely cited and referred to as important insights relating to postcolonial Europe, and several of the outstanding contributions (as by Gilroy, Huggan, etc.), still provide illuminating accounts of the meanings of national and transnational culture in Europe today. Ponzanesi’s 10 page feature review from *Feminist Theory* (2007) demonstrates the same sound, clearly stated commitment to multicultural critical perspectives, informed by gender theory, as in the book.

Kathy Davis’s *Our Bodies, Ourselves* is a good, well-founded retrospective account, drawing on perspectives from book history, reception studies, and situational feminism, of the reception and influence of this key feminist classic of the 1960s, and sheds light on ‘good transnational feminist practice’ and how it might be achieved. The approach, like that of many other of the Gender studies’ outputs, is indicatively and appropriately tempered, optimistic and non-judgemental. Davis’s *Feminist Theory* article (2008) is a close theoretical interrogation, informed by a range of feminist sociologists and other theorists, of the key concept and/or strategy of intersectionality for feminist theory, and finds in its ambiguity as a term its strength. This is a robust, nicely worked essay.

Gloria Wekker’s 2006 monograph on Netherlands-Surinamese fluid sexualities and mati culture, *The Politics of Passion*, rests on extensive research and a range of methodologies including interviews with Afro-Surinamese women, conducted in the Netherlands and Suriname, and sheds important new light on this Netherlands cultural domain of cross-sex relations, interrogating gender, race, cultural and sexual stereotypes and contributing to a more complex understanding of Netherlands migrant and postcolonial cultures today. This is an extremely good study. This is one of the few pieces of research in the programme that explicitly and robustly reflects on the imbrication of race with gender in the politics of intersectionality.

*Doing Gender in Media, Art and Culture*, edited by Buikema and van der Tuin, is a clear, lively and well-researched teaching collection, introducing students and researchers more widely to a representative range of contemporary feminist approaches. The co-editorship and involvement of several of the Programmes members as contributors testy also to a good level of constructive collaboration in Gender Studies at Utrecht. Buikema’s 2009 ‘work-immanent’ reading of Coetzee’s Disgrace and van Niekerk’s Agaat, published in the *European Journal of Women’s Studies*, offers a finely tempered phenomenological reading of the performativity of both novels. Van der Tuin’s 2011 reading of Bergson in a feminist frame endorses the kind of affirmative approach that others in Gender Studies too are investigating and putting into practice.

The dissertations written under the supervision of this programme are certainly wide-ranging, and build out from the supervisor or co-promoters’ research areas. We note the focus of PhD research tends to be more sociological than literary or cultural, which is a surprising trend in the only gender studies programme in the Netherlands located in the Humanities.
Productivity:
The effective intergenerational cooperation among the group's researchers provides a firm basis on which the programme energetically and intelligently combines and interrelates approaches from feminism and women's studies, aesthetic and visual theory, comparative literature, multiculturalism and postcolonialism. The researchers at all levels creatively expand and adapt their ideas in the apparently tireless generation of new research and PhD projects and grant applications. The output in terms of publications is excellent with respect to quantity as well as quality.

Relevance:
The group has developed a compelling corporate identity through the concept of gender studies, generously yet rigorously interpreted. Where other programmes in, for example, women, gender, and society are entrenching themselves in quantitative and social scientific methods, Utrecht gender studies enthusiastically embraces the rich and complex philosophical and theoretical heritage of feminism while balancing that heritage with historical and cultural study. The Committee was impressed by the group's willingness to think about gender both at a high theoretical level, inflected by post-structuralism, and in specific contexts and multi-axial ways, paying sensitive attention to the myriad other determinants of class, race, and sexuality. Several of the programme’s projects, such as that on the use of digital media by migrant youth in the Netherlands, connect their scholarship to the wider sphere, especially to local and national communities.

The societal relevance of the research is without doubt high and is underlined by the number of professional and popularising publications as well as by the regular invitations and participations of staff members in projects and lectures aimed at a wider public in which the group deploys its expertise and knowledge about inclusion and exclusion, equality and difference, masculinity, femininity and conflict. These issues are particularly applicable to the shaping of post-war societies and to the development of processes of transitional justice in post-totalitarian societies. The need to include gender expertise in society is also evidenced by the number of external (third stream) funded projects awarded to the group.

Viability:
Utrecht Gender Studies has positioned itself as an international leader in theoretical and philosophical approaches to studies especially in the context of the humanities. The group evidences excellent team spirit and cooperation in research, administration, and teaching. No doubt they will continue to attract significant numbers of talented students and PhD candidates both nationally and from abroad. There is nevertheless a concern whether researchers will be able to balance the time devoted to teaching and advising students and PhD researchers against time for new research. The programme’s remarkable enterprise in attracting research grants which include some PhD funding would be well rewarded with the additional award of directly funded PhD positions.
 Programme: International and political history  
Programme coordinator: Prof. Duco Hellema  
Research staff 2011: 18.42 fte

The research programme on international and political history has, since 2009, included researchers from the Centre for Conflict Studies. The group’s research programme entitled ‘Conflict, Reconstruction, Integration’ focuses on the history of polities, states and the international system from three perspectives:

- as a process characterized by discordant, violent and at times even genocidal forces;
- as a result of conflict resolution/management, compromise and stabilisation;
- as the moral and institutional expression of shared norms and values.

These developments are studied from the early modern period onwards, yet with a strong emphasis on the history of the twentieth century. The group consists of historians as well as political scientists and anthropologists and combines ‘traditional’ historical research on primary sources with theories and methods from the wider humanities and the social sciences.

The review committee studied the following key publications:


Assessments:
Quality: 5
Productivity: 5
Relevance: 5
Viability: 5
Quality
In contrast to many programmes’ tightly focussed emphases on monographic history and national contexts, the committee is impressed by this programme’s strategic decision to take a more comparative approach and to concentrate on international and transnational problems and perspectives. These are important frameworks for comprehending the increasingly interconnected and globalized societies (not only European but also hemispheric), and also for understanding the long history of globalization since the time of early modern exploration. Another feature that the committee finds to be unusual and laudable is the strategic emphasis on transversal cooperation between different kinds of history, political science, humanities, and anthropology. This kind of open collaboration can produce unique and interesting results as well as innovative methods of research and analysis. A good example would be Ugur Ümit Üngör's fascinating book, *The Making of Modern Turkey*, which augments deep historical research with anthropological and sociological methodologies in original ways. We should also like to single out Liesbeth van de Grift’s *Securing the Communist State*, which addresses in historical detail some fascinating and increasingly relevant contemporary questions: what are the concrete mechanisms for regime change, and how is the security apparatus under one administration folded into the loyal functioning of a new one with different politics. Van de Grift’s research also takes good advantage of newly available archival material in Germany and Romania, her primary case studies. Lars-Behrisch’s account of the special qualities that characterized penal law in late medieval and early modern Görlitz is an excellent study of the consequences of legal history.

The key publications of this group show a marked and laudable interest in contemporary problems linking the Netherlands to broader international and historical contexts: questions of regime change in former Communist countries; the impact of Dutch foreign policy in the history of globalization; the complexities of administering aid programmes in regions of conflict; historiography of the Holocaust in the Netherlands; problems of security promotion in post-conflict situations; the role of international organisations in post-war peace building; and the strategic paradoxes involved in negotiating with terrorists.


Productivity
The International and Political History research group has been notably productive in the review period, and has been published broadly by important international presses (Oxford, Amsterdam, Routledge, Berghahn) and in respected academic journals (English Historical Review [Oxford University Press], International Journal of Peace Studies, Contemporary European History [Cambridge University Press], and the Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History [Routledge]). Several members of the group have also been invited to foreign universities as visiting professors and scholars (UCLA, William and Mary College, Virginia, Harvard, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster, European Peace University, Austria, and University of Basel).

Relevance
The group’s research topics obviously have a considerable contemporary social and political relevance (conflict, violence, terrorism, development, European integration), and this is reflected quantitatively and qualitatively in their projects funded by social and political institutions. Several members of the group are well-known faces in the media, often invited to comment on political developments and conflicts. Moreover, several members of the group fulfil advisory functions, for government and NGOs. We are also impressed by the degree in which the group functions as a strategic policy resource on issues of counter-terrorism and counter-insurgency, and in foreign relations more generally. Group members also serve in a number of national and international advisory positions and are called upon frequently as commentators by the media.
The relevance of the research is also reflected in the number of professional publications and publications aimed at a general public, respectively 140 and 150 in the review period.

*Viability*

The viability of the programme in International and Political History is and will be affected by two principal factors. First, since the last review senior researchers have left the group either through retirement or by recruitment to other universities. However, these departures also created an opportunity to appoint a new generation of young and talented researchers, and in 2009 the group expanded when the Centre for Conflict Studies joined the research group. Research output has continued to be high throughout this transition phase.

Secondly, the main threat to viability is the current teaching load, which is partly responsible for recent departures. The group contributes to four successful Master’s degree programmes and makes a substantial contribution to the bachelor programme in History. The master thesis advising load per staff member is also very large. Given current financial constraints, it is likely that the teaching load of the members of the group will become heavier, and thus the risk greater that research productivity might decline and talented staff lost to less challenging teaching and administrative environments.
Programme: **Media and Performance Studies**
Programme coordinator: Prof. Frank Kessler, prof. Maaike Bleeker
Research staff 2011: 22.47 fte

The Media and Performance Studies programme focuses on the cultural construction of ‘old’ and ‘new’ media. The programme looks at processes of the emergence and institutionalization of media and media forms in particular. The group has a considerable range – from theatre and dance to film, television, and digital media – and, therefore, highlights comparative media research and issues of intermediality, in both a diachronic and a synchronic perspective. Major areas of interest include: performance and ‘corporeal literacy’, early cinema and the history of ‘movie going’ (audiences for film), television in transition, the materiality of digital media and software, and computer games. The group’s research activities chiefly concentrate on media practices, past and present, from the perspective of spectators or users. The group has developed a specific profile by combining historical research and cultural analysis.

The review committee studied the following key publications:

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

Quality
One of the most unique features of the programme is combining the study of screen media (including film, television, photography, and digital and social media) with theatre and performance. The contemporary performing arts, including dance and theatre, increasingly use audiovisual and screen technologies in innovative ways, and in turn the media arts are more expansively understood in the context of performance theory. In fact, this is the major theme of Bleeker’s 2008 book, *Visuality in the Theatre: The Locus of Looking*. Bleeker’s book is a clearly written and well argued application of visual and cultural studies to theatre and performance that offers new frameworks for understanding the embodiment of perception and relationality of vision in performative and screened environments. Her book is a unique example of the deep theoretical advantages of bringing performance theory together with visual studies and media studies.
In reviewing the key publications (and indeed the impressive total research output of the programme) the committee is impressed by the international reach and reputation of the research staff. Their books are published by respected international presses (Palgrave Macmillan, John Libbey, University of Amsterdam Press), and in top international peer-reviewed journals including, History and Theory, (Wesleyan University, USA); Cinémas (University of Montreal, Canada); Media History, Film History, and The Journal of Visual Culture (UK), the standard bearer of this new and exciting field.

Recent scholarship from this group demonstrates an impressive breadth of topics encompassing the full history of modern media forms. Examples include: the late 19th century historiography of screen media (Kessler and Lenk); innovative rethinking of structures of international film distribution in the early 20th century (Kessler and Verhoeff, eds.); the historical power and limits of Holocaust photography (Keilbach); the mobile social dynamics of cinema spectatorship in the Netherlands after WWI (Thissen and van der Velden); the innovations of early Dutch television as a transnational form (Leeuw); and a new theory of the dynamic participatory culture of social media (Schaefer). Schaefer’s recent book, in fact, offers a compelling new perspective by rethinking Bruno Latour’s actor-network theory in the context of media cultural studies. Verhoeff’s essay on theoretical consoles and digital media also offers a fundamentally new approach through the application of Hubert Damisch’s concept of theoretical objects to new media forms. Finally, we should like to single out the collection Digital Material: Tracing New Media in Everyday Life and Technology. Celebrating ten years of digital media study at Utrecht, this anthology from an important press gives ample evidence of a dynamic and innovative research culture with international influence. Indeed Utrecht scholars are a dominant force in Amsterdam’s prestigious publication series, Media Matters.

Cross-disciplinary cooperation is the hallmark of this programme, as well as the capacity to develop new and powerful frameworks for combining historical research and cultural analysis in the context of comparative media studies.

Productivity
Despite apparent understaffing and under-resourcing, the Programme in Media and Performance Studies is highly productive. The scientific and academic relevance of the programme is confirmed not only in its international publication output, but also by the rapid rise in the granting of doctoral degrees since the last review. The programme is obviously attracting graduate students and postdoctoral fellows from the Netherlands and abroad who are doing important and innovative work. We also note that seven recent PhD dissertations were published as books with important presses. Research funding had increased from the NWO and European Union, and the group has an impressive presence, individually and collectively, at international conferences. The programme has also made Utrecht a lively centre for comparative media research with hosted conferences, workshops, and seminars. Individual scholars have also been invited for fellowships and visiting professorships: Bleeker (NYU, 2012), Kessler (IKKM Weimar, 2009; Brno, 2010), De Leeuw (Stockholm, 2006; Budapest, 2007; Stockholm, 2010; Tel Aviv, 2010), Müller (University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 2007/08), Raessens (Riverside, 2004/05; UCLA, 2006). Finally, the research staff are active on numerous international editorial boards and advisory boards of journals such as Cinémas (Kessler), Early Popular Visual Culture (Kessler), FrauenKunstWissenschaft (Lehmann), Games and Culture (Raessens), Inflexions: A Journal of Research-Creation (Bleeker), Maska (Bleeker), Montage/AV (Keilbach, Kessler), Performing Ethos (Bleeker), Research in Drama Education (Bleeker), Theatre Topics (Bleeker, Kattenbelt), and Tijdschrift voor Mediageschiedenis (Fickers, Kessler, van Oort)

Relevance
The societal relevance and valorisation of Media and Performance Studies is demonstrated not only through the impact of published research and academic symposia, but also by the group’s active collaboration in the creation of fellowships with important Utrecht-based arts festivals. The group has also been involved in cooperative research projects with the Netherlands Institute for Sound and Vision, which is one of the most important film and television archives in the world. We are also impressed by the group’s involvement in commissioned research activities, and their leadership and close involvement with community arts projects. Further evidence of the effective communication of their research to the wider public can be found in the number of professional and popularising publications by this group, 186 and 79 respectively.
Viability

Given the tendency to media convergence, the fact that the programme’s profile is geared towards mediatisation, intermediality, and cross-media, comparative research should be even more valuable in the future. The Dutch government’s initiative to designate ‘Creative Industries’ as one of the new research top sectors opens up additional possibilities for the group to develop new projects and possibilities of valorisation. Moreover, the enormous potential and viability of Media and Performance is demonstrated no doubt by their ability to attract students. The growth of the programme in this respect is both impressive and alarming. Student numbers are among the highest within the Faculty. Competition from the University of Amsterdam is fierce, especially since they are more successful in obtaining new positions funded by the university. The programme needs more support in this regard, and must rely less on fixed-term teaching appointments. The Media and Performance Studies group has been successful in obtaining national and European grants, but in the long run investments in tenured positions will be required to remain competitive in a national and international framework. In addition, we note that research time is becoming a scarce resource that needs to be protected against the demands of teaching and administration.
Programme: Medieval Culture
Programme coordinator: Prof. Mayke de Jong
Research staff 2011: 14.63 fte

The Medieval Culture research programme centres on the medieval West and its cultural diversity as expressed in Latin and vernacular written traditions. There is a clear focus on the manuscript-based transmission of such traditions. The titles of two recently funded European projects reflect this interest: 'Cultural memory and the resources of the past' and 'The dynamics of the medieval manuscript'. A shared interdisciplinary focus on cultural memory as well as on the wider implications of 'manuscript cultures' is therefore characteristic of this research group.

The review committee studied the following key publications:
- Poel, D. van der (2011) 'Late Medieval Devout Song: Repertoir, Manuscripts, Function' Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie 130, Sonderheft, 67-79.

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

Quality
This impressive and productive group is internationally recognized for its work in early medieval history and late medieval comparative literature respectively. The group also has notable strengths in Latin, Celtic languages, Dutch, French, German, and Italian as well as history and with this distinctive range they complement well the strengths of medieval studies groups in other Dutch Universities. Their work on medieval Dutch literature moreover is of international importance for the way they enhance the profile of Dutch literature in European medieval literature more generally. The group has been particularly skilful in finding overarching themes to give its members and PhD candidates room to develop their own original projects. The theme of 'cultural identities', for example, has worked to their advantage because they keep the broad theme securely anchored to rigorous scholarship on texts and manuscripts with the thorough and solid linguistic expertise necessary in this field. The imaginative combination of philological and contextual literary work emerges as a striking characteristic of these scholars, as indeed it is for so many members of the OGC. It is clear moreover that members of this group cooperate fruitfully with colleagues in other disciplines, notably art history and musicology. The Committee was impressed with the spirit of energetic cooperation between the various elements of this diverse group which lends it considerable unity of purpose.
Key publications include De Jong’s *The Penitential State: authority and atonement in the age of Louis the Pious (814-840)*, an outstanding study, published by Cambridge University Press, of the context and implications of the public penance and deposition to which the Emperor Louis the Pious, ruler of the Frankish empire 814-840, submitted in 833. This pathbreaking book has made a very considerable impact on Carolingian studies. De Jong highlights the sophistication of the political discourse of the Franks in the ninth century. By a meticulous reading of the texts she argues that the central issue for political authority in this period was accountability to God; political crime was sin and royal authority was enhanced by atonement.

Utrecht has become a famous forum for stimulating conferences in which new research is presented. The Mostert et al edited volume on Trust in Writing is a typical example of the fruitfulness of these conferences and is one of a series of pioneering collections emanating from Utrecht and published in the Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy. Its contributors explore medieval (as distinct from modern) notions of trust, trustworthiness, truth, and deceit in relation to texts and written documents, some of them (e.g. legal documents) designed with purportedly trustworthy status. Marco Mostert’s own essay, Irene van Renswoude’s discussion of the distrust in written communication in the middle ages and Anna Adamska’s fascinating examination of fifteenth-century Polish lawyers’ challenges to the authenticity of documents and title deeds indicates the importance of literate activity and assumptions about how writing should or could be used.

Els Rose’s monograph on Ritual memory is a remarkable achievement. She has already established her credentials as a medieval Latin scholar with the highly praised edition of the early medieval liturgical book known as the *Missale Gothicum*. Her study of the apocryphal acts and liturgical commemoration of the minor apostles in the early medieval west 500-1215 is a major contribution to the study of the development of Christianity in antiquity and the early middle ages as well as to Latin texts. Els Rose takes an original approach, exploring the relationship between the liturgical commemoration of the Apostles and the apocryphal literature that recorded their lives and activities. She studies the so-called minor apostles Bartholomew, Philip and James the Less, Matthew, Simon and Jude. She argues that ritual commemoration had a crucial role in the transmission and dissemination of the Apocryphal acts and conversely the transformation of the narrative traditions because they became part of narrative in ritual. This is conceptually sophisticated and technically excellent, involving also a great deal of work with the original manuscripts.

Frank Brandsma examines the interlace structure of the immensely complicated thirteenth-century prose Lancelot, one of the most popular and influential narratives produced in the middle ages. He addresses the narrative technique of weaving many different strands of a story which combines the quest for the holy Grail, Lancelot’s own love story, and the adventures of many of his companions in addition to his analysis of the way the narrative works. Brandsma explores the manuscript transmission and the social function and audience for the narrative in its oral performance, to which the interlace of the narrative and the deployment of ‘mirror characters’ and dramatic irony contribute. Although Brandsma is careful to say this is the more speculative section of the book, he moves consideration of this literary text beyond the literary record and into its dynamic social context in a very engaging and convincing manner. He succeeds in opening up new perspectives on this very thoroughly studied text.

Andre Bouwman and Bart Besamusca edited *Of Reynaert the Fox*, with the original text and facing translation of the Middle Dutch version of one of the best known beast epics of the middle ages. The book includes an introduction to Middle Dutch and a glossary which also places this text in the context of its audience, readership and circulation in manuscript and print and the adaptation of the text into chapbooks for even wider social circulation. Meens wrote an excellent article in *Speculum* on sanctuary penance and dispute settlement under Charlemagne, with reference to a dispute between two leading theologians and intellectuals of the Carolingian realm, Alcuin and Theodulf of Orleans. Meens highlights the role of religious issues in the management of legal disputes, the use of sanctuary, the function of penance alongside secular punishment, and the importance of the epistolar evidence.

Letters are also the central evidence for Paul Wackers’ *Een berijmde brief over het volmaakte leven*. He discusses a verse epistle associated with the devotion and religious piety Devotio Moderna movement which gives pastoral instruction concerning the spiritual life by a pastor to a woman. Although not a mystic himself,
the author imparts what he has learnt from his reading. Dieuwke van der Poel discusses a late medieval Dutch song book and demonstrates how the songs could be used for meditation. She discusses the range of collections, those with particular commemorative songs for moments in the liturgical year, and books relating to the Latin liturgy. This Dutch material, incidentally, needs to be set beside the Italian Laude, French lais and the English carols and it is a very interesting augmentation of the knowledge of devotional songs generally. This is one of the articles that demonstrates how close the Musicologists’ interests are to many of the scholars working in medieval studies. Peter Schrijver offers a fascinating analysis of the Celtic influence on Old English and some Old Irish phonetic and phonological analogues to suggest how the pre-Anglo-Saxon population in Roman and sub-Roman Britain shifted to Old English. This is the work of an expert philologist who is able to elucidate the wider implications of his detailed findings.

**Productivity.**

In addition to an excellent quality and range of both academic and professional publications the group has been notably successful in winning two EU HERA awards and one EU CLARIN award, signs also of their attractiveness as partners in international research consortia at the highest level. There is also an outstanding cluster of NWO awards of various kinds: Veni, Vidi, Aspasia, Rubicon, Vernieuwingsimpuls, post-doc research, free-competition and internationalisation. Members of the group are especially prominent at the major international medieval congresses at Leeds UK and Kalamazoo USA each year in giving papers, organising and chairing sessions and it is the Utrecht contingent who has played the central role in putting Dutch medievalists on the world scholarly map. Members of the group have been equally successful in winning prizes, visiting professorships and fellowships and honours. Their leadership within their respective fields is also manifest in that they play a conspicuously prominent role as presidents of national professional bodies (including KNAW itself – Oostrom), international disciplinary associations (Wackers, Besamusca) chairs and members of major advisory Boards and funding bodies for their disciplines and the Humanities more generally (Mostert, de Jong, Lie, Rose) as well as assuming a large number of editorial roles for major journals and monograph series.

**Relevance.**

The group fosters a lively interest in medieval history and literature in Dutch society. Members of the group see it as an integral part of their work to share the results of their research with a non-specialist and non-academic public, an instance of which is the wide success of Frits van Oostrom’s *Stemmen op Schrift* and radio and newspaper interviews arising out of the HERA project on cultural memory and the resources of the past and its modern political resonances. The group also puts efforts into involving a wide public, interested scholars and laymen in working groups and in the development of databases such as Dutch Songs Online and Medieval memoria on line (MeMO) as well as digital editions (Lie’s WEMAL), the latter a fruitful collaboration between scholars and the lay public, and the efforts made to provide digital versions of medieval manuscripts on line in which the association with the Huygens Instituut has proved invaluable. The relevance of the research done is also illustrated by a considerable number of professional publications (57) and publications aimed at the general public (107).

**Viability.**

There were some signs of strain in the limited funding and the need to expend much precious research time and energy seeking outside competitive funding. The departmental reorganization has made joint teaching more difficult. The dilution of the research master programme into a more general one of ancient, medieval and renaissance studies can also be regretted. One can see there might be useful cross fertilization but it also needs to be pointed out that rigorous training in each of these three fields could itself require one research masters’ degree each, even if some elements of it could be in common. It is also essential that research and teaching expertise is maintained: the provision at present is worryingly thin, though those in post are outstanding. It is essential that the teaching in Medieval Latin and medieval German be maintained and restoration of the Chair in Medieval Art History is desirable. For the future expertise in medieval Islam and Arabic would be an interesting enhancement of the Group’s expertise.
Programme: Musicology
Programme coordinator: Prof. Karl Kügle
Research staff 2011: 4.04 fte

The research group Musicology explores the role of music as a cultural practice through the direct and indirect study of sounding phenomena in the broadest sense, including technologically mediated traces from the earliest notations to 21st-century video-game music. New research areas at the interface of musicology and performance and media studies and the ‘digital humanities’ are integrated. While retaining its traditional anchoring in Dutch and European art music history and culture, the group now conducts research in a comprehensive range of musical styles, historical periods, geographical locales, and social strata.

The committee studied the following key publications:

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

Quality
The historical musicology in this group is excellent, with some very interesting specialist studies as well as broader reflections on the discipline. A common characteristic is the combination of musical and musicological expertise, self-reflection and theorisation of their work and discipline.

The volume Borderline areas in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century music is an example of Kügle’s encouragement of the study of late medieval music. His review article on the massive (7 volumes) *Oxford History of Music* by Richard Taruskin, moreover, enabled him to make all kinds of observations of historical musicology as a discipline. The canon of western music, attitudes towards it and the formation of the discipline of musicology itself are all considered in an engaging and thoughtful discussion. Dimitrescu’s *The early Tudor court and international musical relations* considers the foreign cultural models at the English royal court, the foreign musicians and instrumentalists who contributed both musical techniques in composition and practical knowledge to English music. The book addresses the wealth of information available in music manuscripts acquired by the Tudor rulers, and the relationship between English music theory and musical traditions elsewhere in Europe. The book fits very neatly into the recent attempts to
expand the historiographical horizons of the study of the Tudors. It adds an important dimension to court studies in England as well as to historical musicology. It provides a valuable complement, even a corrective, to the more insular studies of music at the English royal court. Perhaps even more importantly, it indicates how music is a crucial element of cultural exchange. Dumitrescu contributes new methods to his subject and opens up the possibility for both new analyses of English musical practice and reconsideration of the compositional and analytical relationship between English and foreign styles and trying to pin down the ‘true manifestations of Englishness’.

_Hadewijch Liederen_ is a major contribution both to medieval music knowledge and our understanding of Hadewijch’s poetry. A professional and impeccably presented piece of work, it includes an introduction from the editors on Hadewijch’s context and the survival of her work, a substantial edition of the poems, the notated music for such melodies as have been discovered, and CDs with commentary on the music by Grijp.

Sander van der Maas published a remarkable study of the reinvention of religious music by Olivier Messiaen. Messiaen claimed himself in his writing as composer, commentator and believer, and to have reinvented religious music. This study accepts his claims and addresses very convincingly the question of religion in contemporary music and thus the theological aesthetics of Messiaen’s music. The notions of ‘dazzlement’ and ‘affirmation’ are invoked. Essentially this is a book that actually attempts to chart how a particular aesthetic art, in this case music, can reach parts of human understanding and sensibility that ‘escapes aesthetic assurances’. That is, it becomes something just a little beyond intellect or emotions. Van der Maas characterizes Olivier Messiaen’s creative achievement as a breakthrough ‘toward the beyond’ and explores the relationship between religion and the creative art, primarily with an analysis of Messiaen’s oratorio _La transfiguration de Notre-Seigneur Jésu–Christ_, and suggests there is contact with modern French thinkers such as Martion, Derrida, Stigler, Lyotard as well as with the theology of Kierkegaard and van Balthasar. The thesis depends a little too much on a broad general characterization of secularization and culture in relation to religion but the essential study of Messiaen itself is very interesting indeed.

In the expanding field of ethnomusicology the article on theorising Southern African Music is a refreshingly jargon-free exploratory explanation of African music in the context of African intellectual traditions, the influence of European and African ‘aestheticisation’, and the notion of shared history, using maskanda as a case study.

The musicologists have also explored the manifestations of sound and performance in their work, bringing them closer to the interests of media and performance studies and displaying remarkable versatility. Examples of this development are Isabella van Elferen and Imar de Vries in _On mobile ringtones_, who suggest we might think of them as ‘Musical madeleines’ and as a ‘cultural performance of sub-cultural identity’. This seems more effective as a useful contribution to the public output/professional publications of the group than as an academic study. Similarly, Emile Wennekes’ article is an interesting study of filming a conductor in 1928 and the degree to which it is documentary or a staged and contrived creation in itself, as distinct from either a historical record, or about a documentary about conducting. Isabella van Elferen’s _Nostalgia or perversion._ Gothic rewriting from the eighteenth century until the present day, combines the XVIIth century Gothic novel with considerations of modern ‘Gothic literature’, the ‘Goth’ subculture, music, horror films and comic books. It is a collective volume of essays for which van Elferen provides the Introduction. The book makes an energetic claim for a broadening of the definition of gothic from literary genre to a ‘gesture of pervasive cultural criticism’ and does so by focusing on the rewriting of Gothic novel literary themes in other media or more recent literary works. Nostalgia and perversion are their themes. There might be a danger of the group trying too hard to be modish though they are probably right to suggest that their ability to exploit ‘innovative technologies’ and discuss them will no doubt enhance their chances of securing external funding. They clearly fit in well with other groups in the OGC.

**Productivity**

This group is extremely productive despite its small size and its eminence recognized with prizes (Grijp; Ahrendt, Dumitrescu). With the Medieval Culture group they have played a prominent role in the interactive database Dutch Songs on line. They have been notably active in the hosting of international congresses in the medieval, early modern and modern fields, such as the International Medieval and
Renaissance Music; Liszt, and the Music and Media study group of the International Musicological Society, as well as themselves presenting many conference papers and public lectures and serving on many national and international editing boards and review bodies. They have been notably successful in the PhD theses within the group and in the funding secured for external PhD students.

Relevance
The group suggests in its self-evaluation report that the greatest achievement of (historical) musicologists is the opening up of entire repertories from the European/Western past formerly buried in illegible notation and dusty volumes. A pioneering role in this respect has been played by the Utrecht musicologists in harnessing new digital technologies to create dynamic web-based editions of polyphonic music (Digital scores and premodern textualities: Corpus mensurabilis musicae electronicum). But it is not just that they offer new music repertoire to the world; they are also greatly engaged in its performance to the listening public; Utrecht musicologists play a major role in the early music movement and the promotion of historically informed performance practice and research. Thus programme members have maintained close ties with the Utrecht early music festival (the leading early music festival in the world), contributing in the form of introductory lectures, discussion meetings, advice and congresses running parallel to the Festival. Programme members regularly disseminate their research results to the general public in the form of book publications, contributions to journals and newspapers, and live appearances on radio and television and have recently enhanced their profile still further by the creation of the Utrecht Early Music festival fellowship which has greatly fostered the interaction between performers and researchers.

Viability.
It is a great loss that Dr. Dimitrescu has recently left Utrecht. His departure will upset the balance of interests in the group. The committee recommends that he should be replaced by someone else in the field of Renaissance and early baroque music to complement Professor Kügle’s expertise. Musicology in Utrecht has many strengths, for the group is small, young, ambitious and flexible. It is internationally highly visible and has an ambitious and coherent vision of the discipline and its future. But its current small size makes it very vulnerable.
The Social and Economic History group focuses on economic and social history in the broadest sense, including the history of institutions, gender and related topics. The scope of the research has expanded from a focus on Western Europe to include other parts of the world, such as Indonesia, the Middle East, China and Africa. Economic history’s core question concerns the wealth and poverty of nations. The mission statement of the group is in short described as: How has the world economy managed to grow over the centuries? And why, at the same time, did some countries profit more than others from this growth? The answer to the question why this has happened, has to be preceded by knowledge about what exactly has happened: when did ‘the Great Divergence’ occur, and how did the process of global inequality gradually evolve?

The review committee studied the following key publications:

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

Quality
This is a powerhouse programme fuelled by a cohesive method that has in the last six years produced research of cutting edge importance for the history of the Netherlands, Europe, and the world. By applying the principles of the so-called New Institutional Growth Theory formulated by economist Douglass North, this group has defined a clear and compelling set of questions for analysis. It seems as if the core issue was to understand why the Netherlands and England experienced greater economic growth and progress during the late Middle Ages and Early Modern period. Both Bas van Bavel and Jan Luiten van Zanden answer in different ways that the economic advantage built on deep institutional structures founded during the early and high Middle Ages. Maarten Prak in his now standard history of the Golden Age Dutch Republic also insists on continuity of history as the means to explain the different vital institutions that distinguished the United Provinces. Ewout Frankema looks to institutional paths as well in his search for the reasons behind the striking degree of income inequality in twentieth-century Latin America. The scope of the work has expanded from Low Countries, to Europe, to global comparison.
It is difficult to convey the rich variety of data and sources that these authors bring into play for their arguments. The vast range of major historical problems that they tackle is very impressive and stimulating. Soil type that diversifies the Low Countries regions, formation of reliable markets, the development of written law as a condition for trust in contracts, the economy of manors in contrast with small farm tracts on the peaty ground of Holland, the growth of book production in western Europe, the power vacuum after the collapse of the Carolingian Empire filled by new institutions in countryside and city that would counter the force of territorial princes, the particular equality of marriage in north-western Europe that opened households to participation in new markets; all these and many more are treated in cogent discussion. Some articles send these methods in surprising and innovative directions. For example, the exemplary Dutch cleanliness of the early modern period is traced back to the need for hygiene in the production of dairy products, especially butter that became a major export industry in Holland by around 1500. Even though no smoking gun is ever introduced as evidence, the argument is highly stimulating in its connection between economic cause and cultural habit.

Because they share a common set of theoretical assumptions and methods it is not surprising that different members of the group have published excellent collaborative articles. They work both as individual historians asking their own questions and as a research team engaged in a larger dynamic project. That unity also expresses itself in a consistent political view that seeks to find economic advantage in open and democratic institutions. Certainly their approach directly engages with the actual economic and social problems faced by the world today. It is interesting that their approach has attracted commissions for histories from major corporations such as Royal Dutch Shell. The group’s strong momentum and conviction also invite controversy that will make their field even livelier. By applying economic theory to history they fit into an important development of research and respond actively to the growth of economics as a science. It is evident that this excellent research thrives within a stimulating research environment. The publications fully validate the claim this programme makes. Ongoing research continues in the path of successful earlier work that persuasively combines economic and social history.

To an informed outsider the list of dissertations written under supervision of this programme appear to reflect the strengths, diversity, and coherence of the faculty’s work. Success in attracting external support is outstanding. This is a programme of the highest international importance.

Productivity
The productivity of this group in the review period is excellent, with a wide range of forms of publication in refereed articles, books and book chapters, and an impressive number of dissertations completed in the review period. Its success in securing outside funds and completing commercially, institutionally and government sponsored projects (EURYI, NOW, KNAW as well as companies such as Royal Dutch Shell, Boskalis and Heineken) is outstanding and an eloquent witness to the efforts out into devising and maintaining collaborative new research projects. Similarly their reputation is reflected in their organisation of the XVth World Economic History Congress and conferences on global economic history, the presentation of papers and lectures at many conferences and their ‘good citizenship’ in serving on the editorial boards and review bodies of many of the leading international organisations and journals for Economic history and business history. Further members of the group have been honoured with notable prizes and awards such as the KNAW Akademie professorship (van Zanden) and Jonge akademie (Gelderblom).

Relevance
The success in raising external – third stream – funds, is a tribute to the societal relevance of many of the research subjects of this group, such as the participation and representation in Dutch water boards, the organisation of the Dutch economy from the perspective of businesses, the use of microfinance for small entrepreneurs, the dynamics of financial markets, fiscal regimes and economic growth. The societal demand for the kind of expertise possessed by members of the group is huge. Furthermore the group has put a lot of effort in relating the results of the research to big societal questions and debates, such as the problems of development and underdevelopment, inequality and political participation.
Viability
The viability of this group is excellent. The group has the capacity to get projects funded and will continue to do so for several years. The group is very well managed and seems very lively and stimulating. It contains many excellent researchers with an excellent balance in seniority. As stated the programme is of the highest international importance. But the self-evaluation strikes a warning note in their capacity for teaching and attracting undergraduates, as well as master’s students in order to ensure the future for research.
Programme: Textual Culture
Programme coordinator: Prof. Harald Hendrix
Research staff 2011: 19.21 fte

The programme Textual Culture provides the platform for research on cultural systems and expressions that use texts as their preferred medium. Its overall objective is to study literary culture from a long-term comparative and intermedial perspective. Chronologically, the programme covers research on modernity from early modern to postmodern and contemporary culture. The programme has developed within this framework three research lines:

- Texts and Mediality: in this research line inter-medial interactions are addressed, focusing on the specificity of the textual medium and its relations to other media.
- Memory and Modernity: this research line is concerned with diachronic interactions, and especially with enquiries regarding the different stages of modernity with a focus on the dynamics of memory and oblivion as well as on the particular impact texts and culture in general have on the construction of social memory and/or citizenship.
- Borders and Identities: in this research line the role of literature as a mediator between cultural systems is addressed.

The committee studied the following key publications:

Texts and Mediality

Memory and Modernity

Borders and Identities
- Just, D. ‘From Guilt to Shame: Albert Camus and Literature’s Ethical Response to Politics’. 
MLN: Modern Language Notes, 125 (4).

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

Quality:
Overall this is a dynamic and lively research programme whose corporate identity is loosely organized around the theme of the social life of texts. Close cooperation on questions of texts and mediality of intermediality, cultures and identities, is evident and each of the sub-groups has undertaken effective new strategies for research in the digital humanities. The theoretical precision and its substantiating underlay in empirical research is excellent. The various members of the group have been successful in their efforts to connect aspects of literary culture within a long-term comparative and intermedial perspective. The committee particularly appreciated the creative attention to the materiality of the media in every form from the conventional to modern digital forms and the clear connections presented with other programmes in the OGC.

1. Texts and Mediality
Harald Hendrix edited with P. Procaccioli and wrote the introduction of an attractive volume combining art historical, typographical and literary topics relating to the reformation and counter-reformation in Italy. Bowen and Imhof’s book on Plantin’s innovative use of intaglio printing from engraved and etched plates for the illustration of books (essentially superseding woodcuts) in the 1560s draws on the wealth of material in the Plantin archives. This is an excellent study, well-focused on the relationship between book demand and production as well as deploying the technical expertise on the engraved plates and the processes involved. Jeroen Salman, De middelpuntvliedende kracht van de boekgeschiedenis is essentially a plea for the importance of the history of the physical book and newspapers and journals as well. But it is written by someone who has distinguished himself in the field of the history of the book, especially in the Netherlands (e.g. his fine book on Zutphen). He has a nice sense of the particular contribution of Dutch printing, publishing and libraries to the history of the book in an international context.

2. Memory and modernity
Rigney & Erll, Mediation, Remediation, and the Dynamics of Cultural Memory is a collection of essays and outcome of conference on media and the dynamics of cultural memory. They make a strong case for the way in which the constant reconfiguration of, and production of, cultural memory interacts with social and political developments and contemporary agendas (literature and commemoration in XIXth and XXth century) Rigney and Erll make a case for a more ‘dynamic’ understanding of cultural memory than the more static ‘sites of memory’ approach of Nora et al. That is, they suggest a constant reconfiguration and repositioning of individuals and groups, and suggest remembering should be perceived as active engagement with the past. They further suggest ‘performative’ rather than ‘reproductive’ might be a better adjective to deploy. They introduce the notion of ‘mediation, remediation and performance’ in the public arena. The volume’s essays engage with different media – film, novel, photographs, digital images, and the preservation of texts. Because of the multiple meanings of this mediation this is both effective and misleading. They define this as ‘acting out a relationship with the past from particular points in the present’. Stories are seen as constitutive parts of the dynamics of remembering. The work is good. The theoretical precision and empirical work supporting it is generally excellent, if a little over theorized at times. The Utrecht contributions offer an interesting set of case studies to contribute to other studies in this field. The frame of reference is narrow chronologically – the authors seem totally unaware of how much has been done in earlier periods represented in their own research Institute not least the HERA project in Medieval Studies on Cultural memory and the resources of the past. Ann Rigney’s historical narrative in the on-line age is a clever and scholarly study. Ann Rigney uses the famous Iwo Jima photograph and its on-line coverage to explore issues of narrative, though her notion of narrative itself is rather limited in its conception.
Ann Rigney’s very interesting piece on the commemoration of Robert Burns uses the centenary celebration to reflect on the importance of cultural commemorations and ‘literature’s role in nation building’. It considers in passing a number of other literary commemorations and anniversaries (and of course has her own important work on Walter Scott to contribute). She does not, oddly enough, mention the many Gutenberg celebrations, but this is first rate scholarship.

3. Borders and Identities
This subdivision of the programme addresses the role of literature as mediator between cultural systems. In effect that definition includes a wide-ranging and diverse body of work tied together only by the researcher’s intention to bridge categories that usually are understood as separate and divided. Protestant and Catholic responses to St. Augustine, poetry composed before, during, and in the aftermath of WWI by poets in the different nations of Europe, pre-modern construction of the self and post-modern psychoanalytic theory, translation and reception of literature from English into Dutch, mark the separations. They are bridged by the extremely different texts studied and the divergent methods applied to study them. Individual products of this research are excellent in their distinct qualities. Visser’s account of the early modern reception of St. Augustine remarkably transforms a topic that might interest primarily historians of theology into a consideration of how texts gain authority among different groups of readers. His book is a work of careful and imaginative history that integrates methods of material culture, major debates about confessionalization during Reformation and Counter Reformation, and the real influence of publishers in shaping the messages of their books. In his findings he questions the critical objectivity of early modern humanist readings, and turns instead to the mutual reinforcement of opinion among different ‘textual communities.’ Buelens’ Europa Europa! is a beautifully written and intellectually stimulating account of poetry composed around the event of WWI. It carries the reader along with the narrative verve of a novel and at the same time conveys the extraordinary power of poetry in the lives of writers, in politics, and society spreading diverse beliefs with an intensity that is now unthinkable.

Productivity
The productivity of this group as a whole, in terms of both academic and professional publications and the large number of 32 PhD theses defended in the review period, is very impressive. Like the members of the other research groups, this group’s members have won international recognition for their work in the form of prizes (Buelens, Van Dijk and Rubin); guest professorships in France, England, Spain, South America, South Africa and USA; editorships of leading journals and academic monographs series in the field (not least the Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse literatuur) and have made a substantial contribution to the successful administration of the Faculty and University as a whole, as well as serving on review bodies.

Relevance
The research group is committed to exploring complex questions of what literacy and interpretation become in a digital and screen age. This focus has a direct link to modern issues emerging from society. There is no doubt that the group contributes to the enlightenment of the general public but does so from a rigorous research base. The concerns with textual culture and the history of the book are particularly germane in the light of comparative advances in technology in relation to the dissemination of the written word.

Viability
This is a very large research group that has made a determined effort to respond to the comments made the previous review. Each of three sub programmes: Texts and Mediality, Memory and Modernity, and Borders and Identities also comprises a relatively large group of people. The composition of the group as a whole seems to be more accidental than deliberate and the committee wondered how helpful the current thematic divisions are, and whether a more-explicit post-colonial focus, at least in relation to the second and third sub-groups might be considered. Further a consideration of the overlaps between Texts and medality with the research group on Cultural history and also social and economic history might be fruitful in terms of institutional structure, for the projects and researchers, as noted above, certainly have clear intellectual and thematic links with projects and programmes in other groups. Like all other research groups in the Institute its future is gravely threatened because of the lack of funding for PhDs.
GENERAL CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Our very positive assessment and evaluation of the work of the Institute in all its aspects, and taking all the evidence presented to us in writing and in discussion during the Visitatie has been made in recognition of the dedication, commitment, enthusiasm, intellectual integrity, rigorous scholarship, world class research achievements in every research group, and their sheer hard work. We have been especially mindful of the necessity to compare and evaluate Utrecht Universities OGC against the international standard to which we are accustomed, not just in our own institutions (Cambridge and Oxford in the UK, Harvard and Brown in the USA) but also in the many institutions we have encountered in our own separate experiences as evaluators and assessors elsewhere in North America and Europe.

It is ironic, given the enormous effort every research programme within the OGC has made since the 2004 Visitatie, and in the light of all that has been achieved in terms of publications, academic and professional, and international research profile, that the future of every group is threatened by high teaching loads, the cessation of direct funding for PhDs, and the potential narrowing of the criteria of ‘societal relevance’. During the Visitatie we gained the impression of a considerable sense of strain. We have made specific recommendations in the ‘Viability’ section of our comments on each research programme, as well as in the assessment of the Institute, and for convenience summarise them here.

A: relating to the entire Institute

1. Maintain the current Institute structure rather than attempting to divide the institute into two.

2. Maintain the present diversity of publishing practice.

3. Endeavour to change the current policy relating to direct funding of PhD research in order to ensure the future of research by Dutch scholars in the Netherlands and to ease the burden not only of the constant need to submit, despite the uncertain outcome, competitive applications for external funding, but also the tying of doctoral and post-doctoral research to pre-conceived and often politicised themes, not all of which are particularly appropriate for humanities research.

4. Related to 3, strive to maintain the possibility of ‘blue-skies’ research as well as those connected to specific thematic projects.

5. Take formal account of the balance between time officially allocated to research and the reality of the erosion of research time due to teaching commitments – undergraduate, MS, research –MA and PhD advising.

6. Take formal account of administrative time, especially time spent on preparing applications for external research funding.

7. Consider the introduction of funded sabbatical leave.

B: relating to particular research programmes

8. Replace the position in Contemporary art history.

9. Consider appointments in late antique Roman history, Assyriology, and in classical Latin literary and cultural studies.

10. Reconsider the current structure of the Cultural History group.

11. Replace the post in Renaissance and early Baroque music.
12. Replace the Chair in Art History.

13. Maintain the teaching of Medieval German and Medieval Latin.

14. Reconsider the current structure of the Textual Culture group and whether elements of its research focus might profitably be relabelled as, e.g. 'post-colonial literatures and identities'.

It remains for the Committee to thank the Dean of the Faculty of Humanities Prof. Van den Akker, the Vice-Dean Prof. Algra, the Academic Director of the OGC Prof. Frank Kessler, Managing Director Frans Ruiter, the administrative staff, and all its researchers, for the opportunity to learn so much about the research activity of the OGC and for their warm hospitality during the days of the site visits. We are also very grateful to QANU’s Dr Barbara van Balen for her invaluable secretarial assistance during our site visits and subsequently in preparing the text of this report.

Rosamond McKitterick (Chair)
Elleke Boehmer
Jeffrey Muller
David Rodowick
Appendix A: Curricula Vitae of Members of the Committee

**Elleke Boehmer** is Professor of World Literature in English at Oxford University, Wolfson College. Internationally known for her research in postcolonial writing and theory and the literature of empire, Elleke Boehmer (BA(Hons), MPhil(Oxon), DPhil(Oxon)) currently works on questions of migration, identity and resistance in both postcolonial literature and writing of the colonial period, in particular of sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia. A Rhodes Scholar (1985-88), she is Professor of World Literature in English, a Professorial Governing Body Fellow at Wolfson College, and Deputy Director of the Oxford Centre for Life-Writing at Wolfson. Elleke writes both fiction and non-fiction, cultural history and criticism. Her best-selling short biography of Nelson Mandela (OUP VSI series) has been translated into Arabic, Thai and Portuguese (Brazil region). Elleke Boehmer's main research and supervisory interests include anti-colonialism since 1870; life-writing and auto-biography; modernism, masculinity and empire; and the cross-overs between feminism and nationalism in colonial and postcolonial writing. She has a continuing concern with what it means to represent beauty and death, especially in postcolonial narrative and poetry.

Elleke Boehmer was Co-Investigator, with Professor Susheila Nasta of the Open University (PI), on a large AHRC-funded project 'Making Britain' to investigate the many rich South Asian contributions to British social, cultural and political life in the period 1870-1950. Working together with Research Assistant Dr Sumita Mukherjee and historian Dr Rozina Visram, Elleke focussed on the pre-1918 period. The team explored inter alia Indian students’ lives in Britain, in particular Oxbridge and London, the experience of Indian Sepoys on the Western front, and the involvement of Indian intellectuals, artists, and writers in the formation of a pre-War avant-garde. Elleke is writing up a monograph based on this research, provisionally entitled, India Arrived.

Elleke was the main reviewer for the mock Research Assessment Exercise at Southampton University in 2006-7, and is currently on the UK national Research Excellence Framework committee for English, 2014.

**Rosamond McKitterick** is Professor of Medieval History in the University of Cambridge and Fellow of Sidney Sussex College. She holds the degrees of MA, PhD and Litt.D from the University of Cambridge and also studied 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 Korrespondierendes Mitglied der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Germany, a Korrespondierendes Mitglied im Ausland, phil.hist. Klasse, Oesterreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, and a Corresponding Fellow, Medieval Academy of America. She has held short-term visiting Fellowships at 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). In 2010 she was awarded the Dr A.H. Heineken International Prize for History by the Royal Dutch Academy.

She has played an extensive role in peer review and evaluation in the University of Cambridge on the University’s General Board Review committees and the personal Professorships and Readerships committees for the Faculties of Law, Music, Archaeology and Anthropology, Classics, Oriental Studies (as it was then), Divinity, Modern and Medieval Languages, History and Philosophy of Science, and the History of Art. She regularly acts as assessor for Research Fellowships in Cambridge and Oxford Colleges, examines Ph.D.s for universities in Britain, Continental Europe and Australia, has been a member of the jury for the Habilitation in the Universities of Paris I (Sorbonne), Brussels (Université libre) and Vienna. She has assessed many North American tenure and professorial promotion applications and British applications for Readerships and Professorships, and many peer reviews for research projects for, e.g. the ERC, ESF, NWO, SHO, NRC (USA) and Rockefeller Foundation. In 2004, 2006, 2008, 2010, 2012 she served as a member of the judges’ panel of the Philip Leverhulme Prize in History (for leading young academic historians under the age of 36). She has also served on National bodies (AHRC History research Panel, QCA History Subject Association). She has carried out evaluations of research and appointments to Research Professorships in the University of Helsinki (History, social and economic history and Cultural
She has given numerous papers at seminars, and conferences, plenary or 'key note' lectures, and guest lectures in Britain, Continental Europe (France, Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Italy, Austria, Denmark, Norway, Ireland) as well as Russia, Turkey, North America and Australia. Her publications, to date 26 books and edited books and 143 articles and chapters in books, include The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms 789-895 (1977); The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians, 751-987 (1983); The Carolingians and the Written Word (1989); Books, scribes and learning in the Frankish kingdoms, sixth to ninth centuries (1994); Frankish kings and culture in the early middle ages (1995); History and memory in the Carolingian world (2004); Perceptions of the past in the early middle ages (2006); Karl der Große/ Charlemagne: the formation of a European identity (2008).

Jeffrey Muller is Professor the History of Art and Architecture at Brown University. He has earned the MA, MPhil, and PhD degrees from Yale University and also studied at the Universität München 1973-1974. He is a Fellow of the American Academy in Rome and Member of the Scientific Research Group for Art History at the Catholic University of Leuven. He has held short-term fellowships and memberships from the Institute for Advanced Study 1980-1981, the National Endowment for the Humanities (1993-1994), the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study (2001-2007), and the University of Antwerp (2007). He has been visiting professor at the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University (2009).

In his work as administrator and evaluator he has served long terms as chairperson of the Department of the History of Art and Architecture at Brown University and coordinated the art history sessions of the Annual Meeting of the College Art Association of America. He has chaired and served on tenure and appointment committees at Brown University. He has participated on dissertation committees at Harvard, the Free University of Brussels, and the Catholic University of Leuven, served on senior fellowship committees for the American Council of Learned Societies, reviewed applications for the Belgian FWO, and has assessed many cases for tenure at North American universities.


D. N. Rodowick is William R. Kenan, Jr. Professor of Visual and Environmental Studies, Chair, Department of Visual and Environmental Studies, and Director, Carpenter Center for the Visual Arts. Rodowick is the author of numerous essays as well as six books: An Elegy for Theory (Harvard University Press, 2013); The Virtual Life of Film (Harvard University Press, 2007); Reading the Figural, or, Philosophy after the New Media (Duke University Press, 2001); Gilles Deleuze’s Time Machine (Duke University Press, 1997); The Difficulty of Difference: Psychoanalysis, Sexual Difference, and Film Theory (Routledge, 1991); and The Crisis of Political Modernism: Criticism and Ideology in Contemporary Film Theory (University of Illinois Press, 1989; 2nd edition, University of California Press, 1994). His edited collection, Afterimages of Gilles Deleuze’s Film Philosophy, was published by University of Minnesota Press in 2009. After studying cinema and comparative literature at the University of Texas, Austin, and Université de Paris 3, he obtained a PhD at the University of Iowa in 1983. Having taught at Yale University from 1983 until 1991, Rodowick began the film studies program there. Rodowick subsequently taught at the University of Rochester and at King’s College, University of London, where he founded the film studies program and the Film Study Centre. Special research interests include aesthetics and the philosophy of art, the history of film theory, philosophical approaches to contemporary art and culture, and the impact of new technologies on contemporary society. In 2002, he was named an Academy Film Scholar by the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. Rodowick’s essay, “An Elegy for Theory,” received the Katherine Singer Kovacs Essay Award from the Society for Cinema and Media Studies in 2009. In spring 2010, he was a
Fellow at the Internationales Kolleg für Kulturtechnikforschung und Medienphilosophie at the Bauhaus-Universität in Weimar, Germany. Rodowick has also been an award-winning experimental filmmaker and video artist.
Appendix B: Explanation of the SEP criteria and scores

The **four main criteria** for assessment are: Quality, Productivity, Relevance, and Vitality & Feasibility. The assessment on the institute level primarily focuses on strategy and organization, whereas the assessment on the level of the research group or programme primarily focuses on performance and activities of researchers and the results of their work (output and outcome).

| Quality | The level or degree of excellence of the research, compared to accepted (international) standards in that field.  
|         | The scope of the term ‘research’ is not limited to the research results. Research management, research policy, research facilities, PhD training and the societal relevance of research are considered integrated parts of the quality of work in an institute and its programmes. |
| Productivity | The relationship between input and output, judged in relation to the mission and resources of the institute. |
| Relevance | Social, economic and cultural relevance. Aspects to be considered are:  
|         | • Social quality: efforts of the institute or group to interact in a productive way with stakeholders in society  
|         | • Social impact: how research affects specific stakeholders or procedures in society  
|         | • Valorisation: activities aimed at making research results available and suitable for application in products, processes and services.  
|         | Committee members can also comment on relevance for the academic community, but the assessment should focus on societal relevance. |
| Vitality & feasibility | The ability to react adequately to important changes in the environment. Also a vision on the future is considered. |

The **scores** on a five-point scale are:

| 5 Excellent | Research is world-leading.  
| Researchers are working at the forefront of their field internationally and their research has an important and substantial impact in the field. |
| 4 Very Good | Research is considered nationally leading.  
| Research is internationally competitive and makes a significant contribution to the field. |
| 3 Good | Research is considered internationally visible.  
| Work is competitive on the national level and makes a valuable contribution in the international field. |
| 2 Satisfactory | Research is nationally visible.  
| Work adds to our understanding and is solid, but not exciting. |
| 1 Unsatisfactory | Work is neither solid nor exciting, flawed in the scientific and/or technical approach, repetitions of other work, etc. |
APPENDIX C: Time schedule site visit

Sunday, July 1, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.00 PM</td>
<td>Karel V</td>
<td>Informal Reception</td>
<td>Evaluation Committee: McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management OGC: Kessler, Ruiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00 – 8.00 PM</td>
<td>Karel V/Brasserie</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Evaluation Committee: McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monday, July 2, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.30 AM</td>
<td>Hotel Karel V</td>
<td>Walk to Janskerkhof</td>
<td>Evaluation Committee: McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Board: Van den Akker (dean), Algra (vice dean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management OGC: Kessler, Ruiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00-9.15 AM</td>
<td>Room 0.06 Janskerkhof 13</td>
<td>Installation of the Evaluation Committee by the Board of the University</td>
<td>Evaluation Committee: McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Board: Van den Akker (dean), Algra (vice dean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management OGC: Kessler, Ruiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.15-9.45 AM</td>
<td>Room 0.06 Janskerkhof 13</td>
<td>Meeting with Faculty Board</td>
<td>Evaluation Committee: McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty Board: Van den Akker (dean), Algra (vice dean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management OGC: Kessler, Ruiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.45 -10.45 AM</td>
<td>Room 0.06 Janskerkhof 13</td>
<td>Meeting with OGC Management</td>
<td>Evaluation Committee: McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Management OGC: Kessler, Ruiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45 – 11.15 AM</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15-12.00 AM</td>
<td>Room 0.06 Janskerkhof 13</td>
<td>Meeting with OGC staff</td>
<td>Evaluation Committee: McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff OGC: Kessler,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Evaluation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00 – 1.30 PM</td>
<td>U-Theater, Kromme Nieuwegracht 20 (entrance Muntstraat 2a)</td>
<td>Buffet/Informal meeting with Postdocs and PhD students</td>
<td>McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Postdocs, PhD, PPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30 – 2.15 PM</td>
<td>Room 0.06 Janskerkhof 13</td>
<td>Meeting with Textual Culture</td>
<td>McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Textual Culture: Hendrix, Rigney, Buelens, Brillenburg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15 – 3.00 PM</td>
<td>Room 0.06 Janskerkhof 13</td>
<td>Meeting with Art History</td>
<td>McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art History: Hecht, Hurx, Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 – 3.45 PM</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.45 – 4.30 PM</td>
<td>Room 0.06 Janskerkhof 13</td>
<td>Meeting with The Culture of Classical Antiquity</td>
<td>McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Culture of Classical Antiquity: Blok, Rutgers, Eijnde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.30 – 5.15 PM</td>
<td>Room 0.06 Janskerkhof 13</td>
<td>Meeting with Cultural History</td>
<td>McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural History: Van Eijnatten, Segal, Van der Wal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.15 – 6.00 PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Free/walk to Museum Catharijneconvent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00 – 7.00 PM</td>
<td>Museum Catharijneconvent, Lange</td>
<td>Reception with drinks and Museum tour</td>
<td>McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.30 – 9.00 PM</td>
<td>Huize Molenaar</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td>Balen Advisory Council Schnabel, De Vries, Terreehorst, Van der Meer, Rigney, Ottenheym, OGC and Faculty Board: F. Kessler, F. Ruiter, W.J. van den Akker, K. Algra and guests Rosi Braidotti (Director Center of the Humanities) and Maarten Prak (former Director OGC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, July 3, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>Hotel Karel V</td>
<td>Walk to Janskerkhof</td>
<td>Evaluation Committee: McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00 – 9.45 AM</td>
<td>Room 0.06 Janskerkhof 13</td>
<td>Meeting with Gender Studies</td>
<td>McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen Gender Studies: Buikema, v/d Tuin, Ponzanesi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.45 – 10.30 AM</td>
<td>Room 0.06 Janskerkhof 13</td>
<td>Meeting with International and Political History</td>
<td>McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen International and Political History: Hellema, De Haan, Demmers, Crump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 – 10.45 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Evaluation Committee: McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen Socio-Economic History: Van Zanden, De Moor, Van Bavel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45 – 11.30 AM</td>
<td>Room 0.06 Janskerkhof 13</td>
<td>Meeting with Socio-Economic History</td>
<td>Evaluation Committee: McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen Socio-Economic History: Van Zanden, De Moor, Van Bavel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30 – 12.15 AM</td>
<td>Visit Library</td>
<td>Walk to Drift 27</td>
<td>Evaluation Committee: McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15 – 2.00 PM</td>
<td>Faculty Club, Academiegebouw, Domplein</td>
<td>Lunch with Research Committee</td>
<td>Evaluation Committee: McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 – 2.45 PM</td>
<td>Room 0.06 Janskerkhof 13</td>
<td>Meeting with Medieval Culture</td>
<td>Research Committee: McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen Medieval Culture: De Jong, Besamusca, Rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.45 -3.30 PM</td>
<td>Room 0.06 Janskerkhof 13</td>
<td>Meeting with Musicology</td>
<td>Evaluation Committee: McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen Musicology: Kügle, Van Elfen, Matosec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30 -4.15 PM</td>
<td>Room 0.06 Janskerkhof 13</td>
<td>Meeting with Media and Performance Studies</td>
<td>Evaluation Committee: McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen Media and Performance Studies: Bleeker, Verhoeff, Lehmann, Hagedoorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15 – 5.30 PM</td>
<td>Room 0.06 Janskerkhof 13</td>
<td>Internal Consultation</td>
<td>Evaluation Committee: McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.30 – 6.00 PM</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td></td>
<td>McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00 – 9.00 PM</td>
<td>Location to be announced</td>
<td>Dinner Evaluation Committee</td>
<td>McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wednesday July 4, 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00 – 9.45 AM</td>
<td>Room 0.06 Janskerkhof 13</td>
<td>Consultation Hour (for Institute Members, Management, Faculty Board)</td>
<td>Evaluation Committee: McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.45 – 10.30 AM</td>
<td>Room 0.06 Janskerkhof 13</td>
<td>Internal Consultation, preparation presentation</td>
<td>Evaluation Committee: McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 – 10.45 AM</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45 – 11.30 AM</td>
<td>Sweelinck Zaal, Drift 21</td>
<td>Presentation First Results</td>
<td>Evaluation Committee: McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen Faculty Board: Van den Akker (dean), Algra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30 – 12.00 AM</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00. – 1.45 PM</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td><em>Evaluation Committee:</em> McKitterick, Boehmer, Muller, Rodowick, Van Balen + invites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>