

**QANU Research Review
Leiden University Academy of
Creative and Performing Arts
(ACPA)**

QANU, March 2013

Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities (QANU)
Catharijnesingel 56
PO Box 8035
3503 RA Utrecht
The Netherlands

Phone: +31 (0) 30 230 3100
Telefax: +31 (0) 30 230 3129
E-mail: info@qanu.nl
Internet: www.qanu.nl

© 2013 QANU Q 353

Text and numerical material from this publication may be reproduced in print, by photocopying or by any other means with the permission of QANU if the source is mentioned.

Contents

1. The Review Committee and the review procedures	4
2. Institute level	6
Appendices	13
Appendix A: Curricula vitae of the Committee members	15
Appendix B: Explanation of the SEP scores	17
Appendix C: Programme of the site visit	19

1. The Review Committee and the review procedures

Scope of the assessment

The Review Committee was asked to perform an assessment of the research of the Leiden University Academy of Creative and Performing Arts (ACPA). This assessment covers the research in the period 2005-2011 as well as the general state of the institution today.

In accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 for Research Assessment in the Netherlands (SEP), the Committee's tasks were to assess the quality of the institute on the basis of the information provided by the institute and through interviews with the management as well as with a group of PhD candidates, and to advise how this quality might be improved.

Composition of the Committee

The composition of the Committee was as follows:

- Prof. Moritz Baßler, chair, Germanistisches Institut, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster, Germany;
- Prof. Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, Frederick Marquand Professor of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University, USA;
- Prof. Marc Laureys, Professor of Medieval Latin and Neo-Latin Philology, Universität Bonn, Germany;
- Prof. Dame Janet Ritterman, former Director of the Royal College of Music London and now Vice-President.

A profile of the Committee members is included in Appendix A.

Dr. Floor Meijer of the Bureau of QANU (Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities) was appointed secretary to the Committee.

Independence

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

Data provided to the Committee

The Committee has received detailed documentation consisting of the following parts:

1. Self-evaluation report of the unit under review, including all the information required by the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP), with appendices.
2. Copies of the key publications.

Procedures followed by the Committee

The Committee proceeded according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 (SEP). Prior to the Committee meeting, two reviewers independently formulated a preliminary assessment. The final assessment is based on the documentation provided by the institute, the key publications and the interviews with the management, and the PhD candidates. The interviews took place on 29 and 30 November 2012 (see the schedule in Appendix C) in Leiden.

Preceding the interviews, the Committee was briefed by QANU about research assessment according to SEP, and the Committee discussed the preliminary assessments. The Committee also agreed upon procedural matters and aspects of the assessment. After the interviews the

Committee discussed the scores and comments. The texts for the Committee report were finalised through email exchanges. The final version was presented to the faculty for factual corrections and comments. The comments were discussed by the Committee. The final report was printed after formal acceptance by the Board of the participating university.

The Committee used the rating system of the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 (SEP). The meaning of the scores is described in Appendix B.

2. INSTITUTE LEVEL

1. The academy

The Leiden University Academy of Creative and Performing Arts (ACPA) was founded in 2001 by Leiden University and the University of Arts The Hague. Initially it functioned as an autonomous Faculty, but in 2008 it was incorporated in the newly established Faculty of Humanities, where it now sits alongside the six institutes. It is, however, different in kind from the other three programmes reviewed in this report. ACPA offers a PhD research/training programme, not a research programme in the conventional sense of the term.

The self-evaluation report states that ACPA's main aim is to bring the arts and academic disciplines together in ways that do justice to both elements. ACPA aims to stimulate and facilitate artistic research, i.e. research that derives its insights from artistic practice in the first place. In this type of research, artistic practice itself is an essential component of both the research process and the research results. Such research is therefore generally performed by artists. The research questions characteristic of artistic research are seen as being different from those formulated in traditional European approaches to disciplines such as art history and musicology. Artistic research is founded on an expansion of the concept of (academic) knowledge and its dissemination. It draws on so-called tacit knowledge or embodied knowledge and regards knowledge of this kind as equally (if not more) relevant to discursively articulated knowledge in undertaking research into artistic practice.

ACPA has identified three main research areas:

1. Music: Composition, Performance, and Improvisation;
2. Visual Arts;
3. Reflection on Arts and Artistic Research.

ACPA's main function is to facilitate PhD research. Its PhD candidates, who identify themselves as practising artists (composers, musicians, fine artists, designers), enroll in one of two PhD trajectories: docARTES (for PhDs in the field of music) or PhDArts (for PhDs in fine arts and design). Successful completion for these candidates normally requires the production of a written thesis and related artistic work. The PhD examination itself consists of two components: (1) (an) artistic presentation(s) and (2) the public defence of the written component.

2. Quality and academic reputation

The field of artistic research is still relatively new in many parts of continental Europe. ACPA therefore operates within a small international community of similar institutes: in the Netherlands it is the only arts institute – in a legally based cooperation between an (academic) university and a university of the arts – which has appointed professors with the academic *ius promovendi*. In the Netherlands doctoral degrees such as the DMA, DFA or DMus do not exist. According to the self-evaluation report, there is a productive collaboration with partners such as the Orpheus Institute Ghent, Catholic University of Leuven/Lemmens Institute, University of Antwerp/Artesis University of the Arts, Lund University, Malmö Academy of Music, University of Gothenburg, University of Nottingham, University of Reading, University of Southern California, Gerrit Rietveld Academy and the Early Music Festival Utrecht.

According to the self-evaluation report, staff members contributing to the Academy of Creative and Performing Arts are leading in their respective fields. Some are regularly invited to represent artistic research as practised at Leiden University in academic, artistic, governmental, educational

and institutional circles, and to the media. ACPA Director Prof. Frans de Ruiter is President of the International Music Council (IMC, associated partner of UNESCO) and of the European House for Culture in Brussels. Prof. Ton Koopman is an internationally respected musician with wide professional contacts, while Prof. Gerard Unger is a Visiting Professor at the University of Reading. The internationally recognised composer, Prof. Louis Andriessen, has been extraordinary Professor Art and Culture at Radboud University Nijmegen. Prof. Joep Bor and Dr. Marcel Cobussen are board members of international journals and organisations. ACPA contributes to two online, Open Access peer-reviewed journals that have recently been launched: the *Journal for Artistic Research*, for which Henk Borgdorff is a member of the editorial board, and the *Journal of Sonic Studies*, for which Marcel Cobussen is now editor-in-chief.

While acknowledging that ACPA's PhD candidates already have established professional profiles when embarking on their doctoral studies, the self-evaluation report points to the variety and quality of the completed PhD trajectories. Former PhD candidate Henk Borgdorff, who has established a reputation for his work on the principles of artistic research, was appointed professor at the University of Gothenburg in 2011.

Assessment/remarks

In the relatively few years since it was established, ACPA has been successful in creating a distinctive profile for itself in terms of the two doctoral research programmes within Music and the Visual Arts that it is offering. It is clear that the Leiden University and the Faculty of Humanities have a success story on their hands. The achievements within a short period of time have been very considerable. Of the two programmes, the Music DocARTES programme (which started in January 2004) appears to be the more strongly established, as judged by the number of PhD candidates who have enrolled, the collaborations that it has secured both nationally and internationally, and the systems in place for the provision of training and supervision. The PhDArts programme began only in mid 2008.

In the case of ACPA, it is in terms of the doctoral programmes that this evaluation is being principally conducted. The sample of dissertations that the Committee studied was uniformly of excellent quality and the student representatives from the programmes whom the panel met, were able to articulate the focus and progress of their individual research projects in convincing ways.

An overview of the output of the staff associated with the two doctoral programmes was produced for this review – research which supported the declared emphasis of the two programmes (on artistic research) – but this was taken as background confirmation of the quality of the programme and contributory to its reputation, rather than being assessed in its own right, in terms of quality. The CVs of staff members provided copious instances of wide-ranging professional activity connected with the arts which reflected their commitment to artistic research, although relatively little was included in the CVs to show where key members of staff have given international presentations in which artistic research as practised at Leiden University was the explicit focus.

There is, as yet, no evidence that those members of staff whose main professional commitment is to ACPA have been successful in obtaining competitively awarded grants for research projects from any of the major funding bodies in the Netherlands or further afield, although (as indicated below) Cobussen gained a grant for the establishment of each of the two online journals mentioned above. The aim expressed by the Director – to establish in due course one or more associated research programmes/research groups – may rely on further efforts in this direction. The 'special relationship' that has already begun to develop with areas and with particular colleagues within LUCAS (Leiden University Centre of the Arts in Society) is likely to be of

benefit in strengthening ACPA's work, and in enabling the ACPA PhD candidates to identify themselves as part of the University's doctoral community.

3. Resources

The organisational differences between ACPA and the other entities (institutes) within the Faculty of Humanities are also reflected in its budgetary arrangements: ACPA receives no lump-sum basic financing from the central budget of Leiden University. Its underlying structure is therefore vulnerable. At present, ACPA relies heavily on financing from the University of the Arts The Hague (€ 100.000 yearly + prefinancing). According to the self-evaluation report, it has been difficult to obtain funding for research projects from Dutch funding bodies, since in the Netherlands artistic research is still relatively unknown. Two NWO grant applications (VIDI), both submitted by Cobussen, did not receive awards (although they were characterised as 'subsidisable'). However, small grants to assist in the establishment of the two journals mentioned under 2. ('Quality and academic reputation') above, were received from NWO and RAAK.

During the period under review, ACPA obtained grants from NWO and Stichting De Zaaier to fund two individual PhD candidates.

Assessment/remarks

ACPA's success has been achieved on the basis of very meagre staffing. Apart from one member of full-time staff (Cobussen - directly employed by Leiden University), the other members of staff are funded by (employed by) The Hague. This includes the Director (de Ruiter - 0.6 fte), the Co-Director of PhDArts (Wesseling - 0.8 fte, of which 0.4 is allocated to PhDArts), four colleagues contributing to DocARTES (together 0.8) and two colleagues for PhDArts (one retired, one 0.2). While this spread provides welcome breadth and access to distinctive expertise, the load that it places on the few colleagues whose major commitment is to ACPA appears to be beyond what is reasonably sustainable in the longer term. The Committee was reassured to learn that plans are in hand to make further professorial appointments within the next two years. It was evident to the Committee that developments of this kind were now necessary in order to ensure a more manageable distribution of responsibilities, and to provide the resources necessary to secure the continuation and consolidation of this promising development.

4. Productivity

Annually, between 12 and 15 candidates have been admitted to the ACPA PhD trajectories. ACPA now has a total of 70 PhD candidates. Between 2006 and 2011 53 PhD candidates enrolled at ACPA: of these, one was a PhD candidate with employee status, the others were self-funded candidates. In total, there were 7 PhD completions in the period under review.

During the period under review, ACPA published a total of 11 articles, 5 books, 11 book chapters and 8 PhD theses. By far the highest category of staff output is the category 'CDs/compositions'. This had a total output of 183 - an average of 30 items per year. (The majority of these, however, were produced by part-time staff, and not necessarily as part of their ACPA commitment.) There were also 8 professional publications, and 8 publications aimed at the general public. In almost all categories, the higher numbers were in the last two years.

Assessment/remarks

The comments under this heading similarly refer both to the productivity of PhD candidates enrolled on the two doctoral programmes and to staff.

The strategy for productivity as it relates to doctoral output could be regarded as the systems and structures in place to ensure that PhD candidates make good progress and complete successfully in a timely manner. It was made clear to the Committee that various well-tested approaches are being successfully employed by the Director and his colleagues to ensure that PhD candidates are encouraged to bring their work to successful completion. Signs of these can be discerned in the Student Handbooks which were included in the self-evaluation report. While placing a heavy burden on the shoulders of the ACPA Director, these arrangements would appear to be bearing fruit, judging by the number of PhD candidates currently enrolled and the apparent reduction in drop-out rate. The Committee endorsed the view expressed in the self-evaluation report that since all PhD candidates are pursuing active artistic careers as well as research ambitions, a six-year PhD trajectory (rather than the conventional four years) is a more appropriate expectation.

Because ACPA has been in existence only for a few years, it will be only in the coming years that a balanced assessment of productivity in terms of doctoral completions can be evaluated. The estimates of doctoral completions during 2012/13 – significantly higher than in the previous years – give a positive impression of productivity, as does the success record to date. The nature of these doctorates, which incorporate elements of the PhD candidates' own artistic practices, means that productivity is also demonstrated through public performance and exhibitions during the course of their studies. In this respect, the output from the PhD candidates on these two doctoral programmes has been impressive.

It is difficult to determine on what basis members of staff involved with ACPA should be included in any observations about the research productivity of staff. At the moment, there is only one member of staff directly employed (and funded) by ACPA, whose research output could therefore be regarded as being produced as part of this employment (see above, under 3. Resources). It is clear, however, that in view of the workload involved in the management and leadership of the programmes, and the supervision load that is currently borne by a very few people (above the levels that would internationally be regarded as compatible with quality), the examples of research productivity that were made available to the Committee demonstrate striking evidence of commitment to the definition and the promotion of the field.

Given the early stage of its evolution, it is not surprising that as yet ACPA cannot provide evidence of the type of recognition as a research centre that is signalled by success in gaining competitive research grants and awards or in invitations to contribute as partner in European or international research projects. Developments of this kind can be expected in the coming years, as both the research approach being promoted by ACPA and the quality of the work being produced under its auspices become better known and accepted both within and beyond the Netherlands.

5. Societal relevance

The self-evaluation report emphasises that research in and through artistic practice can have a direct relevance for artists and the art world. Results of artistic research - in the form of artistic presentations, such as exhibitions, concerts and performances; publications, such as CDs, DVDs, articles, websites, books and journals; debates, conferences, seminars - have the potential directly to influence artistic practices and the production of art, as well as informing the ways in which art is disseminated, perceived and evaluated.

Professional artists are not the only target audience of ACPA's research. Educational institutions such as universities, and academics, the media, government, and NGOs, but also and institutions

such as museums, galleries, performance venues, orchestras or ensembles can all gain from the results of artistic research. According to the self-evaluation report, information about ACPA research is now being disseminated to thousands of people – professionals, peers and the public at large. This is achieved partly through regular email circulation. The two online journals with which ACPA is particularly involved, the *Journal of Artistic Research* and the *Journal of Sonic Studies*, both of which, while of particular interest to professional artists, also address a readership that is not solely academic, and thus play a role in making better known the existence of ACPA and its work.

Assessment/remarks

The self-evaluation report rightly identifies the wide range of areas of life where research produced through ACPA – by staff and by PhD candidates – can have societal relevance and societal impact. The examples of research output made available to the Committee provided evidence of ways in which – through the multiple forms of dissemination employed – ACPA research is beginning to have an impact on artistic perception and reception, in particular within the Netherlands. In support of the claim that the results of artistic research can directly influence artistic performance practices and the production of other art works, as well as the ways art is disseminated, perceived, and evaluated, instances of performances, such as exhibitions, installations, conferences and publications of various kinds were cited by members of the ACPA team, although claims of influence were less specifically substantiated. Beyond this, however, there was ample evidence that in terms of human capital, through the insights gained by these PhD candidates in the course of their studies, ACPA alumni were enriching and informing the societies in which they were now professionally active. While some of these examples could be regarded as evidence of valorisation in an economic sense, others are stronger in the evidence they provide of increased cultural value.

In the ACPA future strategy, the ideas identified for new research specialisations include areas which will help in making ever more visible the societal relevance of ACPA's research, as will the increasing trend towards interdisciplinarity.

6. Strategy for the future

The self-evaluation report indicates that ACPA has identified a number of clear intentions for the future. While maintaining its commitment to the current research areas (Music: Composition, Performance, and Improvisation; Fine Arts and Design), the Academy's strategic agenda focuses both on further exploration of the potential afforded by artistic research and on the identification of new research specialisations, some of which are seen as lying 'at the intersections of arts, science and humanities'. At the same time ACPA recognises the necessity of reshaping its staffing structure, reorganising the supervision arrangements (at the moment a large number of the supervisors are external), strengthening the administrative facilities (including PR and Marketing), increasing international cooperation and investing in the development of artistic research within programmes at BA and MA level at several institutions for arts education in the Netherlands.

Assessment/remarks

These elements of the strategy for the future are well-conceived and focus on those areas most necessary for a successful long-term future for ACPA within Leiden University. However all of these ambitions come at a price, and both financially and in terms of its staffing arrangements, ACPA's current situation seems somewhat problematic. The overriding challenge at the moment is to ensure stability and to secure a steady and predictable income.

The self-evaluation report makes no bones of the fact that at the moment ACPA is vulnerable. Stable structural arrangements between the legal stakeholders of ACPA seem not yet to be fully in place. Because of the basis on which it was established, ACPA receives no lump-sum financing from the central budget of Leiden University. Instead it is strongly dependent on the moneys received from successful doctoral completions. Other Dutch sources of funding which support research are not readily accessible, partly because artistic research is still an unfamiliar concept in the Netherlands. This situation colours views not only within the Faculty of Humanities of Leiden University, but also at NWO (the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research). The aspect of ACPA's future strategy which refers to the plan to support the development of artistic research within BA and MA programmes at arts institutions in the Netherlands may be ambitious given current staffing levels, but is the type of activity that is likely to bear fruit in the longer term.

Without effective, visible commitment the future of ACPA will remain uncertain – and this, for the University as much as for the partner institutions in The Netherlands and in Belgium – would be a serious disadvantage, when work of similar kind is expanding under more favourable conditions elsewhere in Europe.

7. PhD training and supervision

As indicated earlier, ACPA offers PhD trajectories in music (docARTES) and in the fine arts and design (PhDArts). DocARTES describes itself as an international inter-university doctoral programme – international, because of the PhD candidates and staff involved; inter-university, because of the partner institutions with whom it has relationships, some of whom contribute to the PhD curricula and/or to doctoral supervision. The DocARTES curriculum consists of six modules. Three of these contextualise artistic research (Key Concepts for Artistic Research; Contours of Artistic Knowledge; Colloquium), three more (Tools & Techniques; Collegium; Laboratorium) are intended to help junior researchers gain the skills needed to embark on artistic research projects. In this provision, ORCiM (the Orpheus Research Centre in Music) in Ghent – through its close collaboration with relevant partners – plays a key role. The PhDArts trajectory, likewise, consists of both an individual research component and a doctoral study programme covering two semesters. The first semester of the curriculum offers courses on aesthetics and philosophy of science, as well as a course covering communication skills. In the second semester meetings take place in the form of workshops or colloquia.

Assessment/remarks

One of the greatest challenges in the doctoral trajectories, according to the self-evaluation report, is the composition and functioning of the supervising teams, a view which the Committee endorsed on the evidence presented. As yet, ACPA has only a small number of professors with the *ius promovendi* and experience/proficiency in PhD supervision. Most of the PhD candidates are channelled by/through them, assisted by a very large number of specialists in a diverse range of areas, both artists and academics from The Netherlands and abroad. It is the task of ACPA's Director to ensure the suitability of all external supervisors (in particular, in terms of their understanding of what artistic research involves), to coordinate all teams, check their functioning, and obtain regular updates on the progress of both candidates and their respective teams, while also acting as supervisor for a large number of individual PhD candidates. The self-evaluation report acknowledges that the workload of the Director, which is a consequence of the shortage of professors with the *ius promovendi* suitable to supervise these doctoral studies, could be considered as a potential weakness in respect of the robustness of the Academy – not because of the quality of the contribution of the Director (which is outstanding) but because of the load (and the reliance) that this places on one individual.

Arrangements for both doctoral programmes are well documented in the Student handbooks and are supported in the case of the DocARTES by the use of a study contract, a development which is planned for PhDArts.

At the request of the Faculty of Humanities and ACPA itself, the Committee has awarded numerical evaluations to the four criteria mentioned by the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP). However it is important to note that these numerical evaluations should not be compared with those awarded to the other three programmes in this report. While the titles of the four categories are the same, the criteria applied in arriving at these judgements are necessarily different. Since ACPA is not a research programme, and this evaluation has focused primarily on the PhD training programme, it is to the latter that the four categories refer. The fourth category, that of ‘viability’, reflects only the uncertainties in the current resource arrangements.

	Quality	Productivity	Relevance	Viability
ACPA	4	4	4	3

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Curricula Vitae of the Committee members

Moritz Baßler is Professor of Neuere deutsche Literatur und Texttheorie at the German Department at the University of Münster. He wrote his dissertation on expressionist prose (*Die Entdeckung der Textur*, Tübingen 1994), introduced the New Historicism to Germany (ed. *New Historicism*, Frankfurt 1995), published a study on contemporary pop literature (*Der deutsche Pop-Roman*, München 2002) and a habilitation on context theory (*Die kulturpoetische Funktion und das Archiv*, Tübingen 2005). His ongoing research includes the academic study of popular culture, including pop music (co-founder of journal *POP-Kultur und Kritik*, 2012), and the semiotics of realism.

Marc Laureys is Professor of Medieval Latin and Neo-Latin Philology at the University of Bonn and founding Director of the Centre for the Classical Tradition at Bonn. His areas of scholarly interest include historiography and antiquarianism from the Late Middle Ages to the Early Baroque period, Renaissance humanism, particularly in Italy and the Low Countries, and humanistic polemical literature in the Renaissance. His latest book-length publication is a volume of proceedings, co-edited with Roswitha Simons, on *Die Kunst des Streitens. Inszenierung, Formen und Funktionen öffentlichen Streits in historischer Perspektive* (2010). Current projects include an edition and commentary (sponsored by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) of Flavio Biondo's *Roma instaurata*.

Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann is Frederick Marquand Professor of Art and Archaeology at Princeton University, where he teaches courses on art and architecture of the sixteenth to the eighteenth century in Europe and its relations with other parts of the world. His teaching and publications encompass the historiography of art, old master drawings, Central European Art, the geography of art, global exchange in art, the possibilities of world art history, and art, science, and magic. His most recently published book is *Arcimboldo: Visual Jokes, Natural History, and Still-Life Painting*, Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press, 2009 (publication date; released 2010). He is now at work on a general world history of art.

Dame Janet Ritterman Former Director of the Royal College of Music London and now Vice-President, Dame Janet Ritterman is an Associate Fellow of the Institute of Musical Research of the University of London., a Board member of the School of Advanced Studies of the University and also of the Advisory Board of the Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities of the University of Edinburgh. She is Vice-Chair of the Board of Governors of Middlesex University and Chair of its Audit Committee and also serves as a member of the Board of Directors of the Royal Welsh College of Music & Drama and as a Board Member of Falmouth University. A founder member of the Austrian Wissenschaftsrat which advises the Austrian Government on higher education reform, she chairs the International Advisory Board for the PEEK Programme (Program zur Entwicklung und Erschließung der Künste) for the Austrian FWF (Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung). She has been a Board member of the UK Arts & Humanities Research Council (AHRC) and was Chair of the Federation of British Conservatoires.

Appendix B: Explanation of the SEP scores

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

Quality is to be seen as a measure of excellence and excitement. It refers to the eminence of a group's research activities, its abilities to perform at the highest level and its achievements in the international scientific community. It rests on the proficiency and rigour of research concepts and conduct; it shows in the success of the group at the forefront of scientific development.

Productivity refers to the total output of the group; that is, the variegated ways in which results of research and knowledge development are publicised. The output needs to be reviewed in relation to the input in terms of human resources.

Societal relevance covers the social, economic and cultural relevance of the research. Aspects are:

- societal quality of the work. Efforts to interact in a productive way with stakeholders in society who are interested in input from scientific research, and contributions to important issues and debates in society.
- societal impact of the work. Research affects specific stakeholders or procedures in society.
- valorisation of the work. Activities aimed at making research results available and suitable for application in products, processes and services. This includes interaction with public and private organisations, as well as commercial or non-profit use of research results and expertise.

Vitality and feasibility. This dual criterion regards the institute's ability to react adequately to important changes in the environment. It refers to both internal (personnel, research themes) and external (developments in the field, in society) dynamics of the group. On the one hand, this criterion measures the flexibility of a group, which appears in its ability to close research lines that have no future and to initiate new venture projects. On the other hand, it measures the capacity of the management to run projects in a professional way. Policy decisions and project management are assessed, including cost-benefit analysis.

Appendix C: Programme of the site visit

Day 1	29 November, Lipsius Building, Cleveringaplaats 1, room 148
09:00-10:00	Introduction of SEP / assessment procedures
10:00-11:00	Committee meeting: discussion of preliminary findings based on self-evaluation reports, key publications
11:00-12:00	Institute management LUCAS (short presentation, interview, reflection) (Zijlmans, Korsten and Korevaart)
12:00-13:00	Lunch
13:00-13.30	Meeting with the Dean
13:30-14.30	Institute management ACPA (De Ruiter, Cobussen, Wesseling)
14:30-15:30	Programme 1: <i>Classics and Classical Civilisation Studies</i> (for each programme 10 minutes presentation, 30 minutes interview, 15 minutes reflection in the Committee, 5 minutes reserve/break) (Sluiter and Wessels)
15:30-16:30	Programme 2: <i>Medieval and Early Modern Studies</i> (Van Eck and Van Anrooij)
16:30-17:30	Programme 3: <i>Modern and Contemporary Studies</i> (Visser and Zijlmans)
17.30-18:15	Meeting with PhD candidates LUCAS (Bartels, Bodde, Van Duijn, Von Courten, Polak, Stelling and Vugts)
18:15-19:15	Meeting with PhD cas ACPA (PhDArts: Ernst, Noorda; DocARTES: Berentsen, Parra Cancino, Huebner)
Day 2	30 November, Lipsius Building, Cleveringaplaats 1, room 148
09:00-11:00	Committee meeting: conclusions, scores, problems, procedures
11:00-11:45	Second meeting with Institute management LUCAS (Zijlmans, Korsten and Korevaart)
11:45-12:15	Second meeting with Institute management ACPA (De Ruiter, Cobussen, Wesseling)
12:15-13:00	Lunch
13:00-16:00	Further conclusions and tasks; writing session