

RESEARCH REVIEW
RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR CULTURAL INQUIRY
UTRECHT UNIVERSITY
2012-2017

ONDERZOEKERIJ

De Onderzoekerij
Vondellaan 58
2332 AH Leiden

Phone: +31 6 24812176

Email: info@onderzoekerij.nl

Internet: www.onderzoekerij.nl



Contents

Preface	4
1. Introduction	5
1.1 <i>Terms of reference for the assessment</i>	5
1.2 <i>The review committee</i>	5
1.3 <i>Procedures followed by the committee</i>	5
2. Assessment of the Institute ICON	6
2.1 <i>Organisation</i>	6
2.2 <i>Mission and ambitions of ICON</i>	6
2.3 <i>Staff policy</i>	8
2.4 <i>PhD programme</i>	8
2.5 <i>Research integrity</i>	9
2.6 <i>Diversity</i>	10
2.6 <i>Recommendations</i>	10
3. Assessment of the research programmes	11
3.1 <i>Medieval culture</i>	12
3.2 <i>Early modern literature</i>	15
3.3 <i>Modern and contemporary literature</i>	17
3.4 <i>Media and performance studies</i>	19
3.5 <i>Gender Studies</i>	21
3.6 <i>Musicology</i>	23
4. National research school for gender studies	25
Appendix A – Short biographies	27
Appendix B – Programme of the site visit	28
Appendix C – Tables	30
Appendix D – Meaning of the scores	37



Preface

The Evaluation Committee was assigned the task of reviewing both the Institute for Cultural Inquiry, ICON, of Utrecht University, and the Netherlands Research School of Gender Studies, NOG, for the period 2012–2017. This included an assessment of the structure and productivity of ICON as one of the four central research institutes in the Faculty of Humanities. In addition, the six research groups within ICON, namely Medieval Culture, Early Modern Literature, Modern and Comparative Literature, Media and Performance Studies, Gender Studies and Musicology, were the subject of individual evaluations.

Members of the Committee first individually assessed the ICON Self-Evaluation Report and the NOG Self-Assessment. Each member was tasked with writing a preliminary report on the performance of two research groups as a first assessor and two additional research groups as a second assessor. These preliminary evaluations were discussed in a preparatory on-site consultation after meeting the dean and the vice-dean of the Faculty of Humanities and the director of ICON. All six research groups, the NOG team and the PhD students were interviewed by the Committee.

The preparatory stages, the meetings of the Committee on site and the two interview days were superbly organised, making an efficient evaluation possible. Members of the Committee worked in a very open and collaborative way, and all decisions were taken unanimously. I sincerely thank all people involved in this demanding task for their dedication as well as for the pleasant and informative interaction during the site visit. In particular, I wish to thank my fellow members of the Committee for their professional input, Esther Poort and Hanneke Jansen for their excellent support, and last but not least the interviewed members of the departments for their cooperation and open discussions.

Eva Warth, chair of the committee



1. Introduction

1.1 Terms of reference for the assessment

The quality assessment of research of the Research Institute for Cultural Inquiry (ICON) 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 Cultural Inquiry of the Utrecht University in the reference period 2012–2017.

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.

This report describes findings, conclusions and recommendations of this external assessment of the Research Institute for Cultural Inquiry.

1.2 The review committee

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

- Prof. Dr. Eva Warth (Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany)
- Prof. Adrian Armstrong (Queen Mary University of London, UK)
- Prof. Rita Felski (University of Virginia, USA)

James Deaville (Carlton University, Canada) contributed by given a written assessment of the research of the research group Musicology.

More detailed information about the members of the committee can be found in Appendix A. The Board of Utrecht University appointed Esther Poort 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 Cultural Inquiry 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 Cultural Inquiry, including appendices and the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) 2015–2021. In addition, the committee studied some key publications of the research groups.

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 1 and 2 November 2018 (see Appendix B).

Prior to the interviews, each research programme was assigned to two committee members as reviewers, who independently formulated a preliminary assessment. The committee discussed its assessment at its final session during the site visit. The drafts for this assessment report were finalised through email exchanges. 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 ICON

2.1 Organisation

The Institute for Cultural Inquiry (ICON) is based in the Faculty of Humanities of Utrecht University. The Faculty of Humanities comprises four different departments: the department of Languages, Literature and Communication (TLC), the department of Media and Culture (MCW), the department of History and Art History (GK), and the department of Philosophy and Religious Studies (FR). ICON has a unique position since it is the only research institute that is embedded in two different departments: the departments TLC and MCW.

ICON is composed of six research groups: Medieval Culture, Early Modern Literature, Modern and Contemporary Literature, Media and Performance Studies, Gender Studies and Musicology. Within these six research groups, multi- and interdisciplinary research is carried out on a wide range of cultural phenomena and artefacts. Its research focuses on the contemporary and historical societal functioning of literature, film, television, games, new media and digital culture, theatre, dance, performance, and music. In many cases, researchers from different groups cooperate.

In its self-evaluation report, ICON stresses that it does not set out a scholarly programme of its own; this is the remit of the six ICON research groups and the strategic themes and focus areas of Utrecht University (UU). ICON management focuses on developing strategies that help the research groups to be successful in their activities and also provides the means to do so. It identifies opportunities for funding applications and collaborations with academic and non-academic partners, it spots and coaches talent, and it provides training in various fields and information on new developments.

The committee finds it laudable that the humanities was able to secure a strong standing in Utrecht University. The committee compliments ICON for its contribution to this strong standing of the humanities within the University.

2.2 Mission and ambitions of ICON

The mission of ICON is to provide organizational and administrative support to the six research groups, to ensure the quality of the PhD programmes, to offer coaching and training to researchers for grant applications, and to facilitate innovative initiatives by researchers. Since the creation of ICON in 2013, the institute has set the following targets for itself:

- Help the research groups in creating a dynamic research environment;
- Stimulate and support activities in the field of Digital Humanities;
- Stimulate societal impact activities;
- Connect researchers to focus areas and strategic themes;
- Increase external funding.

The committee noted that staff members were united in embracing the 'added value' which ICON supplies to the research culture within the departments of TLC and MCW. ICON provides a flexible structure that enables staff to connect with other ICON researchers or researchers from other departments. In addition, staff members highly value the support ICON offers to apply for grants or connect with the strategic themes of Utrecht University.

Overall the committee concludes that ICON has been very successful in achieving the five targets it has set for itself. Below, this will be further explained for each separate target.

Target 1: help the research groups in creating a dynamic research environment

The committee is impressed by the dynamic research culture and the broad range of interdisciplinary collaborations, making connections between different languages, media, contexts and methodologies. According to the committee, the balance between diversification and coherence is handled very well.

The committee assessed the quality of research on the level of the research groups. These assessments are described in chapter 3. The overall conclusion is that ICON has an impressive publication record in



highly ranked international and national journals and venues. Some of the work is excellent. The committee appreciates the variety in publication culture resulting in a diversity of output. Overall, the six research programmes have published a balanced proportion of refereed articles to non-refereed articles, books and book chapters.

Target 2: Stimulate and support activities in the field of Digital Humanities

The committee noted that ICON researchers already engage in a wide range of activities in the field of Digital Humanities. This entails both a) the development and use of digital tools and b) critical reflection on digitised objects. The committee gained the impression that there is a substantial and growing capacity to pursue further work in this area. It advises ICON to consider focusing on one distinctive topic, for example 'data visualization', as data visualization will be increasingly important in the near future. Moreover, the committee learned during the site visit that Utrecht University already has notable experience in this area that should be seen as a valuable base for further expansions.

Target 3: Stimulate societal impact activities

The committee observed that ICON clearly places a great deal of value on societal relevance, and is committed to further strengthening this aspect of their research. Overall, the extent of engagement is impressive by the standards of the disciplines involved. ICON researchers participate in a broad range of public output activities such as contributions to festivals, teaching materials for secondary schools, Internet sites, academic textbooks and publications for a broader public. Several department members appear as specialists in the online and offline press as well as broadcast media, bringing their expertise to public discussions of social events (for example the debate about 'zwarte piet' in relation to diversity). The awareness of the importance of societally relevant research is impressive among all researchers of the different groups whom the committee interviewed.

While the committee applauds the emphasis on generating societal impact, the committee gained the impression that the groups would benefit greatly from the development of a sound strategy for further societal impact activities. An overall strategy would enable researchers to prioritize their societal interactions, and to develop increasingly durable partnerships in selected areas as appropriate. This requires further thoughts on how best to operationalise societal impact. In addition, it would be desirable to develop more thorough ways of documenting societal impacts: both their quantitative reach and their qualitative significance for beneficiaries.

Furthermore, the committee advises a more systematic exchange of best practices between the different programmes and departments. It suggests that the Centre for the Humanities could play a leading role here, given that the Centre already plays an important role in the coordination and support of societal output activities, as the committee learned during its site visit.

Finally, the committee recommends taking into account the differences between the six research groups in opportunities for societal outreach activities. For example, the research group Gender Studies seems to be swamped with requests, leading to a risk of becoming preoccupied with short-term partnerships. Here it would be advisable to take a step back and think about a strategy to create durable partnerships.

Target 4: Connect researchers to focus areas and strategic theme

Utrecht University focuses its research on four strategic themes: Dynamics of Youth, Institutions for Open Societies, 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. The committee is pleased that ICON seems to have good opportunities to connect with the strategic theme Institutions for Open Societies (IOS). The Faculty of Humanities is coordinator of this theme and one of the five strategic hubs (Gender and Diversity) has a strong ICON stamp. The committee endorses the strategy of ICON to explore how ICON research can contribute to this theme on a much broader scale than is the currently the case. In addition, the committee encourages ICON to be more proactive in carving out niches for itself in the University's other strategic themes. It sees good opportunities for most of the research groups to connect with the strategic theme Dynamics of Youth and strongly encourages the recent initiatives to gain recognition as a cooperation partner for this UU strategic theme.

Although the committee has some concerns that researchers might have to orient their research too much along the lines of funding opportunities, it has the impression that ICON researchers generally show themselves to be creative in responding to incentives, while still having the opportunity to hold on to their own lines of research.



Target 5: Increase external funding

According to the SWOT analysis in the self-evaluation report, the main threat is the decrease in direct funding. Therefore, the committee strongly endorses the strategy to invest in finding forms of external funding. The strategy of the institute has proven to be effective. The committee is impressed with the increase of the proportion of 2nd and 3rd stream money in the total budget of ICON. In 2013, 35% of ICON research staff were externally funded and in 2017 this has gone up to 41%, so ICON's earning capacity improved despite an increasingly competitive research environment. The committee acknowledges that ICON is well aware that it will face challenges in the maintenance of grant success. ICON's investment in support for proposal writing and project administration is considered a valuable strategy in this regard.

2.3 Staff policy

Each department has a research director, a director of studies and a head of department (Utrecht triangle). The department TLC has two research directors: one for ICON and one for the Utrecht Institute of Linguistics OTS (Uil OTS). The departments TLC and MCW decide staffing policy. The Director of ICON is a member of the Board of MCW and TLC, and in that function takes part in staff recruitment decision-making. Members of staff are primarily recruited on the basis of the teaching needs of the departments, but the research profiles and quality of candidates play an important role as well.

ICON management aims to support and strengthen the research activities of the staff members. The committee noted that ICON has several instruments in place to deal with the difficult relationship between teaching time and research time. Firstly, the Faculty of the Humanities applies a system of variable research time (dynamization). This system allows the board of the faculty, upon the advice of the director of research, to raise or lower the amount of research time allotted to individual researchers (30% for assistant professors and 40 % for associate and full professors). Every three years, the Faculty undertakes an assessment of the research output of every member of staff. If output is above the decided criteria, an extra 10% research time will be allotted. However, if output is below these criteria, a 10% decrease will be effected. During the site visit, the committee learned that approximately 70% of staff members are awarded extra research time. As mentioned in the self-evaluation, these higher percentages of allotted research time are only roughly indicative of actual research time. In practice, the logistics of teaching (course schedules, time slots, etc.) make it increasingly difficult to schedule set periods of time for research and writing activities. Nevertheless, the committee endorses the active use of dynamization and encourages ICON to further explore flexible approaches to improve the balance between education time and research time.

In this context, the committee regards the possibility to 'save up' time for a funded sabbatical as a valuable strategic tool. ICON management has actively encouraged researchers to make use of this possibility and currently more than 30 ICON researchers participate in this scheme. The committee considers this system to be highly supportive and effective.

2.4 PhD programme

ICON hosts two types of PhD students. The first category consists of PhD students with full employment status. The second category are so-called "contract PhD students", mostly international students funded through grants obtained in their country of origin.

In the period 2008-2013 a total of 43 PhD students enrolled in ICON (23 employed PhD students and 20 contract PhD students). Of these 43 PhD students, 5 students succeeded in finishing up their PhD theses in the nominal time of four years. The majority of PhD students (24; 56%) completed their PhD in five years, eight PhD students (19%) completed their project in 6 to 7 years, while 3 projects (7%) were discontinued and 3 projects are still pending. During the interview with the PhD candidates, the committee learned that a considerable delay in PhD defences appears to occur due to external reasons, such as the oversubscription of the one location on Utrecht University that is allocated for this purpose. The committee strongly advises ICON to procure alternative venues as this seems to be an effective way to shorten the time between the end of the dissertation review process and the defence.



The Graduate School of Humanities (established 2008) provides academic and professional skills training programmes for PhD candidates at the Faculty of Humanities. Training is offered in the fields of academic writing, academic English, research integrity, time management and teaching, among others. The committee acknowledges that the Graduate School of Humanities is aware of the vulnerable position of the contract students, mostly due to their English language skills. In this regard, the plans to develop a special language programme for these students are strongly endorsed by the committee.

The disciplinary training of the ICON PhD students is entrusted to the National Graduate Schools (sometimes called Research Schools). ICON collaborates with the Research School for Medieval Studies, the Huizinga Institute: Research Institute and Graduate School of Cultural History, the Netherlands Research School for Literary Studies, the Research School for Media Studies, the Netherlands Institute for Cultural Analysis, and the Netherlands Research School of Gender Studies. Most PhD candidates participate in one of these national Research Schools.

The Graduate School of Humanities sets out the general policy for the enrolment and supervision of PhD candidates. The selection and pre-enrolment of the students the committee spoke with vary widely according to funding schemes. In all cases, there seemed to be a good and supportive level of communication between the PhD candidate and ICON.

The 'Quality Monitoring Plan PhD Candidates' (Kwaliteitszorgplan Promovendi) provides the policy framework for quality assurance at the Faculty of Humanities. The Faculty has employed a PhD mentor to whom PhD candidates can turn for counselling and advice regarding both personal and academic challenges. Following the Graduate School Quality Monitoring Plan, ICON organizes yearly assessment meetings with the candidate, supervisor(s), and a representative of ICON. In these meetings, the candidate's progress is discussed, but also the organisation and quality of supervision as well as other issues related to the process.

During the site visit, the committee met with enthusiastic and committed representatives of both employed and contract PhD students. The PhD students were pleased with the frequency and the quality of supervision they received. The committee understood that PhD candidates feel well-embedded in their research group, meet regularly with their supervisor(s) to discuss their progress and feel comfortable about contacting them at any time. The PhD students were also content with the available courses, whether provided by the Graduate School of Humanities or the relevant research school. Without exception, the PhD students highly appreciated the broad range of support activities organised by ICON, such as the weekend at the beginning of their trajectory, the ICON meetings, and the 'writing classes' in which PhD students are coached in writing a grant proposal.

The self-evaluation did not provide any information about guidance for PhDs in the job market, but the PhD students informed the committee that the supervisor pays sufficient attention to career perspectives after completion.

Overall, the committee gained the impression that the PhD programme is very strong and can be considered exemplary in terms of planning, organisation, monitoring progress and care for students.

2.5 Research integrity

Like all Dutch universities, Utrecht University adheres to the code of conduct of the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU), which provides guidelines on ethical conduct for academic staff, and on the proper handling and storage of information and data. In addition, Utrecht University has developed its own 'Code of Conduct for Scrupulous Academic Practice and Integrity'.

Next to the formal regulations already in place, the Faculty of Humanities aims to stimulate a culture of discussion and reflection on questions of integrity. The Graduate School of Humanities offers annual seminars for PhD candidates on research integrity. In addition, every PhD candidate pledges to uphold the scientific standard of research integrity upon graduating.

In 2015 the faculty installed a faculty counsellor on questions of academic integrity, and very recently the faculty launched an Ethics Assessment Committee. Another recent faculty-wide initiative is the development of an online tool to aid researchers in the development of data management plans. It also provides training and instructions on proper data management. In addition to this faculty-wide initiative,



ICON commissioned the Utrecht Data School to develop a tool for researchers to assess their research design.

In the opinion of the committee, ICON is well aware of the ethical dimension of science and has taken appropriate measures to ensure research integrity and research ethics. The committee was pleased with the recent developments in supporting researchers with proper data management. The committee encourages the faculty and ICON to continue their efforts in developing and implementing research integrity policies. Since data management is becoming increasingly important in the emerging field of data-research, continued attention to this aspect is recommended.

2.6 Diversity

During the site visit, the committee learned that ICON attaches great importance to considerations of diversity in the makeup of the team, given the emphasis on gender and culture in much of the research of ICON. This vision is appreciated and fully supported by the committee.

The self-evaluation report of ICON considers diversity with regard to gender and culture of the research staff. The proportion of female full professors is currently 38% and the proportion of female associate professors (UHDs) is 72%. This means that ICON has already accomplished the goal formulated in its strategic plan of 50% female associate professors and 25% female professors by the end of 2018. The committee is of the opinion that ICON is exemplary in establishing a gender balanced environment, and encourages ICON to further promote a gender balanced staff at all levels.

ICON staff consists of a broad range of nationalities. Since PhD candidates for research projects are internationally recruited, and PhD candidates with international grants choose to do their PhD at ICON, the ICON PhD community is becoming more and more international. The committee praises ICON's ability to attract a diverse range of staff members with different cultural backgrounds.

2.6 Recommendations

The committee invites ICON to consider the following suggestions:

- Formulate a sound strategy for further societal impact activities that enables researchers to prioritize the kind of societal interactions which are best suited to the development of durable partnerships. This strategy should take into account the differences between the six research groups in opportunities for societal outreach activities.
- Continue stimulating activities in the field of Digital Humanities. As data visualization will be increasingly important in the near future, the focus on this topic will enhance ICON's distinctiveness in this field.
- Give the Centre for the Humanities a role in systemically exchanging best practices of societal impact between the different programmes and departments.
- Create more research niches within the University's strategic themes (especially the theme Dynamics of Youth).
- Continue the active use of dynamization and sabbatical leave and further explore flexible approaches to improve the balance between education time and research time.
- Find a way to address and resolve external reasons that cause delays in PhD projects.
- Continue efforts to develop and implement the research integrity policy, paying specific attention to data management.



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
Medieval culture	2	2	2
Early modern literature	2	2	2
Modern and contemporary literature	2	1	2
Media and performance studies	2	1	2
Gender studies	1	1	2
Musicology	2	2	3



3.1 Medieval culture

Research area

The ICON researchers in the field of medieval culture form part of the Utrecht Centre for Medieval Studies (UCMS), along with researchers from the Research Institute for History and Art History (OGK). This approach to grouping medievalists is not at all unusual in respect of leading international centres: comparable institutions include York (Centre for Medieval Studies) and Zürich (Kompetenzzentrum Zürcher Mediävistik, which had been selected for international benchmarking purposes). Such groups facilitate dialogue and exchange between specialists in different fields; indeed, the publications of ICON medievalists clearly demonstrate an openness to interdisciplinary research, whether this is carried out individually or collectively. There are also interactions with other areas of ICON, notably Musicology and Early Modern Literature. UCMS is associated with the Netherlands Research School for Medieval Studies, based at the University of Groningen (<http://www.medievistiek.nl/>), though PhD students can and do benefit from courses organized by other national research schools.

In 2017 ICON's medievalists comprised 4.88 FTE scientific staff, 1.95 postdocs, and 2 PhD candidates).

Research quality

UCMS's strategic aims are to become the leading national centre for Medieval Studies, and one of the most prominent such groupings worldwide. In practice, this is interpreted as becoming a 'destination': a unit with high international visibility, which other medievalists would seek out as a preferred partner for collaborations and would be eager to visit for scholarly purposes. These aims are ambitious, but realistic. The unit is already operating at a highly impressive level in respect of quality, and further development could only be a question of expansion – both in the range of activities undertaken (both scholarly and societal), and concomitantly in numbers of permanent staff.

Publication activity is very strong in respect of both volume and quality. For the period under consideration, patterns of publication – including the balance between article-length publications and authored/edited books – are in line with what might be expected in a leading research-intensive university in this field. A significant increase in the volume of publications, largely driven by book chapters, is apparent from 2016.

Scholarly publications have appeared in several languages (Dutch, English, German, French, Italian), and with a wide range of publishers and journals, based in diverse countries. Many of the authored books have a most impressive scope and intellectual ambition. It is also encouraging to note a healthy activity in the production of scholarly editions: these constitute a major, prestigious, and durable form of publication in the field. Overall, many publications engage clearly with cross-cultural/linguistic perspectives, and/or with the materiality of the medieval text; these are major current preoccupations in medieval studies. A number of studies by affiliates were also published during the period under consideration: scholarly publications by these researchers generally appear with strong publishers and journals, and in this respect they withstand comparison with the publications of full staff members. Researchers are encouraged to publish in open access form where this is possible and appropriate.

An unusually high proportion of authored/edited books have been published in the Low Countries. This does not compromise international visibility, since the publishers in question are well-regarded and long-established (e.g. Brepols, Brill, Verloren). There are two 'local' publication series, Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy (USML) and Bibliothek mittelniederländischer Literatur (BIMILI). These are important to maintain, as they are valuable in a number of ways. On the one hand, they enhance UCMS's international visibility (more so than the comparable series *Mediävistische Perspektiven*, published by the Kompetenzzentrum Zürcher Mediävistik, which focuses on brief studies largely in German). On the other hand, they enable ICON researchers to develop their own professional profiles by gaining useful experience and 'esteem indicators', through editorial work such as reviewing book proposals.

Two online research tools constitute important elements of infrastructure: these are Arthurian Fiction (<http://www.arthurianfiction.org/>, launched 2012) and Bibliotheca Neerlandica Manuscripta & Impressa (BNM-I: <https://bnm-i.huygens.knaw.nl/>, launched 2015). Their development indicates that digital humanities is well represented within the programme's research, certainly by comparison with other leading universities in the field (including the Kompetenzzentrum Zürcher Mediävistik). A further valuable digital resource is the companion website to a recently published book (<http://nobelstreven.nl/>): this ensures



added value for readers by supplying further documentation, and provides a form of ongoing scholarly dialogue since details can be updated as necessary.

Research grant capture is at an impressive level, both in absolute terms and in comparison with the wider trends across ICON. As for ICON as a whole, overall funding has steadily increased since 2014. Second and third funding streams have generally been significant, accounting for at least 35% of funding in all years except 2015. ICON researchers have secured seven of UCMS's ten team-related awards, including all four awards from joint or international (HERA, ERC) funders, as well as two of UCMS's three NWO VENI awards. In general, researchers have been successful across a wide range of funders and schemes.

The strength and volume of publications, and the healthy range of second- and third-stream funding, indicate that UCMS/ICON are successful in developing researchers' potential to produce optimal scholarly outputs.

Societal Relevance

Medievalists have been involved in a wide range of events and initiatives (local, national, and international), reaching a variety of audiences through different media. Some of these audiences – whether for durable collaborations, single events, or publications – have been substantial. In recent years the priority has been to develop societal activities by reaching numerous audiences and partners. Now that this has been achieved, a strategy for the future has begun to take shape. This will seek to make societal engagements more sustainable, and to take a lead wherever possible rather than responding to external initiatives. A particular priority, which makes UCMS medievalists unique among their peers nationally, is local engagement that involves institutions, organizations, and initiatives in and around Utrecht. Some societal engagements derive from individuals' expertise, while others are embedded in research projects. Publications explicitly aimed at the general public are, perhaps inevitably, overwhelmingly in Dutch.

ICON's medievalists, and UCMS in general, compare very favourably with the Kompetenzzentrum Zürcher Mediävistik in respect of their cooperation with local cultural institutions; their range of non-academic interactions; and the public visibility of those interactions (via UCMS's web pages).

Viability

Leadership is effective and well-informed. The programme's position has been evaluated thoroughly and judiciously, with appropriate strategies for the future. Flexibility has been demonstrated in response to both external opportunities (e.g. societal collaborations) and internal developments (the recent development of a broadened RMA programme in Ancient, Medieval and Renaissance Studies). Equally, researchers are aware that future appointments will offer ways of connecting existing specialisms, hence enhancing their ability to respond to new opportunities. With this in mind, the preference would be to appoint young scholars with wide-ranging expertise. All this evidence indicates that staff are well able to anticipate and address possible future challenges.

The PhD programme has been highly successful in recent years. In the future it may prove necessary to extend the use of the *ius promovendi*, in order to maintain capacity for PhD supervision as senior staff retire.

The strong recent performance of ICON medievalists in securing second- and third-stream funding instils confidence that the unit will continue to be financially robust.

Recommendations

It would be useful for individuals, and for UCMS and ICON management, to monitor the types of article-length publications produced by researchers; specifically, the proportion of refereed articles to book chapters and non-refereed articles. Over the period considered, this proportion is not at all inappropriate for a strong research unit, and book chapters are widely recognized and highly esteemed forms of publication in this field. However, in order to enhance the professional development and international visibility of researchers, particularly younger scholars, it would be desirable to encourage more publication in refereed journals over the long term. In the case of English-language work, it would be beneficial to seek publication in prestigious Anglophone journals with wide disciplinary scope, such as *Speculum* or *Medium Ævum*.

For similar reasons, researchers with future English-language book projects could usefully consider approaching publishers in the English-speaking world.



Authors of books could consider providing companion websites similar to <http://nobelstreven.nl/>. The editors of USML and BIMILI may, indeed, wish to consider introducing such sites as standard accompaniments to books published in those series.

In respect of societal engagement as well as scholarly activity, researchers should consider the opportunities offered by particular questions in the National Research Agenda, notably *063 Hoe objectief zijn canons?* and *111 Gaat digitalisering ons erfgoed redden?*

Researchers may wish to consider using English in some of their publications for general audiences, if opportunities arise to make international societal/cultural impacts.

As in other ICON programmes, it would be desirable to develop more thorough ways of documenting societal impacts: both their quantitative reach and their qualitative significance for beneficiaries.



3.2 Early modern literature

Research area

The ICON grouping in Early Modern Literature was established in 2015, following the division of the programme in Textual Culture into two groups (the other group being Modern and Contemporary Literature). Researchers in this field form part of the Utrecht Centre for Early Modern Studies (UCEMS) along with researchers from other areas, notably the Research Institute for History and Art History (OGK). The ICON researchers within this programme are cross-disciplinary in orientation, with a number of broad interconnected themes serving as sub-categories for research: cultures of knowledge, authorship, and impact of literary production. Digital approaches are represented in each of these themes. In practice, the publications of ICON early modern scholars clearly demonstrate an openness to the interdisciplinary research which the group's organization seeks to foster, whether that research is carried out individually or collectively. The national research school associated with UCEMS is the Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands (Huygens ING); the research school is to move to Utrecht in the future.

In 2017 ICON's researchers in Early Modern Literature and Modern and Contemporary Literature, taken together, comprised 13.29 FTE scientific staff, 0.98 postdocs, and 5 PhD candidates.

Research quality

UCEMS has a clear and well-conceived strategy for the future, with significant roles allocated to developing societal engagements, cross-institutional collaborations, and digital activities (both *using* existing digital tools, and *developing* new ones). Further collaboration with sources of digital expertise elsewhere in UU is anticipated. There is also clear evidence of a supportive informal culture: PhD students are advised on publishing strategies, and early-career female academics have formed a support group to exchange information. The interconnected research themes are general enough to allow researchers from different fields to make vital contributions, but also highly productive in relating historical research to contemporary cultural questions.

Publication activity is very strong in respect of both volume and quality. For the period under consideration, patterns of publication – including the balance between article-length publications and authored/edited books – are in line with what might be expected in a leading research-intensive university in this field. A significant increase in the volume of publications is apparent from 2016. It is encouraging to note that in most years there has been a roughly equal proportion of refereed articles to book chapters and non-refereed articles: this relatively high output of refereed journal articles will inevitably enhance individuals' professional development and visibility. Relatively few monographs appeared during the period under consideration until 2017, though this seems to reflect inevitable fluctuations in publishing rhythms rather than any systemic issues. In all years, an unusually high proportion of publications are recorded as "other research output": many of these are non-print outputs such as websites, or media contributions (which reflect a strong public interest in researchers' expertise).

Scholarly publications have appeared in several languages (Dutch, English, French, Italian, Spanish, Turkish), and with a wide range of publishers and journals, based in diverse countries. Many of the authored books have a most impressive scope and intellectual ambition. Book-historical and reception-oriented studies, often with a cross-cultural/linguistic dimension, play an important part in the group's publications; these are major current preoccupations in early modern studies. Publications by affiliates are mostly self-published.

Research grant capture is at a more than acceptable level over the period under consideration. As for ICON as a whole, overall funding has steadily increased since 2014. Second and third funding streams have generally been significant, despite a small decrease in their relative importance from 2016 onwards. In general, researchers have been successful across a very wide range of funders and schemes, with a predominance of relatively small grants.

The strength and volume of publications, and the healthy range of second- and third-stream funding, suggest that UCEMS/ICON are successful in developing researchers' potential to produce optimal scholarly outputs. UCEMS performs more strongly than the Group for Early Modern Studies at Ghent University, which had been selected for international benchmarking purposes, in supporting funding applications from early-career staff. This may partly reflect varying opportunities in the respective national research environments.



Societal Relevance

The group has a twofold strategy for societal engagement, seeking both to build networks and partnerships (e.g. through the NWO's *Alfa Meerwaarde* programme) and to reach non-academic beneficiaries directly. Researchers have reached a variety of audiences through different media. A particularly distinctive aspect of societal activity in this area is the development of durable resources, in the form of books and websites. This is highly significant, not least because these resources may well generate future societal interactions such as media engagement or collaborations with new partners. Also important are the various initiatives undertaken to support and enrich literature teaching in Dutch secondary schools (e.g. <https://litlab.nl/>). Particularly impressive are the establishment of a chair in Textual Culture in the Renaissance, by the *Algemeen-Nederlands Verbond*; this recognizes the group's importance for various cultural heritage institutions and educational contexts.

Some societal engagements derive from individuals' expertise, while others are embedded in research/publishing projects. Publications explicitly aimed at the general public are, perhaps inevitably, overwhelmingly in Dutch. However, other languages are also represented in this category, so that international societal impacts become possible.

ICON's early modern specialists, and UCEMS in general, compare very favourably with the Group for Early Modern Studies, Ghent University, in respect of their cooperation with local cultural institutions; their range of non-academic interactions; and the public visibility of those interactions (via UCEMS's web pages and other online resources).

Viability

Leadership is effective and well-informed. The programme's position has been evaluated thoroughly and judiciously, with appropriate strategies for the future. Flexibility has been demonstrated in response to both external opportunities (e.g. societal collaborations) and internal developments (the recent development of a broadened RMA programme in Ancient, Medieval and Renaissance Studies). Success in developing digital initiatives has been significant across the programme, positioning it strongly for the future in light of the increasing importance of digital work both in international humanities research and in achieving and supporting societal engagements.

The age profile of researchers is quite evenly balanced, so that future retirements are not likely to impact significantly on its collective capabilities in the short to medium term. A shortage of PhD candidates in the recent past has now been overcome, partly due to success in securing funding for projects with PhDs attached.

The strong recent performance of ICON's early modern specialists in securing second- and third-stream funding instils confidence that the unit will continue to be financially robust. The long-term threat of declining BA student numbers is being addressed through a concerted focus on societal engagement, so that the importance and interest of the subject area can be communicated widely. The move to Utrecht of the Huygens ING will reinforce the unit's capacity in this respect, and enable it to consolidate networks at a national level – a priority of the unit's leadership – and thereby lobby more effectively for the discipline, as well as facilitating coherent large-scale projects.

Recommendations

To extend the range of digital activities, researchers should collectively consider gaining experience in techniques of data visualization, which are assuming increasing importance in the humanities. This would be relatively quick and cost-effective to put into practice, and accessible to scholars who might otherwise lack confidence in their ability to engage with digital approaches. It would also give a distinctive cast to ICON researchers' work in this field.

To enhance the professional development and international visibility of researchers, particularly younger scholars, it would be desirable to consider placing more English-language work in established Anglophone journals with wide disciplinary scope (e.g. *Sixteenth Century Journal*, *Renaissance Quarterly*, *Modern Philology*).

As in other ICON programmes, it would be desirable to develop more thorough ways of documenting societal impacts: both their quantitative reach and their qualitative significance for beneficiaries.



3.3 Modern and contemporary literature

Research area

Modern and Contemporary Literature is a large and diverse group that includes scholars of Comparative Literature, Dutch, English, German, Italian, and Spanish. Researchers are organized around five clusters: Media Materiality, Transnational and Transcultural Flows, Literature in Education, Literature as a Laboratory for Ideas and Affects, and Cultural Memory. As this list suggests, literature is conceived broadly to include the study of media and culture, and to address social as well as aesthetic aspects. The group's expertise has recently diversified to include India and Indonesia; this is a very welcome development, wholly in line with trends in leading institutions worldwide as comparative literature studies extends beyond its traditional Eurocentric focus.

In 2017 ICON's researchers in Modern and Contemporary Literature and Early Modern Literature, taken together, comprised 13.29 FTE scientific staff, 0.98 postdocs, and 5 PhD candidates.

Research quality

Organization into five clusters provides an effective means of managing intellectual diversity: these clusters are well-conceived and not too narrow in their focus. Outputs and activities confirm that research is oriented across language, culture, and media and often cuts across traditional disciplinary boundaries. It's good to see a combination of intellectually and geographically expansive scholarship (e.g., the emphasis on transnational and transcultural flows) and more pragmatically oriented research that addresses local and pedagogical issues (e.g., the teaching of literature in secondary schools). There is also a valuable emphasis on translation studies, with the development of the first master's programme in translation in the Netherlands.

Several key staff members have a notable international profile that has been augmented by an ERC grant and by a significant number of books published with prestigious commercial as well as university presses. Topics are often ambitious and publication activity is strong in terms of both volume and quality. Publications appear in quite a few languages and in a wide range of venues, including high visibility English-language journals such as *Textual Practice*, *Parallax*, *Journal of Modern Literature*, etc. The patterns of publication are in line with research-intensive universities in this field. The proportion of refereed articles to book chapters and non-refereed articles has fluctuated but is rarely much lower than 1:1. This is commendable, as a relatively high output of refereed journal articles enhances individuals' professional development and international visibility. Researchers have also published in outlets that are not associated with literary studies (e.g., *Australian Journal of Human Rights*, *European Journal of Political Research*), thereby enhancing their cross-disciplinary reach.

There is an impressive track record of organizing conferences, especially the recent large annual conference of the American Comparative Literature Association, which significantly enhanced Utrecht's international visibility. Research grant capture is at a more than acceptable level over the period under consideration. As for ICON as a whole, overall funding has steadily increased since 2014. Second and third funding streams have generally been significant. In general, researchers have been successful across a good range of funders and schemes.

There are signs of engagement with Digital Humanities-related approaches, including the development of digital resources (i.e. "instruments and infrastructure") as well as extensive critical reflection on digital culture. There is potential for future development in this respect.

Societal Relevance

Literature departments have sometimes struggled to articulate their social relevance, and we were especially impressed by the unit's efforts and achievements in this area. The focus on cultural memory, for example, has an obvious pertinence for historically oriented institutions such as museums, and there is documentation of significant collaborations on this front. The ERC grant awarded on the history of protest in Europe also speaks to issues of broad interest. There has been a significant number of public presentations, appearances in the media, etc. An impressive range of societal impacts has clearly been generated, including durable outcomes such as publications and digital resources (including the very important Digital Disability Archive). It is encouraging to note that some key publications of societal significance are available via Open Access, and that diverse languages are represented.



The work on the global dimensions of the first world war is an especially impressive example of public outreach. There is evidence of substantial levels of interest in such activities among the general public and cultural practitioners. Importantly, these activities also have durable legacies such as publications, as well as generating follow-up interactions (media engagement, work on creativity in education). Publications explicitly aimed at the general public are, perhaps inevitably, largely in Dutch. However, other languages are also represented in this category, so that a degree of international societal impact becomes possible.

In conversation with members of the group, we were also impressed by their commitment to strengthening the role of literary education in secondary schools and their efforts in this area, including an innovative use of digital resources to inspire interest in the study of literature and language among schoolchildren.

There are valuable precedents here, which could usefully be followed in the future in both this programme and others within ICON. As with the group's publications, interactions with societal stakeholders range considerably beyond the traditional scope of literary studies.

Viability

The SWOT analysis gives a pertinent assessment of the programme's position. Relationships with UU strategic themes and focus areas seem strong in comparison with some other areas of ICON. The uneven spread of capacity across different languages is noted, though this would only constitute a weakness if it prevents research from being carried out as effectively or ambitiously as desired. Strategy for the next period identifies some key priorities, though could provide more detail about implementation.

The overall quality of the SWOT analysis – especially the thorough reflections on threats and how to address them – indicates that the programme's leadership is effective and well-informed. Flexibility has been demonstrated in response to external opportunities (e.g., societal collaborations) and internal developments (focus area in Cultures, Citizenship and Human Rights), suggesting that the programme is well able to anticipate and address future challenges.

The comparison with the Centre for Comparative Literature, University of Toronto – which had been selected for international benchmarking purposes – is helpful and well laid out. It seems clear that the unit at Utrecht has a broader purview and more experience of collaborating with non-academic audiences than is the case in most North American universities. Toronto, meanwhile, has an established and funded graduate programme, and faculty do significantly less teaching than at Utrecht. However, Toronto has been able to generate different kinds of societal interactions through its creative writing programme. It is claimed that the Dutch educational context is less conducive to developments in this field. We would encourage UU to challenge those assumptions and to consider at least a modest investment in creative writing (if only through a part-time visiting appointment).

Recommendations

Modern and Contemporary Literature is a dynamic unit that pursues an ambitious, wide-ranging, and successful research programme. It has achieved an impressive level of performance and visibility, especially in the areas of published scholarship and public outreach. While the PhD programme seems robust and effective, the proportion of students to faculty is relatively low and the challenge of attracting a critical mass of PhD students is noted in the report. More support in training faculty to write grant applications that can attract and fund students is called for. The unit's links to the medical humanities are also promising and could be further developed. Finally, we would encourage further consideration of the option of creative writing. The expertise and cross-disciplinary reach of the Modern and Contemporary Literature group is diverse; in due course it will seem incongruous for the group not to include a creative element.



3.4 Media and performance studies

Research area

The Media and Performance group covers a large area, from film, television, theatre, and dance to games, mobile and social media, and data research. While combinations of media and theatre studies run the risk of sharing little common ground, the UU research cluster Media and Performance Studies has developed both theoretically and in its range of topics into a rich research area in which the study of screen media and stage media offers highly productive modes of cross-disciplinary cooperation. This approach to joining media and performance studies is a hallmark which favourably distinguishes the UU group from Comparative Media Studies at MIT which was selected for international benchmarking. Given the current tendency to media convergence, the group's emphasis on mediatisation, intermediality, and cross-media and the combining of historical research and cultural analysis will undoubtedly cause the group's cross-disciplinary work to become ever more important for future assessments of cultural and societal developments.

Beyond facilitating dialogue and exchange between experts in different fields within the group, this research cluster cooperates productively with specialists in other field within and beyond the humanities such as musicology, computer science, etc.

In 2017 ICON's researchers in media and performance studies comprised 13.74 FTE scientific staff, 3.57 postdocs, and 3 PhD candidates.

Research quality

The research group covers an impressively broad field and succeeded in establishing itself as a force to be reckoned with both nationally and internationally. A huge plus here is, firstly, its transdisciplinary approach with strong and highly productive links to other groups within ICON (e.g. musicology) and outside partners. Secondly, the combination of historical research with the analysis of contemporary cultural phenomena offers a unique methodological framework for diagnosing media-related social challenges and transformations which goes far beyond the insights derived from technology-based disciplines such as computer science or merely quantitative assessments in communication studies and sociology.

The group has excelled in setting an agenda that allows for productive cooperations in the areas of datafication, media implications in the transformation of public space, as well as human/non-human interfaces.

Media and Performance Studies has succeeded in creating synergies with UU focus areas and taking on a leading position in the UU focus area Game Research. Equally important, the group recently gained recognition as a cooperation partner for UU's strategic themes (Sustainability and Dynamics of Youth). It obtained substantial funding from both national and international sources (NWO funding for the Graduate Programme and the Persuasive Gaming project, NWO Clariah as well as the EU CIP programme).

International visibility and recognition are highly impressive in the following respects:

- the quantity and quality of the publications as well as the prestige of the publishers such as Routledge, BFI and UoA Press;
- international conferences, workshops, symposia where members of the group act as committee members, organizers and speakers.

This excellent international reputation is also reflected in the leading positions individual members of the group hold as chairs, distinguished guest professors, and research fellows in numerous international contexts.

Societal Relevance

In the hugely relevant field of datafication, the research group has succeeded in sharing its academic expertise in a wider social context in several projects: the Utrecht Data School and, within that framework, the development of the Ethical Data Assistant. The wide range of applications in terms of data visualizations as well as ethical guidelines guarantees widespread interest and implementation in a broad range of public institutions.

The EUscreen project is an excellent example of productively using digital technologies for accessing historical data and materials and thus making them available for learning scenarios in a cultural heritage



framework. Numerous other projects such as the Ethics of Coding project, the Motion Bank etc. demonstrate the versatility of the group in sharing its expertise in a wide range of contexts and formats, ranging from databanks, guidelines, podcasts to workshops and festivals. In addition, members of the group play significant leading roles in public organizations as members of steering groups, juries for awards etc. The case studies offer detailed descriptions of impressive levels of interaction with non-academic groups, including the embedding of master's students with external partners; engaging with social media, synchronizing of digital archives, community arts, etc.

This strong commitment to making its work productive for a wider social context, a commitment that is clearly a priority for the group as a whole as well as for individual members, is particularly impressive as it is carried out under great time constraints, and requires substantial creativity and pragmatism as well as excellent skills in communicating often abstract academic knowledge to outsiders.

Viability

Among its many strong points, the ability and willingness of the group to constantly reflect on its own strategies and goals shows a great sense of leadership and vision. While developing several successful research areas in the past years (Games, Digital and Digitized Heritage, Stage and Screen Media in Transition, Datafication, Urban Interfaces and Human-Machine Interaction), the group recently translated these areas into a more distinct structure for research initiatives taking the form of five research clusters, namely TV & Screen Cultures in Transition, Transmission in Motion, Urban Interfaces, Utrecht Centre for Game Research and Utrecht Data School. Undoubtedly, this concentration will facilitate transdisciplinary work in the form of workshops, interdisciplinary projects, and collaboration with external partners in the future.

The main issue in terms of viability seems to be the discrepancy between the obvious strength of the unit (relevance of research areas, the outstanding expertise and international recognition of its members, and its highly successful outreach projects) and the aspects which prevent it from fully realizing its potential. One of the biggest problems here seems to be the fact that the group's efforts to be recognized as valuable partners for cooperations within UU strategic themes were only recently rewarded. One of the obstacles the group has to deal with in this context is the overemphasis on communication studies and computer sciences in understanding and dealing with current social transformations.

As is also the case with other groups, Media and Performance Studies suffers from a discrepancy between teaching load and administrative work on the one hand and research obligations on the other. It is thus advisable that alongside existing modes of freeing up research time, efforts should be made to creatively and pragmatically come up with additional solutions to the problem.

Recommendations

It would be useful for individuals as well as ICON management to monitor the types of article-length publications produced by researchers: specifically, the proportions of refereed articles to book chapters and non-refereed articles. Over the period considered, this proportion is not at all inappropriate for a strong research unit, and book chapters are widely recognized forms of publication in this field. However, in order to enhance the professional development and international visibility of researchers, particularly younger scholars, it would be desirable to encourage more publication in refereed journals over the long term.

In respect of societal engagement, the group might want to consider devising a strategy for future activities in terms of both aiming for a more selective choice of engagements and, secondly, prioritising certain modes of reaching out to the public rather than following a demand-driven policy which seems to accommodate a perhaps too broad range of outreach activities.

As in other ICON programmes, it would be desirable to develop more thorough ways of documenting societal impacts: both their quantitative reach and their qualitative significance for beneficiaries.



3.5 Gender Studies

Research Area

The Graduate Gender Programme (GGeP) is relatively small in size, but it has a high level of international visibility and prominence in Europe and beyond. It is one of the few gender studies programmes that is centered in the humanities and consists of three research strands: Contemporary Feminist Theory; Postcoloniality and Social Justice; Art and Beyond. In line with this emphasis, the programme investigates the cultural making of gender, in dialog with relevant research in literary studies, philosophy, political theory, visual studies, history, and related fields.

In 2017 the programme comprised 3.35 FTE scientific staff, 0.99 postdocs, and 7 PhD candidates.

Research Quality

The key questions driving the research agenda of the programme are articulated at a sophisticated level and reveal a strong grasp of the complexity of gender issues, including the need to consider how gender is entangled with many other factors. At the same time, there is a welcome concern with policy recommendations and real world-implications of research. The level of research activity is very impressive. Scholarly books and articles appear in several languages, with an especially high visibility in English-language venues. The record of publications is strong in terms of both quantity and quality, including publications with high-ranked journals and prestigious presses. Monographs are ambitious in their scope and intellectual agenda. Journal articles are associated with a wide range of disciplines – including literary studies, film studies, philosophy, politics, and even scientific fields – ensuring that research in the programme enjoys a high level of cross-disciplinary visibility. Patterns of publication – including the balance between articles and authored/edited books – are in line with what might be expected in a leading research-intensive university in this field, such as the Women & Gender Studies Institute, University of Toronto, which had been selected for international benchmarking purposes.

There is also an impressive record of external funding from national and international grants – impressive both in absolute terms and in comparison with wider trends across ICON. An average of €1,000,000 annual second- and third-stream income over a decade represents an outstanding performance for any area in the humanities. Overall funding volume has risen very significantly since 2016, driven largely by an increase in EU funding. In general, researchers have been successful across a good range of funders and schemes, with both larger and smaller awards.

Other research-related activities include high-profile lectures and the NOISE summer school. International networking is extensive, with active involvement in various groups and consortia and members of the unit being awarded visiting professorships at top academic institutions around the world. The reputation and visibility of the unit is also strengthened by its hosting of the NOG, and by the extensive international and cross-disciplinary reception of some of its work. There are also welcome signs of engagement with Digital Humanities-related approaches, notably in the critical perspectives on digital culture developed by the “Art and Beyond” strand, and in the production of various digital resources.

Societal relevance

The question of gender and its cultural and political implications is of obvious social interest, with members of the programme being regularly called on to respond to news events and public controversies. The level of outreach in the Graduate Gender Programme is impressive; the report documents major and durable forms of public impact that extend well beyond the University of Utrecht. There are clear signs of responsiveness to non-academic stakeholders and diverse types of interaction with publics of various kinds. Alongside numerous events, such as public seminars, performances, and participation in festivals, there is also the creation of online resources, community work, and media engagement. The production of reports forms an important and distinctive element of the programme’s societal activities. There is also significant production of materials used in teaching, at UU and elsewhere.

There are interesting examples of consultation with museums, corporations, etc. around how women and men are represented. The association of Gender Studies with the Museum of Equality and Differences involves co-operation with organizations of different kinds. Benefits for non-academic users include training for culture professionals, and the development of industry practice (in media/advertising) and public policy in various areas. Creative work has also been used as a research method (as part of the work with Imagine Identity and Culture); the programme may wish to consider whether there is scope to do more work of this kind in future.



In view of the external demand for expertise, it is important that a strategic approach to societal engagement is in place. This is indeed the case; rather than simply taking opportunities to act as problem-solving consultants, staff on the programme engage in interactions that are intellectually enriching to all partners.

GGeP's publications aimed at the general public are, perhaps inevitably, largely in Dutch. However, other languages are also represented, so that international societal impacts become possible.

The opportunities that are made available to masters and PhD students are particularly impressive. It is evident that considerable thought is given to their future employment prospects and that, beyond their research training, they are given ample opportunities to make connections to organizations outside the university. Overall, GGeP – like the Women & Gender Studies Institute, University of Toronto – is in line with international best practice as regards developing outreach activities and cooperations with societal stakeholders.

Viability

The Gender Studies Graduate Programme has been exceptionally successful at sustaining itself via external funding while also maintaining an impressive level of research output. In meeting with representatives of the group, we were struck by their intellectual energy as well as by the degree of rapport among members—they clearly work together well as an intergenerational unit and have a flexible, horizontal, decision-making structure. Meanwhile the programme is clearly giving serious thought to developing strategies for the future. Gender Studies is one of the five hubs of the UU strategic theme "Institutions for Open Societies." We note its ambition to develop this link and to grow into a university-wide institute "Gender and Diversity: Building an Inclusive Society," partly by expanding its connections to the social sciences. Over-all, we found that the programme combines diversity with cohesion and a clear intellectual vision.

The overall quality of the SWOT analysis indicates that the programme's leadership is effective and well-informed. GGeP researchers have amply demonstrated their ability to "continually broaden their thinking and strategies in order to be effective". The programme and its researchers seem well equipped to anticipate and address future challenges. A major concern, however, is the lack of permanent positions and shortage of staffing relative to the programme's achievements. If this issue is not addressed, increasing staff-student ratios will put pressure on staff members' ability not only to conduct research but also to exercise management and leadership.

Recommendations

Based on the past record of performance, we feel highly optimistic about the future of the Graduate Gender Programme, which is distinguished by excellence at all levels. Further development could only be a question of expansion – not so much in the range of scholarly and societal activities undertaken, but in the number of permanent staff. The rapid growth, international visibility, and impressive research output of the programme needs to be matched by a corresponding level of institutional support in terms of funded positions for teaching as well as research. Gender Studies qualifies as a world-class research unit that must be encouraged to continue to flourish and to reach its full potential.



3.6 Musicology

Research area

The profile of musicology at UU is characterised by a strong emphasis on historical musicology, particularly the history of early music and music of the Low Countries and The Netherlands. Within the research group, a second research focus on mediatisation of music has proved particularly conducive to transdisciplinary co-operations within ICON and beyond, particularly in relation to joint projects with Media and Performance studies where film and game music as well as notational representations offer rich opportunities for transdisciplinary research.

In 2017 ICON's musicologists comprised 1.64 FTE scientific staff, 0.91 postdocs and 2 PhD candidates.

Research quality

Since other musicology departments in the Netherlands, primarily musicology at the University of Amsterdam, with its emphasis on ethnomusicology and empirical research in music, have chosen to steer away from traditional historical orientations in the discipline, musicology at UU has been able to establish itself as a prominent site for historical research within a national and international context. It operates within an impressive network of research institutes such as Meertens Institute/KNAW, Netherlands Research School for Medieval Studies, The Royal Society for Music History of The Netherlands, and the American Musicological Society.

The group has been successful in establishing productive co-operations both within ICON and outside the humanities. Within ICON, the collaboration with Media and Performance Studies seems particularly successful, but the group has also cooperated with Computer Studies, especially in the contexts of digital visualisation of sound tracks and spectrograms of music. Collaborations with the Medicine and Law Departments (summer schools) are evidence of the group's efforts to extend their co-operations within UU beyond the humanities.

The quality of the group's research has been honoured by a number of substantial grants from national and international organisations such as an ERC Advanced Grant, HERA JRP, NWO Veni, NIAS Senior Fellowship, and Fung Fellowship at Princeton Universities. The accomplishments in acquiring funds are reflected in the positive development of the ratio of direct funding to grants and contract research (in 2013: 82% vs 18%, in 2017: 36% to 64%). It is likely that this impressive history of successful grant applications was also instrumental in the high output of PhDs, with 21 degrees granted in the period under consideration.

In contrast to the Musicology and Dance Studies Department of the University of Salzburg which was selected as the international benchmarking reference, the UU group's emphasis on collaboration and joint ventures both in research and grant applications proves a valuable strategy in comparison to the Salzburg institute's reliance on projects undertaken individually and reluctance to engage in transdisciplinary cooperation.

The research group's publication record features some substantial publications in leading international venues. However, the output appears to be quite uneven, especially considering the quantitative drop from 27 publications in 2012 to 19 in 2017. In addition, the group's emphasis on book chapters and edited volumes with a concomitant neglect of refereed articles and monographs (no refereed articles at all in 2015 and only 1 in both 2016 and 2017; no monographs since 2013) might be grounds for reconsidering publication strategies in the future. This seems particularly pertinent in light of the group's self-proclaimed aim to position itself at the forefront of thematic and methodological developments in musicology, both nationally and internationally.

Societal Relevance

The collaboration of the group with various important and internationally renowned festivals such as the Utrecht Early Music Festival is impressive. The group's societal outreach as experts as well as performers takes on a wide range of formats, from digitized and interactive music editions to websites and public lectures, as well as advisory functions and service as jury members. The Letter Project presented as a case study (a trove of undelivered letters by artists from the 17th and 18th century) demonstrates the group's ability to generate broad public recognition through media coverage as well as public commentary via digital media.



The societal outreach activities of the UU group must be considered superior to the benchmark Austrian institute's as the latter does not focus on collective efforts to make the expertise of its members available to the public.

Viability

The most obvious challenges for the group in terms of strategies for the future are the staffing situation and the declining enrolment numbers at the undergraduate level. After the departure of one of its most distinguished and prolific colleagues to a university abroad, and with the Full Professorship currently on hold, the group faces serious problems in maintaining its impressive profile in terms of third stream funding, and in improving its international visibility in terms of the quality and quantity of its publications.

Considering the importance of the unit's status in offering The Netherlands' only RMA programme in the field of musicology the development of strategies for attracting more BA students seems a particularly urgent task in order to re-establish UU as a prominent site of academic training in musicology. In this context, a re-evaluation of the undergraduate curriculum might be called for. One possibility might be a reconsideration of the traditional, discipline-oriented curriculum and a possible opening of the programme to reflect current transformations in the field, such as the focus on music and media, which features so prominently in the group's research. This could appeal to a wider constituency of students, at the level of both degree courses and individual modules.

Recommendations

As mentioned above, the future success of the group depends on its ability to acquire the resources necessary for overcoming the precarious staffing situation. When advertising new positions, it would be advisable to formulate the profile of future hires in accordance with a clear research strategy and intellectual vision for the group as a whole.

In addition, the group might benefit from the opportunity to create a new and attractive identity for the core courses in the BA curriculum in order to increase enrolment and strengthen UU's position in musicology education.

It would be useful for individuals, and for ICON management, to monitor the types of article-length publications produced by researchers, specifically, the proportion of refereed articles to book chapters and non-refereed articles. The meagre proportion of peer-reviewed articles produced in the last few years is particularly striking. In order to enhance the professional development and international visibility of researchers, particularly younger scholars, more publication in refereed journals over the long term should be encouraged.



4. National research school for gender studies

The Netherlands Research School of Gender Studies (NOG) was established in 1995 and provides a national platform for gender research and teaching by faculty members from various Dutch universities.

Utrecht University is the host of the NOG. Normally, the hosting of a research school rotates among universities. As of 2017, the National Research Schools also provide courses for research masters degree students. Since Utrecht University is the only university in the Netherlands offering a research masters degree in the field of Gender Studies, it is unlikely that another university will take over the hosting of the NOG in the near future.

The NOG's mission is to create an academic community in the Netherlands in which feminist and postcolonial research can be optimally pursued, as well as to educate the next generation of open-minded researchers towards (1) new disciplinary and interdisciplinary developments; (2) novel and innovative theoretical and methodological approaches; and (3) the application of scientific results in society and the productive connection of academy and activism.

The committee is of the opinion that NOG amply fulfils its mission and goals. The number of staff and students since 2012 gives clear evidence that the NOG is large enough to constitute a substantial academic community (the NOG has 45 registered PhDs and has supported approximately 50 international (post)graduate students) in the period under consideration.

The committee was impressed by the roster of activities enabling students to learn from some of the best researchers outside of their own universities. The NOG offers a broad range of challenging and innovative classes, seminars and workshops that play an important role in the training of PhD students in both methodology and area-specific knowledge in the field of Gender Studies. An individual university could not provide this support in a comparable way on its own.

Moreover, the NOG enables students to network with fellow students and staff from other universities in the Netherlands and further afield. The committee appreciated the annual and monthly NOG events, including the annual NOG research day, the NOISE summer school, the 'Doing Gender Lectures Series' and the masterclasses and symposia.

The NOG also cooperates in the preparation of research applications. The research school brings together the research of the partners to apply for NWO, NUFFIC, ministerial and European Commission grants. The self-evaluation lists an impressive number of achievements, including grants awarded to NOG members, and national and international projects and networks in which the NOG is involved. Moreover, NOG has submitted three research questions to be part of the Dutch National Research Agenda, hence shaping not only its own field but also wider research policies and priorities. These questions now emerge in the designed research routes for funding.

All Dutch universities have staff members teaching and researching in the field of Gender Studies embedded in different local infrastructures. Yet only four of the Dutch universities contribute financially to the NOG. During the site visit, the committee learned that one important reason for this low contribution rate has to do with the fact that NOG is a humanities-based research school. Universities that have Gender Studies embedded in social sciences departments are reluctant to contribute on a permanent basis. As described in the self-evaluation, NOG has been pressing for a greater future financial commitment by these universities. The committee fully supports these efforts towards an equal distribution of the financial burden, as this is indispensable for the continuous upgrading of this important research infrastructure in the long term.

NOG has a Curriculum Committee with both academic and student members. According to the committee, this represents excellent practice in ensuring responsiveness to student needs, effective staff-student communication, and close oversight of curricular matters. In addition, the organization of NOG involves both a Board (representing five universities) and an International Advisory Board.



In 2015, NOG established a Social Council to reinforce the dialogue between education, research and professional practice. The council consists of members from different professional fields in the area of gender and diversity wishing to contribute to a creative exchange between theory and practice.

Recommendations

The committee encourages NOG to devise a strategy to secure financial contributions from all other Dutch universities engaging in the field of gender studies, regardless of their disciplinary affiliation within their universities.

The committee noted that many members of the International Advisory board are emeritae, and therefore recommends engaging in long-term planning by appointing some younger scholars to the board. It also suggests creating more synergies between the different committees and boards, for example, by appointing one of the social council members as a member of the curriculum committee.



Appendix A – Short biographies

Adrian Armstrong studied at Oxford (BA 1991, DPhil 1995) and was a Research Fellow at Trinity Hall, Cambridge in 1994-5, before becoming Lecturer in French at the University of Manchester in 1995. After promotions to Senior Lecturer (2000) and then Professor of Early French Culture (2005), he moved to Queen Mary University of London (QMUL) in 2011 as Centenary Professor of French. A specialist in medieval and early modern literature, he has co-/directed major research projects funded by the UK's Arts and Humanities Research Council and by the European Union (Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions). In 2014-17 he was Head of the School of Languages, Linguistics and Film at QMUL. He was President of the Association of University Professors and Heads of French in 2013-17 (2016-17 as Acting President), and is the Association's Vice-President until 2019.

Rita Felski has a honors degree from Cambridge University (1979) and an M.A and Ph.D from Monash University in Australia. After teaching for seven years at Murdoch University in Perth, she moved to the University of Virginia, where she is currently William R. Kenan Professor of English. In 2016 she was awarded a Niels Bohr Professorship to lead a research project on "Uses of Literature" at the University of Southern Denmark. A former editor of the journal *New Literary History*, her books include *Beyond Feminist Aesthetics*, *The Gender of Modernity*, *Doing Time: Feminist Theory and Postmodern Culture*, *Literature After Feminism*, *Uses of Literature*, and *The Limits of Critique*.

Eva Warth studied at the University of Tübingen and Leeds. She received a Fulbright grant to complete her PhD and an ACLS Research Fellowship for her habilitation. After participating in two major research projects on US TV Series and American Documentary Film (both funded by VW foundation), she held a temporary professorship (1994/5) at Media Studies Department, Ruhr-University Bochum, Germany, to which she returned as a full professor after working as a UD and UHD at the Media and Representation Department, Utrecht University 1995-2000. She served as Head of the Department for many years and in 2010 was appointed Dean of the Philology Faculty. Eva Warth has held guest professorships at New York University, Gadjah Mada University Yogyakarta, Indonesia, University of Vienna and Frankfurt University. She is Professor Emeritus since August 2018.



Appendix B – Programme of the site visit

Wednesday October 31, Academiegebouw

		Present
17.00	Informal reception	Adrian Armstrong Eva Warth Frank Kessler Frans Ruiten Ann Rigney Hanneke Jansen Esther Poort
19:00	Diner	committee

Thursday November 1, Faculty of Humanities Janskerkhof 13a, Stijlkamer 0.06

Time	Part	Collocutors
8.30 – 9.30	Preliminary internal consultation	committee
9.30 – 9.50	Installation of Committee by Board of UU and briefing Dean	Keimpe Algra
9.50 – 10.30	Meeting with Faculty Board	Keimpe Algra Ted Sanders Ann Rigney
10.30 – 10.45	Break	committee
10.45 – 11.45	Meeting with ICON Management	Frank Kessler Frans Ruiten Hanneke Jansen
11.45 – 12.15	Evaluation faculty board session and management session	committee
12.15 – 13.00	Lunch	committee
13.00 – 13.45	Meeting with Medieval Culture	Bart Besamusca Els Rose Katell Laveant Andrea van Leerdam
13.45 – 14.15	Evaluation Medieval Culture	committee
14.15 – 15.00	Meeting with Early Modern Literature	Philippe Bossier Arnoud Visser Feike Dietz Rozanne Versendaal
15.00 – 15.30	Evaluation Early Modern Literature	committee
15.30 – 15.45	Break	committee
15.45 – 16.30	Meeting with Modern and Contemporary Literature	Kiene Brillenburg Wurth Ann Rigney Paul Bijl Kila van der Starre
16.30 – 17.00	Evaluation Modern and Contemporary Literature	committee
17.00 – 17.45	Meeting with Musicology	Emile Wennekes Rebekah Ahrendt Michiel Kamp



		Manon Louviot
17.45 – 18.15	Evaluation Musicology	committee
19.00 – 21.00	Dinner	committee

Friday November 2, Faculty of Humanities Janskerkhof 13a, Stijkkamer

Time	Part	Collocutors
9.00 – 9.45	Meeting with Media & Performance Studies	Maike Bleeker Eggo Müller Nanna Verhoeff Evelyn Wan
9.45 – 10.15	Evaluation Media & Performance Studies	committee
10.15 – 11.00	Meeting with Gender Studies	Rosemarie Buikema Sandra Ponzanesi Magdalena Górska Milica Trakilovic
11.00 – 11.30	Evaluation Gender studies	committee
11.30 – 11.45	Break – walk to Muntstraat 2A	committee
11.45 – 12.15	Meeting with PhDs/Postdocs Location: Muntstraat 2, Foyer	PhDs/Postdocs
12.15 – 12.45	Formal meeting with PhD's Location: Muntstraat 2, Theatre	Gerwin van Schie Desi Prianti Manon Louviot Rozanne van Versendaal Andrea van Leerdam
12.45 – 13.30	Lunch, Stijkkamer	committee
13.30 – 14.15	Meeting with the Netherlands Research School of Gender studies, Muntstraat 2 Theatre	Rosemarie Buikema Kathrin Thiele Laura Candidatu
14.15 – 14.45	Evaluation Netherlands' Research School of Gender studies, Muntstraat 2 Theatre	committee
14.45 – 15.00	Consultation Possibility, Muntstraat 2 Theatre	
15.00 – 17.00	Overall evaluation, Muntstraat 2 Stijkkamer	committee
17.00 – 17.15	Presentation First Results, Muntstraat 2 Theatre	ICON members



Appendix C – Tables

Table 1.1 Number of staff and research fte – ICON (entire Institute)

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte
Scientific staff	118 / 43	120 / 40	110 / 36.6	123 / 40.27	105 / 39.12	109 / 36.9
Post-docs	5 / 2	3 / 1.54	1 / 0.55	4 / 2.17	9 / 5.34	18 / 8.39
PhD candidates	25	20	20	14	21	19
Total research staff	148 / 45	143 / 41.54	131 / 37.15	141 / 42.44	135 / 44.46	146 / 45.30

Table 1.2 Number of staff and research fte –Medieval Culture

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte
Scientific staff	14 / 5.51	15 / 4.88	10 / 4.19	12 / 4.76	7 / 3.33	10 / 4.88
Post-docs	0	1 / 0.50	1 / 1.0	1 / 0.50	2 / 1.30	3 / 1.95
PhD candidates	5	5	5	3	5	2
Total research staff	19 / 5.51	21 / 5.38	16 / 5.19	16 / 5.26	14 / 4.63	15 / 6.82

Table 1.3 Number of staff and research fte –Literature: Two research groups: 1) Early Modern Literature and 2) Modern and Comparative Literature

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte
Scientific staff	50 / 16.89	50 / 16.1	41 / 12.43	47 / 15.25	42 / 15.81	42 / 13.29
Post-docs	2 / 0.94	1 / 0.41	1 / 0.67	1 / 0.67	2 / 0.83	2 / 0.98
PhD candidates	6	6	7	4	4	5
Total research staff	58 / 17.83	57 / 16.51	49 / 13.1	52 / 15.92	48 / 16.64	49 / 14.26

Table 1.4 Number of staff and research fte –Media and Performance Studies

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte	# / fte
Scientific staff	39 / 14.65	39 / 13.68	42 / 14.00	48 / 15.22	40 / 14.22	41 / 13.74
Post-docs	2 / 0.83	1 / 1	1 / 0.55	2 / 1	3 / 2.53	10 / 3.57
PhD candidates	11	7	6	3	3	3
Total research staff	52 / 15.48	47 / 14.68	49 / 14.55	53 / 16.22	46 / 16.75	54 / 17.32



Table 1.5 Number of staff and research fte –Gender Studies

	2012 # / fte	2013 # / fte	2014 # / fte	2015 # / fte	2016 # / fte	2017 # / fte
Scientific staff	8 / 3.8	8 / 3.37	10 / 3.52	11 / 3.42	10 / 3.94	9 / 3.35
Post-docs	1 / 0.2	1 / 0.13	0	0	2 / 0.68	2 / 0.99
PhD candidates	2	1	1	2	7	7
Total research staff	11 / 4	10 / 3.5	11 / 3.5	13 / 3.42	19 / 4.62	18 / 4.34

Table 1.6 Number of staff and research fte –Musicology

	2012 # / fte	2013 # / fte	2014 # / fte	2015 # / fte	2016 # / fte	2017 # / fte
Scientific staff	7 / 2.14	8 / 1.95	7 / 1.76	5 / 1.62	6 / 1.82	7 / 1.64
Post-docs	0	0	0	0	0	1 / 0.91
PhD candidates	1	1	1	2	2	2
Total research staff	8/2.14	9/1.95	8/1.76	7/1.62	8/1.82	10/2.56

Table 2.1 Main categories of research output – ICON

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Refereed articles	84	79	88	69	90	99
Non-refereed articles	16	16	7	12	12	14
Books	18	7	12	9	13	13
Book chapters	97	97	107	107	132	123
Book editorship	29	18	15	13	21	18
PhD theses	17	9	15	16	13	16
Professional publications	43	41	43	47	54	42
Publications aimed at the general public	14	20	16	25	36	25
Other research output*	82	57	68	69	115	106
Total publications	405	346	373	369	490	456

* most important: Book/Film/Article reviews; Other conference papers; Web publications or websites

Table 2.2 Main categories of research output – Medieval Culture

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Refereed articles	5	10	9	9	6	5
Non-refereed articles	2	1			2	1
Books	3	3		1	2	5
Book chapters	3	2	15	6	18	12
Book editorship	3	1	4	1	3	3
PhD theses		2		1	1	3
Professional publications	4	4	5	4	6	4
Publications aimed at the general public				2	3	
Other research output	9	6	1	3	1	13
Total publications	29	29	34	27	42	46



Table 2.3 Main categories of research output – Early Modern Literature

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Refereed articles	8	8	8	4	9	11
Non-refereed articles	2	1		2	2	1
Books	1		1	1	1	3
Book chapters	8	11	10	7	7	12
Book editorship	6	5	3	2	1	3
PhD theses	2					
Professional publications	5	4	2	7	7	9
Publications aimed at the general public	1	4	6	4	7	9
Other research output	13	8	20	23	37	23
Total publications	46	41	50	50	71	71

Table 2.4 Main categories of research output – Modern and Contemporary Literature

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Refereed articles	22	20	28	29	21	33
Non-refereed articles	4	5	3	5	3	5
Books	5		4	3	3	1
Book chapters	30	17	27	30	39	25
Book editorship	10	4	3	3	6	3
PhD theses	3	2	3	4	1	2
Professional publications	19	15	19	21	16	13
Publications aimed at the general public	8	7	6	12	13	11
Other research output	19	17	19	22	37	18
Total publications	120	87	112	129	139	111

Table 2.5 Main categories of research output – Media & Performance Studies

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Refereed articles	34	25	26	22	29	36
Non-refereed articles	5	7	1	4	4	6
Books	8	2	1		4	2
Book chapters	32	43	32	42	46	42
Book editorship	4	4	1	5	6	4
PhD theses	5	2	7	7	7	3
Professional publications	13	13	13	12	19	13
Publications aimed at the general public	5	6	1	1	9	1
Other research output	29	17	18	17	35	43
Total publications	140	121	102	112	162	150



Table 2.6 Main categories of research output – Gender Studies

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Refereed articles	12	15	16	7	26	13
Non-refereed articles	1	1	3	1	1	1
Books	1	1	6	4	3	2
Book chapters	23	17	22	21	19	33
Book editorship	4	1	3	2	3	6
PhD theses	4	2		2	1	2
Professional publications		4	4	2	4	4
Publications aimed at the general public		2	4	6	3	3
Other research output	7	5	7	1	5	4
Total publications	52	48	65	46	65	68

Table 2.7 Main categories of research output – Musicology

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Refereed articles	3	1	4		1	1
Non-refereed articles						
Books	3	1				
Book chapters	2	8	2	2	5	3
Book editorship	4	3	2	1	4	1
PhD theses	4	1	5	2	3	6
Professional publications	2	1		1	2	
Publications aimed at the general public		2		1	2	2
Other research output	6	3	3	4	1	5
Total publications	27	21	20	11	19	19

Table 3.1 Funding ICON institute

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Funding	Fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %
Direct funding	35.79 / 69	34.5 / 65	28.32 / 60	32.55 / 66	34.95 / 61	34.01 / 59
Research grants	15.29 / 29	14.8 / 28	13.51 / 29	11.39 / 23	15.59 / 27	16.81 / 29
Contract research	1.13 / 2	3.95 / 7	5.56 / 11	5.64 / 11	7.18 / 12	6.99 / 12
Other	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Total funding	52.21 / 100	53.25 / 100	47.39 / 100	49.58 / 100	57.72 / 100	57.81 / 100
Expenditure in M€	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %
Personnel costs	4.713 / 98	4.977 / 98	4.584 / 98	4.812 / 98	5.074 / 98	4.818 / 97
Other costs	106 / 2	117 / 2	116 / 2	110 / 2	121 / 2	134 / 3
Total expenditure	4.819 / 100	5.094 / 100	4.700 / 100	4.922 / 100	5.195 / 100	4.953 / 100



Table 3.2 Funding Medieval Culture

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Funding	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %
Direct funding	4.36/58	4.46 / 65	3.39 / 57	5.26 / 83	3.63 / 52	3.85 / 48
Research grants	1.94/26	1.17 / 17	1.55 / 26	1.06 / 17	3.36 / 48	4.24 / 52
Contract research	1.2/16	1.20 / 18	0.99 / 17	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Other	0/0	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Total funding	7.5 / 100	6.83 / 100	5.93 / 100	6.32 / 100	6.99 / 100	8.09 / 100
Expenditure in M€	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %
Personnel costs	574 / 98	628 / 98	490 / 97	522 / 98	635 / 98	688 / 97
Other costs	12 / 2	14 / 2	14 / 2	9 / 2	15 / 2	21 / 3
Total expenditure	586 / 100	642 / 100	504 / 100	531 / 100	650 / 100	709 / 100

Table 3.3 Funding Early Modern Literature

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Funding	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %
Direct funding	3.83/ 64	4.10 / 64	3.11 / 61	3.22 / 58	3.95 / 69	3.65 / 70
Research grants	2.12/ 36	2.23 / 35	1.71 / 34	1.80 / 32	1.50 / 26	1.49 / 29
Contract research	0	0.09 / 1	0.26 / 5	0.55 / 10	0.28 / 5	0.09 / 2
Other	0	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Total funding	5.95	6.42 / 100	5.08 / 100	5.57 / 100	5.73 / 100	5.23 / 100
Expenditure in M€	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %
Personnel costs	545 / 98	596 / 98	594 / 98	502 / 97	507 / 98	461 / 98
Other costs	9 / 2	14 / 2	14 / 2	14 / 3	9 / 2	11 / 2
Total expenditure	554 / 100	611 / 100	608 / 100	515 / 100	516 / 100	461 / 100

Table 3.4 Funding Modern and Contemporary Literature

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Funding	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %
Direct funding	8.93/64	9.58 / 64	7.25 / 61	7.51 / 58	9.21 / 69	8.51 / 70
Research grants	5.03/36	5.20 / 35	4.00 / 34	4.21 / 32	3.50 / 26	3.49 / 29
Contract research	0	0.21 / 1	0.62 / 5	1.28 / 10	0.66 / 5	0.22 / 2
Other	0	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Total funding	13.96	14.99	11.86	13.00	13.38	12.21
Expenditure in M€	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %
Personnel costs	1.305 / 98	1.392 / 98	1.387 / 98	1.170 / 97	1.182 / 98	1.075 / 98
Other costs	30 / 2	34 / 2	32 / 2	32 / 3	22 / 2	26 / 2
Total expenditure	1.335 / 100	1.425 / 100	1.418 / 100	1.203 / 100	1.204 / 100	1.100 / 100



Table 3.5 Funding Media and Performance Studies

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Funding	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %
Direct funding	13.36/66	11.86 / 64	10.13 / 59	12.03 / 69	13.59 / 70	13.85 / 73
Research grants	5.45/27	4.91 / 27	3.99 / 23	2.45 / 14	4.61 / 23	4.60 / 24
Contract research	1.31/7	1.75 / 9	3.29 / 18	2.99 / 17	1.35 / 7	0.59 / 3
Other	0	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Total funding	20.12	18.52 / 100	17.41 / 100	17.47 / 100	19.56 / 100	19.04 / 100
Expenditure in M€	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %
Personnel costs	1.601 / 98	1.660 / 97	1.467 / 97	1.924 / 98	1.811 / 98	1.650 / 98
Other costs	40 / 2	41 / 3	41 / 3	38 / 2	40 / 2	39 / 2
Total expenditure	1641 / 100	1.701 / 100	1.508 / 100	1.962 / 100	1.851 / 100	1.689 / 100

Table 3.6 Funding Gender Studies

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Funding	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %
Direct funding	2.97/64	2.72 / 63	2.79 / 58	2.41 / 55	2.67 / 28	2.72 / 29
Research grants	0.75/16	1.06 / 25	1.58 / 33	1.19 / 26	2.3 / 25	1.41 / 15
Contract research	0.93/20	0.53 / 12	0.4 / 9	0.82 / 19	4.30 / 47	5.15 / 55
Other	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Total funding	4.65	4.31 / 100	4.77 / 100	4.42 / 100	9.27 / 100	9.27 / 100
Expenditure in M€	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %
Personnel costs	428 / 98	455 / 98	433 / 97	480 / 98	684 / 96	647 / 96
Other costs	10 / 2	10 / 2	11 / 3	11 / 2	28 / 4	27 / 4
Total expenditure	438 / 100	465 / 100	444 / 100	491 / 100	712 / 100	674 / 100

Table 3.7 Funding Musicology

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Funding	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %	fte / %
Direct funding	2.34/92	1.78 / 82	1.66 / 71	2.12 / 76	1.90 / 68	1.44 / 36
Research grants	0	0.23 / 10	0.68 / 29	0.68 / 24	0.32 / 11	1.58 / 40
Contract research	0.2/8	0.17 / 8	0 / 0	0 / 0	0.59 / 21	0.95 / 24
Other	0	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0
Total funding	2.54	2.18 / 100	2.34 / 100	2.80 / 100	2.82 / 100	3.98 / 100
Expenditure in M€	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %	k€ / %
Personnel costs	260 / 98	246 / 98	213 / 98	214 / 97	255 / 95	298 / 96
Other costs	5 / 2	4 / 2	5 / 2	6 / 3	7 / 5	11 / 4
Total expenditure	265 / 100	250 / 100	218 / 100	220 / 100	262 / 100	309 / 100



Table 4.1 PhD candidates (employee status)

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	3	2	5	- / 0%	2 / 40%	1 / 20%	1/20%	4 / 80%	1 / 20%	- / 0%
2009	0	0	0	- / 0%	- / 0%	- / 0%	- / 0%	- / 0%	- / 0%	- / 0%
2010	5	5	10	- / 0%	7 / 70%	2 / 20%	- / 0%	9 / 90%	1/10%	- / 0%
2011	0	2	2	- / 0%	1 / 50%	- / 0%	- / 0%	1 / 50%	- / 0%	1 / 50%
2012	2	2	4	- / 0%	4 / 100%	- / 0%	- / 0%	4 / 100%	- / 0%	- / 0%
2013	0	2	2	- / 0%	2 / 100%	- / 0%	- / 0%	2 / 100%	- / 0%	- / 0%

Table 4.2 International PhD candidates (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	0	3	3	2 / 67%	1 / 33%	- / 0%	- / 0%	3 / 100%	- / 0%	- / 0%
2009	1	1	2	1 / 50%	1 / 50%	- / 0%	- / 0%	2 / 100%	- / 0%	- / 0%
2010	2	2	4	- / 0%	2 / 50%	- / 0%	2/50%	4 / 100%	- / 0%	- / 0%
2011	0	7	7	2 / 29%	3 / 43%	- / 0%	1/14%	6 / 86%	1/14%	- / 0%
2012	2	1	3	- / 0%	1 / 33%	1/ 33%	- / 0%	2 / 66%	- / 0%	1 / 33%
2013	0	1	1	- / 0%	- / 0%	- / 0%	- / 0%	- / 0%	- / 0%	1 / 100%



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

