RESEARCH REVIEW

RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR HISTORY AND ART HISTORY

UTRECHT UNIVERSITY

2012-2017

De Onderzoekerij
Vondellaan 58
2332 AH Leiden

Phone: +31 6 24812176
Email: info@onderzoekerij.nl
Internet: www.onderzoekerij.nl

Contents

Preface

This report assesses the Research Institute for History and Art History (OGK) at Utrecht University for the period 2012-2017. We would like to thank the management and administration of OGK for the warm hospitality we were shown during our visit and for the opportunity to review the many areas of scholarship that flourish under the broad umbrella of OGK. We appreciate the willingness of so many research staff and PhD researchers to make time to speak with us, and to do so with candor and in a spirit of cooperation. Over the course of the site visit we came to appreciate a number of fundamental challenges facing OGK as well as the many opportunities for new scholarly ventures. We hope that our review and recommendations will help the research staff and management of OGK to further sharpen their vision and meet the praiseworthy goals which they have identified for their future.

We also especially want to signal our appreciation to Annemarie Venemans, the review secretary, who organized and guided our work, and so expertly communicated the expectations of the national assessment protocols. Her documentation of the staff interviews and our Committee discussions were instrumental to the preparation of this report.

With much appreciation to all who participated in the review process,

Anne McCants, chair of the Committee

1. Introduction

1.1 Terms of reference for the assessment

The quality assessment of research of the Research Institute for History and Art History (OGK) is carried out in the context of the assessment system as specified in the Standard Evaluation Protocol for Public Research Organisations by the Association of Universities in The Netherlands (VSNU), the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO), and the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW).

The Review Committee was asked to assess the scientific quality and the relevance and utility to society of the research conducted by the Research Institute for History and Art History of Utrecht University between 2012-2017, as well as its strategic targets and the extent to which it is equipped to achieve them.

Accordingly, three main criteria are considered in the assessment: research quality, relevance to society, and viability. In addition, the assessment considers three further aspects: the PhD training programme, research integrity and diversity.

The Committee was asked to compare the research programmes with a number of institutes in the world as a form of qualitative benchmarking based on the respective experience of the different members. However, in its opinion it is in most cases impossible to do a proper benchmarking, which would require the Committee to compare like with like. While sharing similar interests with the proposed benchmark programmes, the OGK programmes differ on a number of important characteristics, such as size, ratio between research and education, and sometimes other tasks, that make a comparison unproductive. In addition, the Committee members did not have the detailed information on the comparisons necessary to evaluate scholarly quality at more than a summary level. Nonetheless, where possible the Committee has included benchmarking into the report for individual programmes.

This report describes the findings, conclusions and recommendations of this external assessment of the Research Institute for History and Art History (OGK).

1.2 The Review Committee

The Board of Utrecht University appointed the following members of the Committee for the research review:

- Professor Anne McCants
- Professor Anne Deighton
- Professor Joanna Woodall
- Professor Hilde De Ridder-Symoens

More detailed information about the members of the Committee can be found at Appendix A. The Board of Utrecht University appointed dr. Annemarie Venemans of De Onderzoekerij as the Committee secretary. All members of the Committee signed a declaration and disclosure form to ensure that the Committee members made their judgements without bias, personal preference or personal interest, and that the judgment was made without undue influence from the Research Institute for History and Art History or stakeholders.

1.3 Procedures followed by the committee

Prior to the site visit, the Committee received detailed documentation comprising the self-assessment report of the Institute for History, including appendices and the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) 2015-2021. During the site visit, the Committee were given the midterm review report, information with regard to language of publication of monographs, positions of alumni PhD students, and the percentage of junior staff in temporary positions.

The Committee proceeded according to the SEP. The assessment was based on the documentation provided by the Institute and the interviews with the management, a selection of researchers of the Institute, and PhD students. The interviews took place on 29, 30 and 31 October 2018 (see Appendix B).

The Committee discussed its assessment at its final session during the site visit. The members of the Committee commented by email on the draft report. The draft version was then presented to the Institute for factual corrections and comments. Subsequently, the text was finalised and presented to the Board of Utrecht University.

2. Assessment of the Institute OGK

2.1 Governance of OGK

The Department of History and Art History is one of the departments of the Faculty of Humanities. It coordinates the research and teaching programmes. Scientific staff are appointed at department level. The academic research being conducted in the Department of History and Art History falls under the Research Institute for History and Art History (OGK).

Research at OGK is organised into six programmes:

- Ancient History and Classical Civilization
- Art History
- Cultural History
- Economic and Social History
- History of International Relations and Political History
- Medieval Culture

The administrative staff of OGK consists of a director of research (0.4 fte), a research coordinator (0.6 fte) and administrative support staff (0.9 fte). The director of research is one of the three members of the board of the Department of History and Art History.

The Committee noted that the director of research and the research coordinator were highly praised by staff at all levels. It is admirable that there is a clear commitment to personal and research support at the Institute level. Despite the stressors which affect the entire Institute, the commitment on the part of the management personnel to support their colleagues both personally and professionally is admirable, even if perhaps not sustainable with continued limited resources.

As stated in the self-assessment document, the mission of the Institute is (A) to offer support to the research community at large and (B) to support the training and supervision of the department's PhD candidates. The current strategy of OGK appears to be largely that in effect of a hands-off facilitator, intentionally leaving a multitude of issues to be addressed at the level of the six programmes.

According to the Committee, this stated mission could have been more specific about the quality and quantity of research expected, about the desired relationship between collaborative and individual research, about the desired historical and geographical coverage of the various research programmes, and about the University's criteria for sustainability.

Several of the research programmes appear to function well with relatively horizontal leadership structures that allow all members of the research programmes to participate in the intellectual agenda-setting, and give even junior appointments some voice. Some programmes do not appear to function in this way, and in some cases, this appeared to have an effect on morale.

2.2 Research quality of OGK

The overall assessment of the Committee is that the quality of research is of a high level and well monitored. The extraordinary commitment to research quality is truly impressive. There are differences between the different programmes, but all programmes meet the criteria of a top-tier research university. The output as measured by bibliographies and highlighted items appears to be generally of high quality, broad in scope and varied. An analysis of the publication lists clearly shows the big difference in production and scope between the senior and junior researchers. Some staff in particular stand out; their output is prodigious, they receive the most project funds, and they are very active in the international forum.

Utrecht University focuses its research on four strategic themes (Dynamics of Youth, Institutions for Open Society, Life Sciences and Pathways to Sustainability). These themes offer scholars from different faculties opportunities to collaborate in new research projects and to reach out to societal partners. For OGK the

strategic theme 'Institutions for Open Society' (IOS) has been the most important one over the past six years.

The Committee noted that several researchers of OGK are actively participating in the strategic theme 'Institutions for Open Society' (IOS) and the 'History' routes of the National Research Agenda, offering ample opportunities for those involved to develop new projects and to receive additional funding. However, for those whose research does not fall neatly into one of the university-wide research themes, it is clearly very difficult to secure funding. It seems that the fact that funding is often dictated by the overarching research themes of UU or the various national funding agencies means that it is difficult to truly set the research agenda at the Institute level. The mismatch between sources of funding and administrative oversight seems one source of stress in the system. In addition, it seems unlikely that "blue-skies" research can be prioritised. However, to maintain a position on the frontier of new research necessitates that individuals have the opportunity to take risks and embark on innovative projects outside of the main themes.

2.3 Societal relevance of OGK

The Committee concludes that the commitment to public engagement from even very specialised research areas is particularly impressive. This strikes the Committee as much higher than what one would expect at a comparably ranked US institution for instance. Almost all of the research programmes are committed to public engagement, and at various levels, from local school and museum programmes, to policy-setting by the European Union. A tremendous amount of creativity is evidenced through some of the public-facing activities and/or tools created by the research staff. For this in particular, the Institute should be highly commended. The Committee noted further that all of this activity seems in keeping with a very high level of interest among the general public for history, maybe especially the history of the Netherlands itself, although the Committee wondered how much effort goes into other historical research projects whose scope extends beyond work on the Netherlands or Western Europe.

2.4 Viability of OGK

Steady signs of improvement could be observed across the review period. However, the Committee encountered some challenges for the future. Given the several stressors created by the tight research funding situation at the national level, the heavy burden of teaching, the desire to attract a more international faculty and staff, and a more diverse student body, the Committee believes that the management of OGK could take a more proactive stand in promoting administrative best practices across the individual research programmes. These stressors seem likely to require coordination at the central level, because solutions need to be applied consistently and equitably across the six programmes. More central direction would also allow for best practices from one programme to be applied to another programme.

More centralised oversight is desirable to:

- increase the diversity of the faculty and research staff;
- attend to the high stress of all levels of teaching and research staff broadly attested during the site visit;
- make the teaching/research division more equitable across programmes and individuals;
- strategize a smoother navigation of the national research funding environment;
- coordinate the teaching calendar to support time off from teaching for everyone (i.e. sabbatical funding if possible, or at a minimum one block without teaching each academic year);
- decrease the level of administrative burden.

The Committee admires the Institute's sympathetic approach towards young scholars. It noted that this made an important contribution to success in the previous review period. However, the Committee also noted that early career scholars are vulnerable. An area of concern in this respect is the mechanism related to a lessening of the time allocated to research in the face of heavy teaching loads. During the site visit the Committee learned that even the goal of 30% guaranteed research time is difficult to ensure. On the other hand, some postdocs are forbidden to teach, because of the protocol of their grants. Ideally,

the Committee would like everyone involved in a research project to have a minimum research time of 30%, but also the opportunity to teach. This would also help to strengthen the link between cutting edge research and the teaching curriculum.

See also further specific recommendations at the end of this report.

2.5 PhD programme

In the period 2012–2017 a total of 36 PhD students enrolled in OGK, 21 as part of an NWO or ERC grant and 15 with a self-developed research project ('*beurspromovendi*').

The PhD Graduate School of Humanities is responsible for the PhD programme. It sets out a general policy for the enrolment and supervision of PhD candidates. At the beginning of the PhD trajectory, the PhD supervisor and the PhD candidate establish an individual training and supervision agreement. This agreement has to be signed by the PhD and the supervisor(s), read by the PhD coordinator, approved by the director of OGK and sent to the secretary of the Graduate School. This agreement includes expectations about supervision and provides a schedule for formal evaluations. The Committee is pleased that the Graduate school has such a general policy in place. During the site visit the Committee didn't find any evidence of abusive treatment of doctoral candidates by supervisors. In addition, there was broad acknowledgement of the personnel and procedures in place for dealing with harassment. However, the Committee further suggests that the Institute as a best practice extend the training and supervision plan with a standardized Memorandum of Understanding around behaviour and expectations.

The Committee interviewed PhD students at various stages of their PhD research about their supervision, research facilities, the usefulness of graduate school training courses, and possible constraints on their research of whatever variety. It was pleased to note that PhD students are generally well supervised and coached by their—now obligatory—two supervisors. The students that the Committee spoke with were generally happy with their working conditions and with the guidance provided by their supervisors. They were also satisfied with the freedom they were given in their research. The Committee admired the proactive approach of PhD students to their administrative environment and the way they see their opportunities locally and nationally. It especially appreciated that PhD students organise their own graduate seminars.

The Committee was very impressed by the individual support that many of the PhD students indicated. OGK provides coaching and advice to PhD students, offered by the research coordinator. This research coordinator is directly involved in the selection of PhD candidates and in the planning phase of their projects. During the site visit the Committee learned that from November 2018, a new research coordinator will start. His task will principally be the support of the researchers and not so much the PhD mentoring. The Committee recommends that sufficient attention to PhD mentoring continue to be paid.

The Committee noted that PhD students expressed satisfaction with their ability to fully integrate with the members of their own research programmes, but that there is only limited cohesion between PhD students across the different programmes. There is nothing wrong with PhD students feeling a closer vertical bond with other researchers (junior and senior) working in the same area, than with the horizontal bond they share with other PhD students across OGK, but the Committee believes it is also important for PhD students to be integrated beyond their own topic to broaden their academic horizons and capabilities.

An organised curriculum is offered to PhD students by the Graduate School of OGK. This comprises academic and professional skills training courses in support of academic writing, academic English, research integrity, time management, and first-time teaching, amongst other offerings. In addition, most PhD candidates participate in one of the Dutch national research schools, which offer courses and workshops to help young researchers design their projects, present preliminary findings, learn how to interact in different scholarly environments, and build an (inter)national network of fellow researchers and senior specialists in their respective fields.

The students the Committee spoke with during the site visit were positive about the training opportunities provided. They appreciated the range of University and Faculty courses to which they had access. The

students appreciate their national research schools and are encouraged and reinforced to participate at least in one of these. In the opinion of the Committee, participation in one of the research schools provides the PhD students with a valuable national networking environment, as well as further resource opportunities that they exploit effectively. The Committee was not given the detailed breakdown of course content for these methods programmes, however.

Completion rates are calculated based on PhD students who started between 2008-2013. In this period 36 students started their PhD project (28 standard PhD students and 8 contract PhD students). Of 36 started projects, 8 projects (22%) were completed in 4 years, 13 projects (36%) were completed in 5 years, 7 projects (19%) were completed in 6 years, and 3 projects (8%) were completed in 7 or 8 years. Of the 36 projects, 3 projects (8%) were still pending by the end of 2013 and 2 projects (6%) discontinued.

Based upon these numbers the time for completing a PhD thesis appears to be longer than desired by the OGK; more than 40% of the PhD students did not finish within 5 years. The Committee recommends that the administration keep monitoring the completion rate and, if necessary, take measures that will lead to an increase in the number of post graduates completing their PhD within the optimal four-year period in the coming years, if necessary by encouraging a relatively more focused topic than might have been the norm a decade ago, as well as providing a broad range of career advice for students.

2.6 Research integrity

The University states on its website that faculty and staff are subject to the University rules regarding academic integrity. The University assumes that everyone involved in academic teaching and research at Utrecht University shares in the responsibility to maintain academic integrity. According to the self-evaluation document, the faculty has formulated explicit standards of scholarly good conduct, which will become available soon.

During the site visit, the Committee learned very little about research integrity in OGK. It was therefore not convinced that it is an integral part of the culture of the Institute. Some programmes presented good examples of data protocols and data protection within their programme. However, there should be a standardised protocol applicable for the entire Institute. A risk assessment for students doing field-work should also be part of this protocol.

2.7 Diversity

The self-assessment report is very limited in its discussion of the diversity of OGK. It states that the Faculty of Humanities pays special attention to diversity, in particular to gender diversity among staff in senior positions. With regard to other forms of diversity, such as ethnicity or social background, there is no information in the self-assessment report. There is evidence of efforts to recruit internationally, and the Committee commends this, but the implications of international recruitment for diversity have not yet been fully thought-through.

The Committee is concerned about the diversity of the Institute. It urges OGK to develop a clear diversity plan. Further action to promote more gender balanced and diverse environments, teams and Committees, and further to raise the awareness and improve the knowledge of discriminatory mechanisms in academic environments and how to consciously counteract them, is needed. The Committee recognizes that this is a very challenging issue for many universities, particularly in a case such as at Utrecht where a significant portion of the BA and MA courses must be taught in the Dutch language. The Committee recommends that the Institute management consult with their peers across the Netherlands and abroad to become informed of best practices that have been successful in attracting a more diverse academic staff. Furthermore, it notes that the pipeline trajectory supporting an academic career is a very long one, and will need to be assessed in a comprehensive way. So, to achieve diversity among the ranks of the senior faculty, each level below (from secondary schooling up through early career faculty) must be opened up to previously excluded types of people, and more or less in succession. Such persons must be available to be hired, and that requires a long-term plan to expand the so-called pipe-line of potential historical scholars.

3. Assessment of the research programmes

The committee assessed the research programmes both quantitatively and qualitatively. For the quantitative assessment a four-point scale is used, according to the standard evaluation protocol 2015-2021. The explanation of the criteria underlying the scores can be found in appendix D. The qualitative assessment of the institute can be found in the next sections.

According to the SEP scoring system (see Appendix D), the Committee has awarded the following scores to the research programmes:

	Quality	Relevance	Viability
Ancient History and Classical Civilization	2	1	3
Art History	2	2	3
Cultural History	2	1	2
Economic and Social History	1	1	2
History of International Relations and Political History	1	1	1
Medieval Culture	2	3	4

3.1 Ancient History and Classical Civilization

Research area

The Ancient History and Classical Civilization programme investigates:

- the history of the ancient world from Archaic Greece up to the End of Antiquity;
- the rise of Islam in the Mediterranean and Near East (800 BCE–600 CE).

Their thematic focus centres on cultural interaction, innovation, and migration and processes of inclusion and exclusion, with special emphasis on the role of citizenship and religion, and also on the Jewish world. Cultural integration is the guiding principles of their research.

Archaeology is not – as elsewhere - a separate department or unit, but is fully integrated in this programme. A tenured staff member is involved in the excavations in Thorikos (Greece). In their research methodologies traditional methodologies are combined with archaeology, digital humanities, and techniques derived from the sciences. For the work on ancient population genetics the archaeologists are working together with research centres across The Netherlands and Belgium. The UU is making an active contribution to the digital humanities.

The programme is also making an active contribution to the digital humanities and cultural heritage by elaborating innovative databases.

In 2017, the programme consists of:

- 5 tenured staff;
- 2 non-tenured staff;
- 1 PhD candidate.

Research quality

As the self-assessment tells us "the past six years has been a transitional period". With only 2 full professors and 3 tenured staff it is difficult to be "world leading" in Ancient History and Archaeology. Funding is becoming more and more difficult to realise all the ambitious projects. Taking into account the limited personnel and resources, it is surprising that the researchers do not systematically cooperate with other Utrecht programmes in and outside the OGK. They are aware of this lacuna.

Collaborations across the history department are determined by the projects and grants, not by the fact that the programmes are a subdivision of the Institute. The contribution of the OGK is more in facilitating research than in steering collaborations.

Over the last two years, thanks to strong leadership, the programme has managed to set up big projects, to teach substantially and to guarantee enough qualitative research time by giving each researcher a teaching-free block of ten weeks. Although the programme is small, several grants have been acquired in the last years, both national and European, allowing for new projects (with staff) and the development of digital databases. As a consequence, the output and activities of the Programme are of high quality and some research strands are world leading.

Overall, the research output is very good, the programme and the staff are very internationally oriented and the many publications testify to the breadth of the research topics. The scientific relevance is beyond dispute. The leading staff members are very well embedded internationally and as such recognised. The Committee was also impressed by the concern for the dissemination of new knowledge to different layers of the population. It noted further that the research is primarily disseminated via books and book chapters rather than in peer-reviewed journals. The leadership of the programme should assess the appropriateness of this strategy for the desired scholarly profile of the research staff into the future.

The Committee further notes that it cannot offer a meaningful comparison between the programme in Ancient History at Utrecht and similar topical programmes at Oxford University. The self-assessment document asserts that having archaeology integrated with the historians is a relative strength, and the Committee agrees that with the very small size of both aspects of the programme it most certainly is.

Nonetheless, the gross disparity in programme size between Utrecht and Oxford renders this comparison moot.

Societal Relevance

It is not immediately evident how to make specialized knowledge and research about Antiquity relevant for contemporary laymen. Taking into account the limited availability of researchers and resources, the programme pays a great deal of attention to societal services. Specifically, the Ancient History programme seeks to contribute to the various societal debates - both written and spoken - that concern the area of modern identity, citizenship and religion, multiculturalism, migration and diaspora.

In the period under consideration the programme set up and finished the Archeolab project. This enterprise sought to make available Utrecht University museum's collection to the public at large. This was done through a specially developed user-friendly website and particularly by providing on-site hands-on training to 8-12-year-old schoolchildren. This Archeolab project is something to be really proud of, and could be a model for future projects, in which 'real archaeological research', digitalisation, research-led teaching, and social relevance are integrated and work efficiently together for specific stakeholders.

The programme is now setting up a new research master: Heritage Studies together with Cultural Studies and Art History. The Limes project (How do we look at borders today), in cooperation with Cultural Studies, is fitting into the new research area Heritage Studies, whose aim it is to interpret the past for the public.

The involvement of Ancient History in heritage management turned also into a digital humanities initiative entitled "PEACE: Portal of Epigraphy, Archaeology, Conservation and Education on Jewish Funerary Culture". This worldwide project seeks to preserve Jewish material remains in a digitised form that allows for sustained future historical and genealogical research by scholars as well as by the public at large (including the development of text-mining).

Viability

The staff is well aware of their weaknesses of limited personnel and resources, but the way they deal with it is deserving of praise: developing digital humanities in their field; and seeking more and better collaboration with other disciplines in and outside the programme and OGK. In the considered assessment period (2012-2017) the number of non-tenured staff and PhD's was yearly about three. Since 2017 the number of non-tenured researchers has increased with an average research time of 30%.

All the members recognise that the teaching load is very high but they manage to be efficient in their allocation of teaching time. They designed a flexible educational programme which is mostly research related. In addition, every staff member has an unbroken period without teaching. The benefits of research-led teaching are evident as at the Masters level the student output is remarkable. Research masters students (Ancient, Medieval and Renaissance Studies) specialise for 40% in Ancient History, 40% in Medieval Studies and 20% in Renaissance and Celtic studies. About 50% of the graduates are very successful in acquiring PhD positions.

In the SWOT analysis the programme admits that there might be a mismatch between the size of the programme and its scientific ambitions. The description of the programme is slightly lacking in coherence, especially as many different research strands are mentioned. There seems to be a divide between the digitalisation projects and archaeology, and between group projects and traditional individual scholarship. The in-group collaboration could be still stronger but it is the administrative burden that weighs the most on results. Nevertheless, all researchers have great confidence in the viability of their unit.

In order to realise their ambitions, the staff depends on factors that are beyond their own control (finances, attribution of staff, very low success rates for project applications, etc.). As mentioned in the self-assessment report, no extra funding is available for Classical Studies, which means there are no good prospects for increasing the staff in the future. Despite these constraints, the Committee notes the favourable atmosphere of the programme's working conditions attested by all levels of staff, including doctoral candidates, who clearly participate fully and collegially in the intellectual life of the programme.

Although the Committee worries about the vulnerability of the programme it sees the enthusiasm, solidarity and the teamwork of the programme and the very good leadership. There is a case for merging with another programme but the Committee believes that the OGK would need to consult very carefully on this as the staff is not convinced that being embedded in Cultural history or being merged with Medieval Culture will be beneficial for them. The Committee notes further that ancient history programmes in the Netherlands are generally small, so this programme is far from unusual in that regard.

To sum up: The Committee sees strong leadership and a coherent mission, a strategy for going forward which is cognizant of societal relevance. But with scarce resources, low numbers of students and small staff there is real concern about their viability. The given score is a flag to the university to make sure that the programme's mission is viable into the future.

3.2 Art History

Research area

In 2017, the Art History programme had 16 tenured staff, 7 non-tenured staff and 5 PhD candidates. The self-assessment singled out three strands of research:

- history of art and architecture of the Low Countries in their global context (also described as global art history per se);
- technical art history;
- digital art history and the relationship between digital art history and the other two strands.

However, the self-assessment report also states that the 16 permanent members of the programme together cover 'the visual arts and architecture from the Middle Ages to the present, focussing on the Northern and Southern Netherlands and complemented by expertise in the art of the Italian Renaissance and multiple modernities.' The UU-webpage for Art History quotes the Review Report 2012: "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."

The discrepancy in research focus seems to result from a rapid and ambitious transition during and following the review period from a traditional art history programme, founded on iconography and connoisseurship of national schools of art, centred on the Netherlands, to a cross-disciplinary approach focussing on technical art history and the visual culture of the Low Countries from a global perspective. This radical expansion of disciplinary and geographic boundaries has resulted in good part from the appointment of four new professors in the past three years, including a Chair in the History of Art, Science and Technology. The Committee had the opportunity to speak to three of these Professors, one of whom was not employed at Utrecht during the review period. It would have welcomed a conversation with other members of staff about this major transition in focus, especially as this would have helped us to more fully comprehend the viability of the programme into the future.

Research quality

There are senior scholars of great international reputation amongst the faculty, and some younger scholars whose achievements are already outstanding. The publications list reflects a programme in transition, and a variety of intellectual interests. The key publications were selected to represent the three research strands. They are of very high quality and indeed world-leading in the sense that they are works of rigorous scholarship that expand the boundaries of art history in influential ways. The Demonstrable Products of the programme are more heterogeneous than the key publications. Some of them relate to the history of material and visual culture, particularly in science and technology. Others are representative of more traditional protocols of art historical interpretation in which national schools and individual, named authorship are privileged sites of interpretation and the work of art is distinguished from visual and material culture more generally. The majority of these latter outputs are very good: written by scholars of considerable reputation and published in peer-reviewed journals or by reputable academic presses both within the Netherlands and abroad. The requested comparison with the Department of Art History at Cambridge University is potentially illuminating. In some specific efforts, such as the Ingenuity project, the programmes compare favourably. But as a whole it is not possible to provide evidence that the Cambridge Art History department is world-leading because it was not evaluated in REF 2014 as a separate department.

Societal Relevance

The self-evaluation rightly takes for granted the relevance of art history to societal debates because of the importance of heritage to Dutch identity. It is also justified in stating that in the Netherlands art history generates societal impact through interactions with museums and heritage institutions, especially in exhibitions and exhibition catalogues. The self-evaluation document and interviews with faculty provided

ample evidence that the Art History programme at Utrecht has been very active in these areas, particularly through collaborations and partnerships with museums and other cultural institutions. It should be commended for bringing cutting-edge research into the public domain through these activities and institutional links. The key societal relevance publications also include a textbook aimed at secondary schools.

In comparison to some of the other programmes of OGK, the definition of society implicit in the evaluation of societal relevance by this programme is somewhat restricted. The stakeholders are generally educated, adult and high status, whether Dutch or international. An explicit attention to diverse (socio-economic, ethnicity, gender, age, disability for example) audiences is not evident. Digital media appealing to very broad audiences, such as blogs, podcasts and social media could be exploited. Ideally, means of measuring societal relevance and impact would also have been considered (as in all the programmes). Whilst impressive in its scope and energy, it is thus not clear that this programme's engagement with external partners and audiences at large forms part of a coherent strategy of outreach to enhance societal relevance. Examples of good practice from other programmes could be helpful here.

The Committee noted that societal relevance to diverse stakeholders is a particularly thorny issue for the Art History programme because, while it is the crowning glory of the Netherlands, Dutch art, especially of the Golden Age, has historically been identified with bourgeois elites within the boundaries of a nation state. The programme leader, who joined the university as recently as September 2016, is already considering the question of how a continued focus on the art of the Low Countries can be accommodated within international perspectives. There are opportunities to develop further research questions relating to Dutch art and other materials that are of relevance to a wider range of stakeholders.

Viability

The self-evaluation document reports that the art history programme has been overhauled almost completely during and after the review period. The four new professors appointed since 2015 have brought with them three new research strands (global, technical, digital), collaborative research projects, institutional partnerships, international networks, various proposals for ambitious new funding applications and new PhD and postdoc positions. All this is hugely impressive and promises an exciting future for their research and very substantial income from external funding.

However, this rapid change poses a challenge for the leadership of the programme because it needs to embed the new appointments and research strands within the teaching curriculum and include and enthuse members of the faculty (both junior and senior) researching and teaching art history in more traditional ways, often with a focus on the Netherlands and Italy. This is a difficult managerial as well as intellectual challenge, which would benefit from support at the institutional level by, for instance, providing information about how similar transitions have been achieved in other programmes. The viability strategy for the coming period describes an extraordinary array of activities and opportunities; it would be helpful to prioritise them in relation to explicit goals.

The self-evaluation states that the overhaul at the professorial level was initiated in response to the decreasing number of BA and MA students majoring in art history and the lack of funding for PhD positions. The relationship between the new research strands and the development of teaching curricula that, by integrating the new research strands, are attractive to a wider range of prospective BA and MA students and potentially more socially relevant, could be addressed in the viability strategy for the coming period. Such integration is relevant to the long-term viability of research because stronger student recruitment to distinctive, redesigned BA and RMA programmes will feed appropriately prepared graduates through into the research culture and professional positions. Better recruitment will also justify direct funding for PhD positions and jobs in academia. The lack of job prospects and teaching opportunities was a source of anxiety amongst some of the early career researchers in this programme particularly, despite their deep appreciation of their research environment and the leadership and mentoring of their PIs.

3.3 Cultural History

Research area

In the research review period, the Cultural History Programme stayed about the same in size with 17 tenured staff, 5 non-tenured staff and 6 PhD candidates in 2017. The self-assessment describes the research area as 'The historical investigation of cultural modernity in its European and cultural dimensions.' Modernity is conceived both as the period from 1500 to the present-day and a concept with which critically to engage.

Three research strands were singled out:

- Transcultural connections;
- Cultural citizenship;
- Knowledge practices, including the history of science and the humanities.

An emphasis on Europe was acknowledged in strands one and two. The full publications list was extremely varied in topic and methodology and here the three strands were not immediately evident to an external reader. However, during the site visit the members of the programme clearly shared a sense of common intellectual purpose.

Research quality

The programme holds the field in The Netherlands and its staff are confident that it is the leading programme in Cultural History under that label in Europe. The Cultural History programme is internationally recognised in the field of Digital Humanities. Several members have been recognised for their research and/or are members of prestigious scientific Committees or editorial boards. This puts the programme in the market to be world-leading in research, certainly in some areas. Prestigious presses and journals, prizes, reviews and evidence of innovative methodologies provide evidence of the quality of the core publications at an international level. The full list of publications includes a fair proportion (30 – 50% depending on the type of output) of publications in Dutch, on Dutch topics and/or in journals with a primarily national profile, alongside publications aimed at international readerships. In all these regards, the Cultural History programme compares very favourably with the KU Leuven programme, with which it shares a number of points of contact, especially to promote a common public presence across the Low Countries. The fact that Utrecht researchers are more likely to publish in English is certainly a plus for purposes of international attention. In both the self-assessment and in discussion, the programme acknowledged that the issue of language is always a consideration in striving for world-leading status, not because of the quality of the research per se but because, unfortunately, publication in English is required to enhance significance and contribution to the field internationally.

Societal Relevance

The programme is self-consciously and enthusiastically engaged with present-day questions, challenges, and concerns. There is ample evidence of a very wide variety of initiatives to engage with different stakeholders. The media employed include digital and online as well as more traditional publications and activities such as lectures. There is a serious commitment to societal relevance at a variety of levels, from government agencies to schoolchildren. The digital humanities work sounds outstanding in innovation and in the development of text-mining, which makes quantitative evidence available to answer research questions posed by academic historians, librarians and heritage institutions.

There is strong evidence of contributions to important current issues and debates in society (e.g. race, the continuing impact of colonialism, the nature and significance of history, cultural heritage, the concept of Europe) and examples of productive interaction with stakeholders (e.g. *Historicidagen,* education of secondary school teachers, librarians, heritage workers). The historical and cultural dimensions both appear to be addressed.

There is some tension between the clear commitment to societal relevance and the lack of diversity amongst the staff, who seem to be all of European heritage. The self-assessment provides no quantitative or qualitative evidence that all this good work has made a difference to the stakeholders, or to procedures, and ways of measuring this might be considered. Overall, however, the programme's commitment to societal relevance is extremely impressive and could be used as a model of good practice.

Viability

As represented both in the self-assessment document and in the meetings, the programme came across as well-led and confident of continuing with what has been successful so far – i.e. the three research strands, successful applications for external funding, societal relevance and, importantly, dissemination of knowledge through popular and social media as well as high status journals. There is a fairly strong strategy for the future, relating to Digital History, Heritage and Public History and History of Knowledge.

The enthusiasm for and reliance upon digital humanities seems justified in that the programme's high reputation and good professional connections in this area should indeed provide useful, funded research projects well beyond the next review. There is evidence of forward planning in the vision of a Heritage Lab and moves to collaborate with other research programmes, such as Art History and Ancient History. The programme appeared agile and motivated by the challenges of contemporary life. Unusually, it is thinking creatively about the relationship between teaching and research and appreciates the need to balance research output with administrative duties for the programmes and the University.

The SWOT analysis demonstrated self-criticality and constructive strategic thinking. There is an awareness of the lack of diversity but opportunities for tackling this are limited to PhDs and postdocs, rather than permanent appointments. In terms of recruitment, 'international' does not necessarily mean diverse.

The robustness and stability of the programme is dependent on a continued ability to attract external funding. The amount of external funding in 2017 was significantly lower than in previous years but this may well be a temporary variation as might be expected for a relatively small programme and the number of externally funded projects that are already in place (especially SKILLNET). The intellectually critical stance of the programme, its multi-disciplinarity, digital emphasis and explicit societal engagement and relevance will be very attractive to some students and funders. However, this positioning also poses slight risks. Multi-disciplinarity and collaboration need to be demonstrated, managed and fostered on a project-by-project basis and through new doctoral work. In an unstable political climate, some funders and potential students need to be convinced of the intellectual value of working across established disciplinary methodologies and moving beyond traditional cultural history. At moments, the self-assessment came across as speaking to the converted.

Looking to the longer future, there is scope for greater collaboration with other programmes within and beyond OGK, since all dimensions of 'history' are expanding and changing. There is some potentially fruitful overlap with other programmes and this could be developed.

3.4 Economic and Social History

Research area

The Economic and Social History (ESG) programme is the second largest of the research groups. It supports two parallel masters programmes (one Dutch and the other English), and also a doctoral programme supporting the completion of 25 PhD theses over the study period, the highest of any programme. In 2017, ESG had a tenured staff level of 15 tenured staff, 18 non-tenured staff and 9 PhD candidates. It has been the most stable of the programmes over the evaluation period, maintaining both a consistent size and broad continuity of personnel among the permanent staff. For every year of the assessment period between 75 and 90 per cent of the research time funding was obtained via grants from national, international or third-party sources.

The research programme focuses on global history and interdisciplinary history:

- Global history: from a focus on the history of the Low Countries and Europe, the programme has evolved into one with a global outlook. This entailed a shift in both content and recruitment;
- Interdisciplinary history: from its inception in the 1990s, members of the programme have taken inspiration from the social science literature. During the period under review it aimed to move from inspiration towards genuine collaborations with social science scholars in multi-disciplinary teams.

Research quality

The ESG research programme seeks to understand developments in economy and society in a self-consciously historical framework. Using a combination of archival and other explicitly historical methods it further draws upon social science methodologies to document and explain long-term historical change, including fundamental transitions or crises, by making comparisons between different world regions, and between social groups. Inequality, resilience, and innovation are the wonderfully broad but flexible themes deployed to steer the programmes' research agenda. Their approach requires clear hypotheses that they then test by the highest standards of both qualitative and quantitative analysis.

This work has been executed with a very high level of international visibility and is especially noteworthy for the quality of its senior and mid-career faculty as measured by scholarly publications, conference participation and organization, leadership positions in international associations, and on editorial boards, as well as the reputation of its doctoral training programs and the quality (measured by publications and placements) of its graduates. It is among a small group of the most well-respected programmes in economic and social history in the world. Multiple members of this group have acted as the PIs of major collaborative research projects that span multiple years and countries, with an impressive track record in successful grant applications, even in the incredibly tight research-funding environment that currently exists. ESG researchers are frequently invited to give academic lectures around the world, but also speak regularly to local audiences via national radio history programmes, a television series on the Dutch Golden Age, and other forms of public engagement detailed below.

The work of the programme includes a number of extremely important books that have attracted broad international attention. However, as is appropriate to the sub-discipline of economic history, the largest part of the research output appears in refereed journal articles. The balance overall of the kind of work typically done by historians (big books as the ideal) and the kind of work done by economists ("homerun" articles as the ideal) seems more even for ESG than say for the Lund comparison group. This may in part reflect the relatively heavy emphasis, especially among the senior researchers, on early modern topics. Lund is more heavily weighted to 19th and especially 20th century topics and is more narrowly econometric in its approach to questions. But the ESG research output also reflects the explicit commitment of the programme across the career stages to social history and not simply quantitative economic history. Indeed, the strong statement of commitment from this programme to the disciplinary modes of historical scholarship, while also appreciating the benefits of broad collaboration with a number of social science disciplines, was heartening given the drift towards the practice norms of economics for

much of the profession. This is much to be commended. What might have been a risk, not following the crowd, has proven to be a real source of reputational strength, and more importantly, intellectual fertility.

A final point deserves mention which is the clearly strong leadership of this programme, reflected in the disproportionate leadership of the Institute in both personnel and vision, the senior coordination of one of UU's research themes, Institutions for an Open Society, and a high level of extra-university public service. Notably, the seniority of the programme leadership is coupled with a strongly-attested 'democratic' atmosphere of the programme's working conditions. All levels of staff (including doctoral candidates) expressed broad satisfaction with their membership in the programme, the voice they have in the collective conversation, and the support they feel from their colleagues, despite the obvious resource constraints under which they work.

Societal Relevance

Given the emphasis over the last evaluation period (and before) on the causes and consequences of long run economic growth in global perspective, the sources and perils of economic inequality, human resilience and flourishing, and innovation – all of which have strong policy implications -- the work of this programme is highly relevant to both national and international concerns. Much of this work appears to be done via reports (often for government agencies), followed by media interventions using the expertise of the staff in the wider policy field. However, this work also appears to be complemented, or even facilitated in the first place, by basic research. This practice should be continued.

Moreover, the commitment to engaging the public, even in projects that are deeply historical rather than either policy oriented or concerned with present-day living conditions (such as the family account books crowd-sourcing project, or the development of business finance in the early modern period), is both commendable and strategic. The game of the Golden Age is a compelling example of this commitment and it is heartening to see its popular success, bringing further visibility to the historical work of the programme. The strong connections between some members of the group and both the intellectual and public work of various Dutch museums is also impressive, and adds to the public profile of ESG. Again, in this area the Committee is particularly impressed with the commitment of ESG staff in comparison with the Lund benchmarking programme that is not characterized by a similar level of public outreach effort or ingenuity.

The commitment to publishing in English keeps international visibility high, but perhaps at a cost to accessibility to the public, or undergraduates whose English is not as strong. Clearly efforts are made to develop projects, publications, museum work, and public lectures in Dutch too. This is critical for making the research visible to a broad Dutch audience.

Viability

Of all the programmes ESG has the highest proportion of untenured staff reflecting its success in generating large grants to support PhDs and temporary postdoctoral staff. It also bears a disproportionately high burden of administrative responsibility for the Institute as a whole. While this broader leadership is to be commended, it results in a well-attested burden for the programme in supervising its large number of temporary researchers and students. This level of administrative and supervisory burden is not sustainable without sacrificing the quality of life and perhaps the intellectual creativity of programme members. The difficulty of attracting international hires to the programme, as attested in our interview with the senior faculty panel, seems related to the fact of the high burden of work, as otherwise this programme would be an attractive place for an academic career in terms of reputational quality.

The various investments made over the study period to attract additional interest from undergraduates is commendable and perhaps essential for long-term viability of the programme, especially as a goal should be to have more permanent staff to shoulder the heavy supervisory and administrative load the programme bears. A question might be the relative balance in this programme of teaching versus research. Given the very high visibility of the research outputs, attention to teaching and student outreach could easily be stretched thin. That it appears not to be is commendable, but nonetheless worrisome for

attracting international talent to the programme if working conditions are perceived to be comparatively onerous.

The high rate of hiring from among the programmes' own PhD recipients is perhaps understandable given the very high quality of the graduates and the teaching requirement of Dutch language proficiency; nevertheless, it could become problematic. Over time it can create a deeply insular perspective and make any kind of change extremely difficult. Change for its own sake should not be the goal, but an ability to be open to new possibilities is essential for a healthy research environment. It will be important to continue to expand the English language BA course, both to attract a more international undergraduate student body, but also to allow for a greater diversity of new hires.

Related to this is a concern about the impact of the teaching load that is currently high enough to be noted by all with whom we spoke. One has to question the future continuation of the level of research output currently characteristic of the programme given the length of the teaching calendar and the current inability in this programme to align the teaching distribution so that one block per year is opened up for the purpose of conference attendance, travel to archives, and/or concentrated writing time. Perhaps greater transparency and/or control over the distribution of grant funding at the programme level could help the programme to meet their local needs more efficiently?

Finally, one might have wondered how the programme would flourish over time as embedded in History rather than Economics or as a free- standing interdisciplinary department, but the commitment to their place within History noted above is clearly a part of the strategic plan the programme has for its future.

3.5 History of International Relations and Political History

Research area

The History of International Relations and Political History programme (IPH) is the largest programme in the Institute after having been substantially enlarged over the period in question. In the research field, it supports two very well attended masters programmes, and also a productive doctoral programme. In 2017, it had a staff level of 27 tenured staff, 12 non-tenured staff and 11 PhD candidates. There are two sections within the programme, Political History (PH) and International Relations (IR).

This programme studies the simultaneous processes of Europeanization and globalization and their impact on democracy and the rule of law. More specifically it analyses how conflict, war, terrorism and violence impact (inter)national political systems, and considers the changing position of the Netherlands in this international context.

Research quality

The variety of research delivered from these two related areas is necessarily large, and there is a rich menu of methodologies deployed by IR and PH. There is acknowledgment of the close ties with political scientific methodologies for some research, but the programme is positively and self-consciously embedded within an historical framework.

There is a developing research and publication interest in research areas beyond Europe, but much of the research is still largely anchored in a Eurocentric perspective, which is natural and entirely appropriate, given The Netherlands' geopolitical position, and its place in the international institutional system.

Success in securing European grants, and also other grants shows a very healthy increase, and this further encourages collaboration. Output is very rich indeed, and appears to have remained relatively stable over the period in question, though with a decline in book chapters. Scholars are using good publishing houses, and their work has been much appreciated by prizes and awards. There are fewer conference papers – often a source of subsequent journal publication, but it appears that many invited outside lectures have been given by both junior and more senior researchers. Further, contacts and internationalisation of research contacts is excellent and indicates an admirable appreciation of the research output by the international community. Deliverables are most impressive. The wide use of English has allowed this output to be further facilitated, although Dutch should not of course be lost from the programme entirely.

The acknowledged concentration upon 20th century work necessarily narrows the overall offer from the programme. However, it is also clear that some scholars are now integrating their research into a longer time frame. There is an interesting emphasis on transnational and comparative work that is in line with similar departments with the same research interests elsewhere.

The Committee understands that the programme will now also diversify further by not only extending the chronological reach of their research, but through the development of thematic research themes, explored over time. This will give greater flexibility within the programme, allow for further cooperation with other programmes in the Institute and beyond, and is much to be commended.

Finally, the Committee notes that comparison with the London School of Economics (LSE) is difficult. The LSE has a department of International History, International Relations (as well as one of Economic History). It does not have a Department of Political History. Therefore, the configuration is very different, and direct comparison is unlikely to be persuasive.

Societal Relevance

The programme has an outstanding activity report under this heading. This has wide variety, and, though mainly Dutch focused, is also very imaginative. The observation that the programme's report/advice for outside bodies was certainly not consultancy, but contributing to a 'reflective' society is subtle, and much appreciated. The PH group appears to have been more closely involved with current policy issues.

There is extraordinarily interesting and innovative work based on new technologies/apps and security in two programmes (to combat local radicalisation and confronting violent extremism) in the region, and also on knowledge transfer into schools for a better understanding of the Cold War. These demonstrate effective outreach with impact for the wider school system and a deep understanding of how research and societal outreach can be combined. The Committee hopes this will be used as an exemplar elsewhere across The Netherlands, and indeed, beyond, if it proves to be successful. This should make a critical contribution for the promotion of continuing success for a pluralist society such as The Netherlands. Bringing this kind of history into broad public discourse, and embedding it in the educational fabric, is of tremendous value, even though such work has not enjoyed the same valorisation as traditional research outputs. The capacity to work with both staff and students in these outside projects is to be highly commended as well.

There is evidence of very extensive conference organisation and professional contributions – which all places time pressure on academics, but enhances the internal and external profile of the programme.

Viability

There is generally a very strong, energetic and self-confident approach to routes forward, building on strengths and developing these, in part through their research clusters, though all within the constraints of heavy teaching loads. These loads appear to be managed as well as is possible within the constraints of the existing administrative structure. At the programme level, the 'teaching labs' appear to be a positive innovation which should impact upon both staff and student learning and perhaps be a model elsewhere. Teaching loads are clearly an issue, but it is to be hoped that increasingly efficient and fair allocations may be managed within the Institute as a whole. It is further to be hoped that the University would be able to fund a number of doctoral students per year given the number of high-quality master students the programme has attracted. Perhaps a measure of greater autonomy for the programme might also allow more flexibility in assessing priorities.

IPH has clear and natural ties to the public sector, including most obviously the Dutch national government, EU governance bodies of all types, and specialist international institutions devoted to state-building, justice, peace-keeping, etc. These links perhaps make this programme appear self-evidently more "essential" to the public mission of the university than might be the case in some of the other programmes. This is a strength to be taken advantage of (in terms of funding and visibility), but it can also be a trap if the relevance of the work is just taken for granted. Public links should continue to be cultivated, but always bearing in mind the primacy of the academic coherence of the work. The programme is well informed and active in terms of directions for future research within the University research frame and beyond.

Cultural diversity is improving in terms of international hires, and this is to be welcomed, although the issue of Dutch language is one which will probably have to be managed within the wider University environment – video recordings in Dutch and English of core lectures might be considered as an independent learning tool. Diversity in the student population intake is being confronted within the limits of the programme and the need to ensure academic standards are retained in a competitive environment for student places.

There is a good focus on big and flexible research ideas rather than micro-focus projects, yet the programme hopes to use its common 'thread' to keep cohesion and hopefully fulfil the University's wider research priorities. It is to be hoped that the Institute will also facilitate consolidation of the links between the programme and cognate programmes in the Institute, and indeed beyond.

3.6 Medieval Culture

Research area

The programme Medieval Culture is according to the self-assessment a component of the interdisciplinary and interdepartmental Utrecht Centre of Medieval Studies (UCMS). The researchers are since 2013 divided into two research Institutes: the medieval historians and art historians fall under the OGK, the medieval language studies, comparative literature and musicology fall under ICON. The medieval (art) historians work more closely with the ICON researchers than with other programmes within the OGK. The self-evaluation is not clear about the organisational division of Medieval Studies/Medieval Culture, neither about their activities within the framework of the OGK. Consultation of the Utrecht University website required a lot of time to disentangle the organisational complications. It is quite clear that the OGK medievalists feel more associated with the UCMS than with the OGK. The contribution of the OGK is of a more administrative nature than in steering collaborations or framing the intellectual life of the programme.

In 2017, the programme comprises 5 tenured staff, 4 non-tenured staff and 2 PhD candidates. Utrecht medievalists are internationally well-known for their research on the early Middle Ages (literacy and religious culture). Studying the late Middle Ages has traditionally not been their core business. This does not detract from the fact that very valuable research is also carried out on the late Middle Ages, admittedly more locally and regionally oriented (i.e. Memoria cults, communication and literacy).

For long-term developments in European society and civilization, researchers of the programme are collaborating, albeit on a surprisingly low level, with the other historians in the OGK, in particular with those studying Antiquity and Early Modern Europe.

The situation of the programme in Medieval Culture within the OGK makes the benchmarking exercise in this area a particularly fraught one. The medieval historians (as they described themselves in the discussion) do not think of themselves in the first instance as having OGK as their primary home. That is instead UCMS. This, coupled with recent major leadership and staff changes specific to the group inside of OGK, suggests that benchmarking at this point in time will be less instructive than normally. Nonetheless, it is clear that they envy the freedom of project choice enjoyed by their Zurich peers and the Committee would agree with them here.

Research quality

The strength of Medieval Culture as a whole is the interdisciplinary approach, working together with colleagues in- and outside Utrecht. The OGK medieval historians are a small group with an explicit commitment to have as individual researchers, (A) freedom of choice in research topics and (B) a scientific output that meets the highest scientific standards. The programme plays an important role in the reputation of Medieval Culture as a whole but it is difficult to measure their weight and impact.

The publication strategy is evidenced by core publications: outstanding individually authored monographs and edited volumes by highly respected presses. By far the majority of publications are books and chapters in books and not articles in journals. The 'individual author' strategy limits the earning capacity from large-scale funding projects, although the staff members have been successful in gaining grants for personal projects. They are more sceptical than members of other programmes about applying for large European grants not knowing which topics are likely to catch on.

The Digital Humanities are foremost related to the creation of websites:

- The research strand 'orality, literacy and communication' in the early and also later Middle Ages is innovative and of world class. It generated, (A) the series Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy, published by Brepols Publishers of Turnhout, Belgium, one of the most important publishing houses for medieval studies. Secondly, the programme has developed a general forum for publications on the history of medieval communication, and (B) a website that is meant to provide references to the series;

- MeMO (Memoria and remembrance practices) offers an Internet-based database application with inventories and descriptions of four types of sources that are fundamental to the study of the commemoration of the dead. For practical reasons the geographical scope and time frame are the present-day Netherlands from the 12th until the late 16th century. The sources contain both texts and objects.

Individual scholars have inherited from previous leadership an enormous network that they are further developing with medievalists at other research universities worldwide. But this is not presented as an 'infrastructure' that could be susceptible to strategic planning and development.

Societal Relevance

There is considerable, impressive evidence of general responsiveness and particular initiatives, but there is no evidence, qualitative or quantitative, of impact on stakeholders (i.e. a change in the knowledge, awareness, skills etc.).

As a service to the profession it is the ambition of the Medieval Culture group in Utrecht to be the leading centre for Medieval Studies in the Netherlands, and to develop UCMS into one of the most prominent research associations in Medieval Studies worldwide. An example of this service is the series Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy.

The main activities in science communication to the general public are the rather traditional (but of high-quality) participation in debates, writing opinion texts, giving lectures, organising exhibitions (on relics in Catherijneconvent), publishing books and articles written in Dutch (i.e. *Cultuurgeschiedenis van de Middeleeuwen: Beeldvorming en perspectieven*).

Researchers dealing with orality, literacy and communication are well placed to provide long term explanations on communication problems related to current immigrants. There is a lot of interest among a broader public to know 'how it used to be' and 'how it can be solved'. Knowledge about the 'longue durée' can be crucial in understanding current problems.

Staff members of the programme are involved in material and immaterial heritage; they work together with museums, libraries and other heritage organisations. Perhaps the researchers should become more creative in modern science communication and make more use of social media. The websites they are responsible for appeal to researchers, not to the wider public. The relative lack of cooperation and strategy in societal relevance are hampering the interaction with stakeholders in society.

There is some awareness of stakeholders, although these are limited to the culturally engaged (especially local) and the 'non-academic' 'general public'. There is no explicit acknowledgement of the issue of diversity. By thinking in a more nuanced way about stakeholders it might be possible to prioritise certain groups, given the limits on resources.

Viability

There is internationally a concern about the long-term viability of Medieval studies in all departments of history in the Western world, the Middle Ages being no longer that popular among students in recent decades. The consequences of small numbers of master and research master students are manifold: fewer allotted teachers, and thus fewer researchers and opportunities to get project grants. In Utrecht and elsewhere, scientific interest and output are disproportionately large in relation to the small number of majors in the field. A proportionally large number of MA graduates want to remain at the university as trainees in Medieval Studies and specifically in Medieval Culture. In the research master 'Ancient, Medieval and Renaissance Studies' 40% of all the research master students (foreign and domestic) are medievalists of whom half of them were getting a PhD grant, inside or outside Utrecht. Nevertheless, the lack of visibility of Medieval Culture at the BA level and a lack of a sufficient number of PhDs and postdocs is acknowledged as a real threat to the future sustainability of this research programme.

Traditionally, medievalists have collaborated much more in an interdisciplinary way than in a diachronic way. The Committee sees the value of even closer collaboration across the OGK about common issues such as religion, migration, identity, anticlericalism, strategies of inclusion/exclusion etc. Such collaboration

could easily be extended back, and also forward in time. In practice, the initiatives are currently left to individuals; any form of group strategy is missing. While the programme enjoys clear scholarly leadership, it appears nonetheless to lack strategic leadership.

The departure of the leading professor has certainly not resulted in rejuvenating and dynamizing the staff. The youngest tenured is 45 and it doesn't look as if this might change in the near future.

The strategy used is defensive, based on a legitimate belief in the value of rigorous individual research and freedom to choose research topics. The Committee appreciated a concern about how to imagine ways to participate in general themes that would not at the same time risk their traditional strengths. Nonetheless funding schemes currently privilege the broad themes, as well as large scale, quasi-scientific projects and big data. As an interviewee told the Committee with resignation: 'we are too small to do big research projects'.

The commitment to greater collaboration and to societal relevance at local, national and international level is imaginative and positive but the programme could do with more support (from the university, the OGK) in developing a more explicitly strategic approach to these aims, rather than relying on heroic personal goodwill, effort and initiatives as described in self-assessment report. There don't seem to be many funding applications in the pipeline.

The weakness of strategic thinking is clearly expressed in the SWOT analysis; it is rather sketchy and doesn't relate very precisely to the descriptive analysis. For example, the retirement of three tenured staff should be mentioned as a threat but also an opportunity, as funding seems to be available for new appointments. This is surely a moment to discuss long term aims and priorities and to think about research strategy and the curriculum in relation to them. For example, an appointment related to public engagement and/or Heritage Studies could be suitable for Utrecht and might provide opportunities for collaboration with Cultural Studies and Art History. The increased teaching load is also clearly a problem, but there is no evidence of strategic thinking about how this might be alleviated by research-led teaching or, say, the introduction of a more 'popular' strand of teaching, leading towards public engagement (tourism and heritage) rather than academia. On the positive side, the Utrecht Centre for Medieval Studies and the National Research School for Medieval Studies suggest that those who do pursue this specialism are well supported.

To sum up: the programme is potentially viable in part because it is embedded in UCMS, but it requires a step-change in strategy. The staff are convinced that the programme could not easily fit with other programmes (e.g. Cultural History) or merge (e.g. with Ancient History). They want to remain as a group of medieval historians in the OGK, but with a stronger voice. The Committee, however, sees the longer-term intellectual and financial viability of the programme as best facilitated by merger into a larger programme of like-minded researchers.

4. National research school for Art History

The Research School for Art History (OSK) is a national platform for the coordination of art historical research and a mechanism for delivering enhanced educational outcomes for researchers in art history at RMA and PhD level. Art is broadly defined, and there are OSK sections for different aspects of the discipline. Research Schools are an imaginative way of enhancing provision in a small country, and are used in many disciplines. For Art History, which has only a few research students at any one time, and in an academic area that both covers a vast range of different types of art and a long chronological time span, this is an imaginative platform.

The organisation consists of six universities and seven museums, and two associated members. It is run with the input of a director (0.1 fte) and coordinator (0.4 fte). Teaching activities are financed by annual contributions of all universities based on the number of their RMA and PhD candidates enrolled in the OSK. The Chair is based in UU, under the Board of Humanities of the University of Utrecht.

The training element is for the young scholars as future researchers. This is a voluntary addition to the doctoral provision, although certificates of completion are awarded. This is additional to the core processes for admission, topic selection and supervision which come from within each university. The training programme draws very heavily on the offer provided by individual supervisors, and this varies over the years. Given the structure as it now exists, the relationship between how individual university training and interaction between university departments, and the OSK input to training and enhancement plays out in practice is essentially via a flexible staff-student committee structure. The interface between museum and collections work, and the art history is not made clear beyond the provision of teaching space and specialised teachers, but this coordination, networking openings and the overall programmes appear to be appreciated by young researchers. New perspectives on future careers (e.g. in museums) are facilitated by the OSK.

Some of the OSK offer is bottom up, with student ideas, presentations and progress assessments. There are also short courses; a master class procedure; special meetings; travel to other centres of importance e.g. Rome and Florence; and visiting fellows add to the offer. Overall, this sounds as though this is a project to enhance research environment, rather than simply to train new scholars.

It is not clear to what extent the OSK sees itself as delivering value-added in terms of technical ability, or to the wider social/technological context of art at the public interface, and its adoption of new art history practices and approaches.

There is some outreach to general public in terms of opening up lectures and seminars to those outside the training aspirations of the providers. After all, Dutch art in its widest sense must be considered one of The Netherlands' crowning cultural glories, and hugely important to tourism etc.

The Committee is satisfied with the training programmes that are provided at OSK and the ways they are managed, but the very low intake numbers involved must be a cause of concern. No doubt scholarship offers could improve this, as well as more intensive contact with possibly interested BA students before they reach the advanced research stage, and also the possibility of attendance by secondees from museums/galleries. Although the curriculum delivery is intended for those from Dutch universities, students training elsewhere are on occasion able to participate in courses.

5. Recommendations

5.1 Recommendations for OGK

- The Committee recommends that the Institute for History and Art History should be called The Institute of History within which art history would remain visible as a research programme.
- The six separate research programmes appear to enforce a 'silo' mentality for some, and they generate a high administrative burden. The small size of some programmes also makes them vulnerable. The Committee proposes that the six programmes should be consolidated into three, and be renamed Units;
- The three Units would be of a more even size. This would make each Unit more viable, lessen the amount of total administration required, facilitate the sharing of best practice, and encourage greater long-term viability for some aspects of research. It would still be possible to have self-contained research programmes, if that continues to make sense in terms of the organisation of the research agendas. In particular, placing Cultural History, Ancient History and Classical Civilisation, Medieval Culture and Art History within a single Unit would lower the administrative burden and encourage closer collaboration;
- A more participatory structure of academic management, led by the research Institute leadership and strongly coordinated with the three (consolidated) Units and, where relevant, programme leaders is strongly recommended. This would encourage greater transparency in administration, cross-Unit interaction, and sharing of best practice in, for example, societal relevance;
- The Institute should be more proactive in monitoring the weak links. The Institute management should be prepared to support or deal with inadequate leadership within any given Unit. The promotion of dynamic and imaginative leadership of each of the Units is vital to encourage strategic thinking;
- OGK should press for greater transparency on the nature and outcomes of the wider university-level setting of research priorities; the size of grants received and the subsequent distribution of funds from these grants;
- OGK should develop a well-articulated and internally broadly embedded strategy for research integrity. For example, the data protocol used now by ESG could be expanded for use by the whole Institute;
- OGK should further develop at Institute level a well-articulated and embedded strategy for diversity, involving the structured sharing of best practice and specific plans for increasing the diversity of staff and students;
- OGK should take steps to standardise expectation of teaching distribution across the Institute so that everyone has three blocks on and one block off. This should have high administrative priority;
- The involvement of all research staff, from professors to postdoctoral staff, in research-led teaching is recommended as a way to promote efficiency, innovation and integration in the teaching curriculum and in research. This is particularly important in the humanities. Participation in teaching would also contribute to greater expertise for the postdoctoral staff for whom it could be useful when looking for permanent academic employment. A minimum of 30% research time should be guaranteed;
- To lower the teaching burden and to strengthen their own CVs, postdocs should be allowed to do some research-led teaching (as they have expressed a desire for) insofar as it conforms with research grant criteria;
- An expansion of dual publication of research in Dutch and in English, in different venues seems desirable. It would allow for the continued support of Dutch language journals and books but also fund translation into English of more work and position more publications relating to Dutch topics in journals and edited books with an international readership. There may be online possibilities to facilitate this expansion, for example with core lectures being posted in English and Dutch.

5.2 Recommendations for the research programmes

Ancient History and Classical Civilization

- In the context of the institutional and administrative slimming of the OGK, the Committee recommends placing Ancient History and Classical Civilisation as an autonomous research programme within a larger Unit (see general recommendations above);
- Consider looking for partners in eastern Europe and more recent EU member states to increase the probability of successful EU grant applications;
- Consider also collaborating more intensively with other programmes in the OGK, in particular with early medieval history colleagues to develop promising projects for grant applications;
- One of the two full professors is retiring soon. She should be replaced to enhance the viability of a well-functioning and broad-oriented programme.

Art History

- In the context of the institutional and administrative slimming of the OGK, the Committee recommends placing Art History as an autonomous research programme within a larger Unit (see general recommendations above);
- Ensure that PIs teach in the Art History degree programmes as well as the OSK and try to ensure that grant applications do not prohibit the postdoctoral researchers from doing a modest amount of teaching to strengthen their own CVs and to enhance the curriculum through research-led teaching;
- Prioritise the appointment of the new positions in Global and Technical Art History, which will combine research with a commitment to teaching;
- Consider developing grant proposals, possibly in collaboration with Cultural History, which historically and critically interrogate the issues raised by the three new research strands in relation to art history as traditionally practiced at Utrecht. Examples might be the relationship between Dutch art of the 'Golden Age' and changing concepts of national identity up to the present day, or how the 'work of art' in the early modern Netherlands was defined and positioned in theory and in practice in relation to the broader visual and material culture of the region. Such projects could potentially bring different approaches within the group into productive dialogue;
- Prioritise the development of Heritage Studies in collaboration with Ancient History and Classical Civilisation, Medieval Culture and Cultural History. A well-designed programme could:
  - incorporate critical thinking about Dutch art and national identity;
  - build on the shared commitment in Art History to object-based and source-based research;
  - make use of Art History's strong connections with museums and heritage institutions;
  - strengthen alternative professional paths for Art History graduates;
  - enhance societal relevance;
- Seek out models of best practice in societal relevance in other programmes in the OSK as a means of establishing priorities, strengthening communication with more diverse audiences and encouraging student recruitment.

Cultural History

- In the context of the institutional and administrative slimming of the OGK, the Committee recommends placing Cultural History as an autonomous research programme within a larger Unit (see general recommendations above);
- Consider returning the fte research staff to 2014 levels;
- Prioritise the development of Heritage Studies in collaboration with Ancient History, Medieval History and Art History;
- Seriously explore at how the three research strands, expertise in digital humanities and commitment to societal relevance could be used actively to enhance diversity at faculty, postdoc, doctoral and undergraduate level as part of a broader OGK strategy for diversity. For

example, it would be possible to develop projects on topics that attract more diverse researchers, or which involve collaboration with programmes or institutions in which there is greater diversity.

Economic and Social History

- Re-evaluate the distribution of teaching/research allocations to relieve stress on junior ranked researchers;
- Assess the impact on the programme of the high proportion of senior ranked staff that perform administrative and leadership positions in the Institute and the University more broadly. If necessary, expand staff provision to accommodate this burden;
- Standardize the teaching calendar so that all research staff have one block free of teaching annually;
- Remain cognizant of both the risks and opportunities of having this Unit embedded in History rather than Economics or as a free-standing department. This is a major strategic and intellectual question for the leadership to keep in their sights;
- Develop a strategic plan for making open positions more attractive to international applicants.

History of International Relations and Political History

- The senior management team should consider how they will consolidate the recent expansion and new work achieved over the past few years. They will need to ensure that on-going effective quality control can be sustained through research deliverables, not least with regard to the high numbers of students passing through their programmes. Time should also be given for the research outputs of the programmes to bed down and develop, percolate through the programme and beyond, and to allow the programme's research agenda and outputs to intensify and consolidate the outside and international links that is a sine qua non of this very successful programme.
- Standardize the teaching calendar so that all research staff have or continue to have one block free of teaching annually;
- The University should consider providing more direct funding for doctoral students, given the exceptional popularity and vibrancy of the existing Masters provision, thus allowing for learning progression from masters work to doctoral work for those who are qualified and wish to proceed further.

Medieval Culture

- In the context of the institutional and administrative slimming of the OGK, the Committee recommends placing Medieval Culture as an autonomous research programme within a larger Unit (see general recommendations above);
- Take steps to empower a more dynamic and imaginative leadership of this programme, which should encourage strategic thinking and promote enthusiasm across the programme;
- To ensure more effective and efficient use of digital media, the group should work more strategically and collaborate with others (e.g. within a wider university strategy, or with other medievalists nationally, in the League of European Research Universities or with more domestic stakeholders).

5.3 Recommendations for OSK

Whilst the OSK is enjoyed and appreciated by students and staff alike, this point of transition of administration from Utrecht to Amsterdam provides an opportunity to reflect on its purposes and, in conditions of tight budgetary constraints, consider the efficiency of its use of resources, both financial and human. The Committee recommends consideration of a more structured and compulsory national provision for the training components of OSK, to relieve individual universities of this responsibility.

Appendix A – Curriculum Vitae

Anne McCants is professor of History and Economic History at MIT where she directs the Concourse First Year Learning Community for the integration of the humanities in the science core. After hosting the XVIIIth World Economic History Congress at MIT in 2018, she will serve as the President of the International Economic History Association for a three-year term. Her books include Civic Charity in a Golden Age: Orphan Care in Early Modern Amsterdam, and several edited volumes on railroad construction in technological, economic and social context. She has also authored numerous articles on welfare in the Dutch Republic, European historical demography, and material culture and global consumption. She is the Editor of Social Science History and an incoming Co-Editor of the Journal of Interdisciplinary History.

Anne Deighton is a member of the University of Oxford, Faculty of History. She is also an emerit professor of European International Politics in the Department of Politics and International Relations in the University. She is a fellow of Wolfson College. Anne writes on British foreign policy, the Cold War, European integration, and European security. An academic publications list is at https://www.politics.ox.ac.uk/academic-faculty/anne-deighton.html. Since June 2016 she has, primarily, been trying to understand the contemporary and historical significancies of Brexit. She has been a visiting professor at universities in Germany, France, Italy, Switzerland and Belgium. She is a recently elected member of the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters, is a Committee member of conseil scientifique de la récherche historique de la défense, Ecole militaire, France, and is on the Research Board of the Division for Social Science at the Research Council of Norway. She was a longstanding member of the Council and Executive Committee of Chatham House, London. Anne did her doctorate in the University of Reading, where she was then a lecturer, before moving to Oxford.

Hilde de Ridder-Symoens is emeritus professor in Medieval History at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and in Early Modern History at the Universiteit Gent. Fields of research are the History of European Universities and mainly the mobility of students and teachers (13th-18th c.), Intellectual and cultural life during the Renaissance (15th-18th centuries) in its educational and social context. Former secretary-general, president and vice-president of the International Commission for the History of Universities (ICHU). Fellow at i.a., MPI Frankfurt am Main, Merton College Oxford, UC Berkeley, UC Los Angeles. Member of the Kuratorium of and contributor in the Repertorium Academicum Germanicum at Bern; member of the Advisory Committee of Heloise. European Network on Digital Academic History. Member of the Royal Flemish Academy of Belgium for Science and the Arts (KVAB)

Joanna Woodall is a professor at The Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London. From 2002-2005 she was Deputy Director, Head of Studies, with responsibility for the teaching and research programmes, widening participation and staff development. She teaches a research-led MA entitled 'Bodies of Knowledge in the Early Modern Netherlands, ca. 1550-1670'. Recent and forthcoming publications include 'Greater or Lesser? Tuning into the pendants of the Five Senses by Jan Brueghel the Elder and his companions'; 'For love and money. The circulation of value and desire in Abraham Ortelius's Album amicorum'; 'Monstrous masculinity? Hendrick Goltzius and The Great Hercules (1589)' and a jointly edited volume, Ad Vivum? Visual materials and the vocabulary of life-likeness in Europe before 1800.' She is a member of the editorial board of the Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek.

Appendix B - Programme of the site visit

Sunday 28 October

Time	Part	Collocutors
17.00 - 17.30	Welcome by Dean	Keimpe Algra, Oscar Gelderblom, Tom Gerritsen
17.30 - 19.00	Site visit preparation	Committee

Monday 29 October

Time	Part	Collocutors
08.30 - 9.15	Site visit preparation	Committee
09.15 - 10.15	management	Keimpe Algra (dean), Ted Sanders (vice-dean), Maarten Prak, Oscar Gelderblom, José van Aelst
10.15 - 10.30	evaluation management session	Committee
10.30 - 10.45	*break*	Committee
10.45 - 11.30	group leaders - Art History	Eva-Maria Troelenberg, Thijs Weststeijn, Chris Stolwijk
11.30 - 12.15	researchers - Art History	Jenny Boulboullé, Merlijn Hurx, Marjolijn Bol
12.15 - 12.45	evaluation Art History	Committee
12.45 - 13.30	*lunch*	Committee
13.30 - 14.15	group leaders - Cultural History	Willemijn Ruberg, Dirk van Miert, Jaap Verheul, Joris van Eijnatten
14.15 - 15.00	researchers - Cultural History	Gertjan Plets, Fenneke Sysling, Lorella Viola, Britta Schilling
15.00 - 15.30	evaluation Cultural History	Committee
15.30 - 15.45	*break*	Committee
15.45 - 16.45	group leaders and researchers - Medieval Culture	Marco Mostert, Carine van Rhijn, Rob Meens, Janneke Raaijmakers, Robert Flierman
16.45 - 17.15	evaluation Medieval Culture	Committee
17.15 - 18.00	evaluation day 1 and preparation day 2	Committee

Tuesday 30 October

Time	Part	Collocutors
8.30 - 9.00	preparatory meeting committee	Committee
9.00 - 10.00	group leaders and researchers - Ancient History and Classical Civilization	Leonard Rutgers, Saskia Stevens, Floris van de Eijnde, Ortal-Paz Saar
10.00 - 10.30	evaluation Ancient History and Classical Civilization	Committee
10.30 - 10.45	*break*	Committee
10.45 - 11.30	group leaders - Economic and Social History	Jan Luiten van Zanden, Bas van Bavel, Tine De Moor, Elise van Nederveen Meerkerk
11.30 - 12.15	researchers - Economic and Social History	Kate Frederick, Ruben Peeters, Sarah Carmichael, Joris Roosen
12.15 - 12.45	evaluation Economic and Social History	Committee
12.45 - 13.30	*lunch*	Committee
13.30 - 14.15	postdocs	Marieke Hendriksen (ART), Corinne Boter (ESH), Luuk Slooter (IPH), Elon Heijmans (Ancient)
14.15 - 15.00	PhD students	Amaury de Vicq (ESH), Started September 2016; Ayhan Isik (IPH): Started April 2015, Steije Hofhuis (CMI): Started March 2016, Francesca Hooft (IPH): Started September 2017, Carlotta Capurro (CMI): Started August 2017, Mark Vermeer (Medieval): Started January 2016
15.00 - 15.30	*break*	Committee
15.30 - 16.00	evaluation PhD programme and postdocs	Committee
16.00 - 17.00	evaluation day 2 + preparation day 3	Committee

Wednesday 31 October

Time	Part	Colluctors
08.30 - 09.00	preparatory meeting committee	Committee
09.00 - 09.45	Research school - management	Koen Ottenheym, Hetty Berens (Rotterdam), Freek Schmidt (Amsterdam), Lex Bosman (Amsterdam)
09.45 – 10.30	Research school – Phd students	Thijs Hagendijk (UU), Anne van Dam (UL, Leiden), Marieke van Wamel (RU, Groningen), Angela Bartholomew (VU, Amsterdam)
10.30 - 11.00	evaluation Research school	Committee
11.00 - 11.15	*break*	Committee
11.15 - 12.00	group leaders - History of International Relations and Political History	Beatrice de Graaf, Annelien de Dijn, Jolle Demmers, Liesbeth van de Grift
12.00 - 12.45	researchers - History of International Relations and Political History	Uğur Ümit Üngör, Lorena de Vita, Laurien Crump, Ozan Ozavci, Pepijn Corduwener
12.45 - 13.15	evaluation History of International Relations and Political History	Committee
13.15 - 14.00	*lunch*	Committee
14.00 -14.30	preparation of meeting with management	Committee
14.30 - 15.00	management of institute	Maarten Prak, Oscar Gelderblom, Tom Gerritsen
15.00 - 15.15	*break*	Committee
15.15 - 16.45	evaluation	Committee
16.45	presentation of preliminary results	plenary

Appendix C - Tables

Table 1.1 Number of staff and research fte - Ancient History and Classical Civilization

	2012		2013		2014		2015		2016		2017	
	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte
Tenured staff	6	1.93	5	1.6	5	1.35	5	1.55	5	1.8	5	1.9
Non-tenured staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.17	2	1.2	2	2
PhD students	3	–	1	–	0	–	1	–	1	–	1	–
Total research staff	**9**	**1.93**	**6**	**1.6**	**5**	**1.35**	**7**	**1.72**	**8**	**3**	**8**	**3.9**

Table 1.2 Main categories of research output - Ancient History and Classical Civilization

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Refereed articles	1	2	8	4	1	3
Non-refereed articles	0	0	0	0	0	0
Books	1	0	1	0	1	4
Book chapters	19	7	7	8	6	8
Book editorship	2	1	0	1	0	1
PhD theses	1	2	1	0	0	1
Conference papers	0	0	1	0	1	1
Professional publications	10	4	1	1	1	1
Publications aimed at the general public	0	3	38	55	52	51
Other research output	39	46	63	65	76	69

Table 1.3 Funding - Ancient History and Classical Civilization

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Direct funding	100	100	79	49	41
National Research grants	0	0	21	51	59
European Grants and Third Parties	0	0	0	0	0

Table 2.1 Number of staff and research fte – Art History

	2012		2013		2014		2015		2016		2017	
	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte
Tenured staff	19	7.02	18	6.9	17	7	17	6.36	15	5.7	16	5.5
Non-tenured staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1.9	7	4.6
PhD students	4	–	4	–	3	–	1	–	4	–	5	–
Total research staff	23	7.02	22	6.9	20	7	18	6.36	23	7.6	28	10.2

Table 2.2 Main categories of research output – Art History

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Refereed articles	4	4	6	3	8	9
Non-refereed articles	1	0	0	2	1	2
Books	2	1	1	3	2	0
Book chapters	11	26	16	13	36	13
Book editorship	3	3	3	2	5	3
PhD theses	2	2	0	0	1	3
Conference papers	2	0	0	0	0	3
Professional publications	15	11	14	23	13	16
Publications aimed at the general public	8	7	2	1	5	0
Other research output	50	37	45	46	79	103

Table 2.3 Funding (%) – Art History

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Direct funding	81	66	68	47	34
National Research grants	10	30	27	24	32
European Grants and Third Parties	9	4	5	29	34

Table 3.1 Number of staff and research fte – Cultural History

	2012		2013		2014		2015		2016		2017	
	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte
Tenured staff	15	7.89	15	7.84	14	5.99	16	5.32	16	6.8	17	6.2
Non-tenured staff	5	2.23	6	3.56	6	4.6	6	2.59	5	2.4	5	1.9
PhD students	4	–	6	–	6	–	5	–	4	–	6	–
Total research staff	24	10.12	27	11.4	26	10.59	27	7.91	25	9.2	28	8.1

Table 3.2 Main categories of research output – Cultural History

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Refereed articles	13	18	16	19	11	6
Non-refereed articles	1	0	2	1	3	2
Books	3	0	5	4	2	2
Book chapters	22	14	9	14	4	11
Book editorship	6	4	1	2	0	1
PhD theses	1	1	2	1	1	3
Conference papers	0	0	2	2	1	1
Professional publications	13	14	13	18	2	17
Publications aimed at the general public	3	4	9	3	4	0
Other research output	62	69	115	96	105	113

Table 3.3 Funding (%) – Cultural History

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Direct funding	42	36	33	37	58
National Research grants	22	35	47	44	25
European Grants and Third Parties	36	29	20	19	17

Table 4.1 Number of staff and research fte – Economic and Social History

	2012		2013		2014		2015		2016		2017	
	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte
Tenured staff	15	9.17	14	9.04	14	6.89	13	6.92	13	8.8	15	7.3
Non-tenured staff	15	9.82	15	9.83	14	10.6	15	8.57	14	6.9	18	7.2
PhD students	7	–	7	–	11	–	8	–	9	–	9	–
Total research staff	37	18.99	36	18.87	39	17.49	36	15.49	36	15.7	42	14.5

Table 42 Main categories of research output – Economic and Social History

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Refereed articles	29	22	39	23	23	29
Non-refereed articles	2	2	4	2	1	1
Books	4	4	7	7	1	0
Book chapters	15	23	32	13	2	14
Book editorship	0	5	4	1	0	2
PhD theses	6	1	4	7	5	2
Conference papers	1	1	1	7	6	2
Professional publications	5	5	8	6	7	4
Publications aimed at the general public	2	2	3	2	4	1
Other research output	51	78	161	67	125	88

Table 4.3 Funding (%) – Economic and Social History

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Direct funding	11	11	14	24	19
National Research grants	49	70	55	47	45
European Grants and Third Parties	40	19	31	29	35

Table 5.1 Number of staff and research fte – History of International Relations and Political History

	2012		2013		2014		2015		2016		2017	
	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte
Tenured staff	24	7.65	25	8.07	28	8.69	26	8.84	26	9.7	27	8.9
Non-tenured staff	3	2	2	1.67	1	0.58	3	0.9	6	2.9	12	5.1
PhD students	14	–	11	–	8	–	7	–	9	–	11	–
Total research staff	41	9.65	38	9.74	37	9.27	36	9.74	41	12.6	50	14

Table 5.2 Main categories of research output – History of International Relations and Political History

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Refereed articles	15	17	20	25	14	20
Non-refereed articles	1	7	4	4	5	6
Books	5	3	4	6	7	6
Book chapters	39	22	27	38	43	21
Book editorship	8	3	4	5	7	4
PhD theses	3	4	2	3	6	4
Conference papers	0	0	1	0	4	1
Professional publications	13	19	20	23	20	20
Publications aimed at the general public	14	18	32	36	23	15
Other research output	80	129	228	208	256	341

Table 5.3 Funding (%) – History of International Relations and Political History

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Direct funding	62	63	50	40	36
National Research grants	23	22	18	20	29
European Grants and Third Parties	15	15	32	40	35

Table 6.1 Number of staff and research fte – Medieval Culture

	2012		2013		2014		2015		2016		2017	
	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte	#	fte
Tenured staff	7	2.5	7	2.5	7	3.1	7	3.1	5	2.1	5	2
Non-tenured staff	4	2.1	2	1.2	3	1.48	2	1.75	4	2.2	4	1.8
PhD students	2	–	2	–	1	–	1	–	2	–	2	–
Total research staff	13	4.6	11	3.72	11	4.58	10	4.85	11	4.3	11	3.8

Table 6.2 Main categories of research output – Medieval Culture

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Refereed articles	8	2	1	3	5	5
Non-refereed articles	0	1	2	1	0	1
Books	3	0	1	0	1	1
Book chapters	17	18	15	17	19	3
Book editorship	1	4	2	0	4	1
PhD theses	0	0	1	3	2	0
Conference papers	12	0	0	1	0	0
Professional publications	3	3	10	14	4	8
Publications aimed at the general public	0	1	4	1	1	0
Other research output	46	56	49	50	74	65

Table 6.3 Funding (%) – Medieval Culture

	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Direct funding	67	49	36	26	37
National Research grants	9	51	62	57	56
European Grants and Third Parties	24	0	2	17	7

Table 7 PhD candidates (standard and contract)

Enrollment				Success rates														
Starting year				Graduated in year 4 or earlier		Graduated in year 5 or earlier		Graduated in year 6 or earlier		Graduated in year 7 or earlier		Graduated in year 8 or earlier		Not yet finished		Discontinued	
	M	F	M+F	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2008	4	5	9	1	3	4	11	3	8	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
2009	5	3	8	3	8	1	3	1	3	0	0	1	6	0	0	2	6
2010	2	1	3	0	0	1	3	2		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2011	5	2	7	1	3	3	8	1	3	1	3	0	0	1	3	0	0
2012	1	4	5	3	8	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2013	4	0	4	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0
Total	21	15	36	8	22	13	36	7	19	2	6	2	6	3	8	2	6

Appendix D – Meaning of the scores

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