

QANU Research Review
Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society
(LUCAS)

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
3. Programme level	12
Classics and Classical Civilisation Studies	13
Medieval and Early Modern Studies	16
Modern and Contemporary Studies	19
Appendices	21
Appendix A: Curricula vitae of the Committee members	23
Appendix B: Explanation of the SEP scores	25
Appendix C: Programme of the site visit	27

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 Centre for the Arts in Society (LUCAS). 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 and the research programmes on the basis of the information provided by the institute and through interviews with the management and the research leaders 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 institute 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 reports of the units under review, including all the information required by the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP), with appendices.
2. Copies of the key publications per research programme.

Procedures followed by the Committee

The Committee proceeded according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 (SEP). Prior to the Committee meeting, each programme was assigned to two reviewers, who independently formulated a preliminary assessment. The final assessments are based on the documentation provided by the institute, the key publications and the interviews with the management, the leaders of the programmes, 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 institute

The Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society (LUCAS) is the successor to the former Pallas research institute for art-historical and literary studies, which in 2008 was incorporated in the Faculty of Humanities as the Leiden University Institute for Cultural Disciplines (LUICD). The most recent name change to LUCAS (September 2012) was motivated by a desire to adjust to the context of a globalising world and the increasing impact of the digital and new social media, as well as by the aspiration to reflect the institute's common interest in how the arts function and play a role within society.

The aim of LUCAS is to study, in a wide array of diachronic, cross-disciplinary and cross-cultural methods, the ways in which the arts act on and shape the societies in which they are created, preserved and disseminated. According to the self-evaluation report, LUCAS aims to establish an interdisciplinary scholarly community that fosters a deep understanding of the power and dynamics of art and cultural objects in the past and present, in all their media and generic forms. It both practises established forms of research and develops new forms of intermedial, cultural and intercultural analysis, combining disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches.

The research undertaken by LUCAS is conceived in terms of three axes, which the self-evaluation report refers to as 'period', 'thematic' and 'theory'. The temporal axis corresponds to the different research programmes of the institute: (1) Classical Antiquity, (2) the Middle Ages/Early Modern Period, and (3) the Modern/Contemporary Period. The second, thematic axis cuts through these time frames and focuses on three research themes: (1) interculturality/cultural transformation, (2) intermediality, and (3) rhetoric and agency. This research axis has given rise to a number of interdisciplinary research clusters that transcend period borders. The self-evaluation report states that, although much of the research currently produced by institute staff still shows a dominance of the temporal axis, the aim for the coming period is to stimulate more flow between the historical periods by gradually highlighting the thematic axis. The 'theory' axis offers a set of theoretical instruments developed to study the design and impact of art/artefacts in a combination of well-tested approaches (philology, iconography, cultural history, rhetoric) and contemporary theory (gender/queer, post-colonialism, cultural analysis, intertextuality, memory theory, life sciences-related, ecocriticism, performativity).

2. Quality and academic reputation

The self-evaluation report states that LUCAS is 'embedded in a high-quality research field with a strong infrastructure and high level of ambition'. Internationally, it fosters exchanges and collaborations with renowned universities, research institutes and research-focused museums and art institutions. The institute includes three chairs for visiting professors (Chair Brazilian Studies; Chair for Middle-European Studies; Scaliger Chair).

The three individual LUCAS programmes have successfully applied for research grants. The most prestigious current projects are the Marie Curie Programme 'Mobility of Ideas and Transmission of Texts in the Low Countries 1300-1550' (Warnar), and 'Art, Agency and Living Presence in Early Modern Italy' (NWO/VICI Van Eck). According to the self-evaluation report, the institute has been relatively successful in acquiring funded PhD positions, an outcome that testifies to its reputation with funding agencies. Likewise, the increased number of self-funded PhD researchers

who affiliate themselves to the institute is said to underline the attractiveness of LUCAS as an academic centre for the study of art, literature and media.

According to the self-evaluation report, LUCAS has a solid track record in terms of the quality of its publications. Books are published by national and international peer-reviewing publishers, and articles are successfully submitted to peer-reviewed A-1 journals. Staff members present their research at international conferences and hold editorships of journals that are important to their field. A number of LUCAS' staff members have recently received prestigious awards and prizes, such as the Spinoza Prize that was awarded to Prof. Sluiter in 2010.

Assessment/remarks

LUCAS is certainly the most diverse institute within the framework of the Humanities at Leiden University. The process of merging the disciplinary units of very different character, from philology to art history, from classics to modern, from historical to analytical, into one institute with three programmes based on historical periods, is still ongoing. While the overall quality of the output is good to excellent in all three programmes, the restructuring process that resulted in LUCAS does affect them in different ways as far as the quality of future research is concerned. Within the Classics programme the disciplinary character remains more or less intact, but the other two programmes face the challenge of finding more effective ways for interdisciplinary cooperation, because their disciplinary units have become extremely small. LUCAS may well turn out to be a good breeding ground for interdisciplinary collaboration, but the proof has still to be produced. This process is well on the way, although the quality of publications today still results principally from the capacity of the individual researchers.

3. Resources

For the period 2006-2011, LUCAS shows a slight decline in research staff, from 82.4 to 80.6 fte (fulltime equivalent). The institute's staffing reflects Leiden University's ambition to increase the proportion of non-tenured staff in order to have greater flexibility: the number of non-tenured staff has increased from 11,9 fte in 2006 to 13,9 fte in 2011. In the past six years the number of contract PhDs has also increased slightly (18.6 to 19.7 fte). Currently there are 22 contract PhD researchers, most of them are part of externally funded research projects. The number of self-funded PhD researchers has doubled (now 133), a trend that reflects the shortage of funds for contract PhDs.

In 2011, 70% of LUCAS' funding was directly provided by Leiden University. This indicates a small decrease compared to earlier years (average 73%), which is compensated by an increase in external funding (30% in 2011) through research grants from competitive funds, national and international (NWO, EU). In a general sense, LUCAS does not fulfill its full potential in gaining grants. According to the SWOT analysis carried out by the institute, its researchers lag somewhat behind in applying for funding from European funds, which tend to be for cross-disciplinary, broadly-defined research programmes. The institute recognises that it needs to be more proactive in deciding which applications deserve priority. To support the research applications of staff members to NWO, the ERC, EU and other external funds, regular research meetings are held during which applicants present their research proposals and obtain feedback from their colleagues.

Assessment/remarks

Obviously, the need for cost reduction has been a major formative aspect in the recent restructuring operations that formed LUCAS. While processes to increase the chances of larger external funding have been initiated by the institute, it will take some time for them to bear fruit.

The Committee gained the impression that cooperation and communication between faculty and institutes setting out its/their research strategies and policies in terms of priorities, profile, and the related issue of staffing could still be improved.

Within the financing system of the university, it would be helpful and stimulating if the institute and programmes were allowed to keep more than just a third of the sum granted for a completed PhD-thesis.

4. Productivity

The research output over the past six years totals 2,604 items. Per year, LUCAS staff members have published between 85 and 145 refereed articles, between 52 and 94 book chapters, and between 10 and 21 books. There were also between 77 and 151 professional publications, and between 40 and 61 publications aimed at the general public. The average production per fte remained roughly the same over the review period (5,0 publications in 2006 against 4,95 in 2011).

In the period 2006-2011, 72 LUCAS PhD candidates successfully defended their theses, an average of 12 per year. Of the total number of PhDs, 45 (63%) were self-funded and 27 (37%) were contract PhDs. 15% of the PhDs were awarded a *cum laude*. The self-evaluation report indicated that a point of concern is the small number of PhD researchers who finish their dissertations in time (i.e. submit the final manuscript in four years, in the case of those candidates who hold full-time appointments). Generally, less than 25% of the contract PhDs graduated within four years. For external PhDs no numbers were provided, but their graduation rate after four years is likely to be lower.

Assessment/remarks

The overall productivity of LUCAS in terms of publications and extra-academic output is impressive. One problem that was repeatedly noted by members of the institute as a whole, though, is the strong and still growing pressure on research time. While demands to produce scholarship remain high, time to carry out research and writing has been reduced. Teaching and administrative demands have increased across the board. The system of accountability produces a heavy load of archiving, documentation, examining, and paperwork in general that affects all members of staff. Every chance to simplify these tasks should be taken. In addition, while teaching, and the number of students taught, remains paramount in the system by which positions are funded, no reward, either financial, or in terms of time, or promotion, is correlated with scholarship by the university. In effect, part of the system might even be said to discourage scholarly productivity. Of course, neither the institute nor the programmes can be held responsible for any of this.

5. Societal relevance

The self-evaluation report states that scholars from LUCAS regularly contribute to the public domain, where they communicate their ideas regarding cultural issues and debates. Examples of such involvement include contributions to the national debate on the multicultural society (Hoving, Minnaard), the status of religion in modern society (Goedegebuure), the role and function of education in society (Visser, Sluiter), politics and identity (Visser), and the role of the arts with regard to technology (Zwijenberg).

All LUCAS staff members have connections, collaborations and exchanges with museums and art and cultural institutions in the Netherlands and abroad. In the period 2006-2011, they served on Committees of national institutes in the socio-cultural domain, such as the Dutch Foundation

for Literature (Korsten), the Wertheimer Foundation (Zijlmans), the Rijksakademie Amsterdam (Van Alphen), the Fonds voor de Letteren and the Martinus Nijhoff Prijs (Houppermans, Schulte Nordholt). Staff participate in networks and juries. Many hold positions on the boards of foundations, funds, museums and other advisory or supervisory boards.

Some staff members have been involved in policy making, by holding positions on national and regional Councils of Culture and/or have contributed to evaluation programmes of national institutes such as the National Council of Culture (Korsten, Westgeest, Zijlmans). During the period under review, Prof. Sluiter accepted the appointment by the Ministry of Education to chair the 'Verkenningcommissie Klassieke Talen', and to develop a plan for revitalising the national curriculum of Greek and Latin in secondary schools.

Staff members also translate their scholarly findings into publications for the general public. Lectures given by some staff members (Sluiter, Visser, Zijlmans) which have been published as audio CDs in the Home Academy Series provide examples of public outreach. However the SWOT analysis in the self-evaluation report suggested that across the institute as a whole, efforts in this field could be enhanced.

Assessment/remarks

The work of LUCAS staff is of high impact on the national public. In various ways it reaches out to cultural stakeholders, e.g. museums, high-schools, and non-academic organisations and publications, and contributes to public discourse. The Committee recommends that care should be taken not to weaken the core competences in early modern Dutch art, which are of strong impact on heritage, tourism, and museums. Public visibility, e.g. the structure and quality of the internet presentation of LUCAS and its programmes, could certainly be improved. LUCAS in general, though, seems to be well aware of the need for impact and visibility. The Committee noted the idea of LUCAS Apps and could see potential in this.

6. Strategy for the future

The self-evaluation report situates LUCAS in the initial phase of a development towards becoming a truly multidisciplinary institute with interdisciplinary approaches, a development that first began with its inclusion in the Humanities Faculty in 2008. The current management team considers it to be one of its major challenges to work towards greater unity, to make the individual members feel part of the institute, and to create the circumstances under which bottom-up research groups can develop. It believes that it is essential for future funding applications that the institute becomes more integrated in terms of content and of organisational culture.

LUCAS' research agenda reflects the research profiles recently established by Leiden University as whole: 1. Fundamentals of Science; 2. Health, Life and Bioscience; 3. Health Across the Human Life Cycle; 4. Law, Democracy and Governance: Legitimacy in a Multilevel Setting; 5. The Asian Challenge; 6. Global Interactions of Civilizations and Languages. Of these, the most relevant for LUCAS are 6, 4, 5, 1, and 2 respectively. These themes determine LUCAS' main research ambitions for the coming review period.

In a wider sense, the organisational strategy for the future can be narrowed down to three ambitions. First, the institute intends to create space for and to experiment with entrepreneurship. Secondly, it strives to expand collaboration with institutions in the cultural field, for example by looking into the possibilities for public-private collaboration. Finally, LUCAS aims to improve its identity and profile within the Faculty of Humanities, the University,

the cultural sector and society at large. In terms of all three ambitions, the institute sees potential for greater engagement with new (social) media, including innovations such as the ‘app’, which can be used to present LUCAS’ expertise on art, literature, architecture, books/manuscripts (including digital editions), museum collections and transcultural exchanges to the world at large and make the institute itself more visible.

According to the self-evaluation report, LUCAS’ age statistics show that over 60% of staff are aged 45 or over, the majority of these in the 55+ group. This applies particularly to tenured staff of the ME/Early Modern and Modern/Contemporary programmes. This is seen partly as a threat (since in a few years a large number of vacancies will occur at the same time) and partly as an opportunity (since vacancies would offer the possibility of appointing young scholars and developing a profile more in keeping with emerging research priorities).

Assessment/remarks

The main task that LUCAS is facing today seems to be that of reconciling its traditions of ‘disciplinary’ research (i.e. traditions of research within a single discipline) and the newer challenges of interdisciplinary research. While LUCAS staff had previously not identified with the Leiden University key research areas, they have definitely begun to adapt to the general guidelines and to accept the need to seek national and international research funding. The institute management convincingly conveyed that they have started this process wholeheartedly. Even though questions remain (e.g.: How much disciplinarity can or should be sacrificed? Some examples show that specific and well-defined areas of research can reach across institutional borderlines, but how many such cases are there?), the Committee expresses the hope that the LUCAS management team can be given time, without further upheaval, to carry through the changes that have flowed from the earlier restructuring.

7. PhD training and supervision

The self-evaluation report states that all arrangements concerning the supervision and educational programme of PhD candidates are laid down in a training and supervision plan, which contains agreements on regular meetings, feedback, teaching (in years 2 and 3 only), didactic education, attending and if applicable organising symposia, meetings with fellow PhD researchers, giving papers, publications, and the yearly meeting with the Director of the institute.

Typically, the training programme of contract PhD candidates includes participation in:

- The LUCAS PhD seminar (4 meetings a year), possibly including a presentation at one of the meetings.
- A course or masterclass organised by the national research school of which the PhD researcher is member.
- A LUCAS theory seminar or course.
- A skills training offered by the Humanities Faculty or by the University (e.g. Effective Communication, Project Planning for PhD researchers, Didactic Skills for PhDs with Teaching Responsibilities).
- A two-yearly Graduate Conference organized by and for PhD researchers (including several educational aspects such as chairing, lecturing, editing, publishing).

External PhD candidates have access to programme courses, facilities and supervision, but not to meetings intended for university employees. The institute currently considers establishing an education and supervision programme for which self-funded PhD researchers pay a fee, receiving in return a clearer and more recognised place in the institute’s Graduate School and a set programme of courses, supervision, facilities and other support.

The progress of PhD candidates is monitored by an annual evaluation of the training and supervision plan, and a yearly meeting with the Director of the institute.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee assesses the PhD training at LUCAS in collaboration with the National Research Schools as successful and productive, especially in the case of the employed candidates. The candidates feel comfortable within this system. The fact that most of the dissertations take longer than four years to finish is in part due to the teaching possibilities and 'grace time' policy of LUCAS and not seen as a major problem by the Committee. The Committee welcomes the interdisciplinary tendencies that are increasingly evident in the supervision structure of the PhD programme.

PROGRAMME LEVEL

The Committee assessed the following programmes of the Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society:

	Quality	Productivity	Relevance	Viability
Classics and Classical Civilisation Studies	5	4	5	4.5
Medieval and Early Modern Studies	4	4	3.5	3
Modern and Contemporary Studies	3.5	4	4.5	4

The detailed assessment per programme follows in the next section of this report.

Programme LUCAS 1: Classics and Classical Civilisation Studies

Section:

Programme director: Prof. dr. I. Sluiter, Prof. dr. A.B. Wessels

Research input 2011 (tenured) : fte 4,9 tenured, 11,9 total fte

Assessments: Quality: 5
Productivity: 4
Relevance: 5
Viability: 4.5

Brief description

The research of the programme in Classics and Classical Civilisation Studies covers a broad range of topics in the study of classical antiquity and its continued relevance for our contemporary society. The primary research question comprises the analysis and interpretation of the formation processes and the transmission of the culture of the Graeco-Roman Period. Approaches range from the strictly philological to the literary and cultural-historical, with an emphasis on the study of the relationship between cultural products and their social context. Of the three LUCAS programmes, the Classics cluster forms the tightest, most integrated unit. Its research is strongly embedded in OIKOS, the national research school for classical studies.

Quality

It cannot be doubted that the research, produced by staff members of LUCAS in the Classics programme, is, generally speaking, of an outstanding level internationally and confirms the strong reputation that scholars in the field of Classics at Leiden have enjoyed practically ever since the foundation of the university. The key publications listed in the self-evaluation report convincingly illustrate the scientific excellence of the research produced. The scholarship pursued in the Classics programme strikes a very good balance between disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity and covers a spectrum going from strictly philological work to projects, which adopt innovative methodical approaches drawn from various disciplines. The very effective coherence of the Classics programme, particularly in comparison to the other two programmes of LUCAS, may at least partly be determined by the fact that this programme draws on the concept of *Altertumswissenschaft*, which automatically implies a combination of disciplinary and interdisciplinary methodologies. Whereas the Committee recognises the significance of the 'integrated' approach to Classical studies, as it is advocated in Leiden and described in the Report, it nonetheless has some difficulty in recognising a specifically Dutch c.q. Leiden version of *Altertumswissenschaft*. Far more relevant than such national categorisations seems to the Committee the central position of the Classics programme at Leiden in the national Research School for Classics, OIKOS, which offers a whole range of stimulating perspectives and incentives for staff and PhD candidates alike.

Productivity

Staff members of LUCAS who teach in the Classics programme have produced a substantial amount of publications and have earned numerous awards and grants for research projects in various categories of funding. While a distinct productivity strategy fails to emerge from the self-evaluation report, the productivity of these staff members should not be questioned. This productivity is, admittedly, particularly obvious on the Greek side of the programme, more so than on the Latin side. Some publications and projects evidently fit into the three thematic axes that have been defined for LUCAS, whereas the degree of interdisciplinarity (a self-declared centerpiece of LUCAS's research profile) varies considerably in the research output indicated in

the self-evaluation report. The various parameters for scholarship, however, defined on several institutional levels, such as the 'six profile themes for research' of the university and the 'vision, mission and objectives' of LUCAS, are clearly not all equally relevant to the actual output of the Classics programme.

Concerning the success rates of PhD candidates the self-evaluation report voices some concern for LUCAS as a whole. The Classics programme, however, is far less affected by this problem than the other two programmes in LUCAS; one of the reasons for this positive track record is the comparatively high number of contract PhD candidates. At any rate, a well-organised monitoring procedure is in place to speed up the progress of PhD candidates.

Societal relevance

The societal relevance of this programme, particularly on the level of 'interaction' and 'products', lies above all in the substantial efforts made to reach out to high-schools, while postgraduate teaching is also well documented. Several members of the teaching staff are involved in a variety of initiatives for high-school students and in producing scholarly articles and textbooks for a specific audience of high-school teachers. The activities for the general public generated by the staff of this programme evince a real interest in connecting with a local and national audience through various channels. In addition, several staff members both for Greek and Latin actively contribute to the public debate on the role and place of Classics in the curriculum of secondary education.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

It is not easy, and perhaps even somewhat unfair, to judge the robustness and stability of a programme that has been operating in an institutional context that has changed quite drastically over the course of the last years. In addition, there have been quite a few recent changes in the staff on the Latin side of the programme, and it is as yet not perfectly clear whether or to what extent a stable staff structure has been achieved at this point. The robustness and stability will only become apparent in the coming years, when the process of reorientation, which 'has only just begun' (to quote the self-evaluation report), will have further evolved and materialised. At any rate, the challenges are clearly defined, the objectives are carefully and thoughtfully set, and the self-evaluation report convincingly documents a substantial potential for reaching these goals.

Conclusion

The Classics and Classical Civilization Studies programme in LUCAS can demonstrate in all four assessment categories, discussed in this evaluation, a very good to excellent track record, which has a substantial impact on the national level in every relevant respect and can claim a very important international impact in some. Whereas scholarly work of excellent quality is being done in both parts of the programme, the scholarship produced on the Greek side of the programme has been more conspicuously at the forefront of the field internationally than the research produced on the Latin side over the past years (this restriction, it should be noted, does not hold true for Neo-Latin research, but Neo-Latin is formally integrated into the Medieval and Early Modern, rather than the Classics programme). A similar picture emerges in terms of productivity. The ample efforts made to maintain and even enhance the societal relevance of the Classics programme, however, are shared by all staff members. The Committee acknowledges the fact that over the last years there have been far more changes and fluctuations in the staff structure, and consequently in the research profile, on the Latin than on the Greek side of the programme, so that this is hardly a suitable time properly to assess the viability particularly of the Latin component of the programme. The Committee, nonetheless, perceives a substantial potential on both sides of the programme, not in the least because of the close-knit cooperation throughout

the entire programme, and has every reason to feel confident that the new goals and objectives, recently set and defined within LUCAS, will be adequately met.

Programme LUCAS 2:**Medieval and Early Modern Studies**

Section:

Programme director:

Prof. dr. C.A. van Eck and Prof. dr. W. van Anrooij

Research input 2011 (tenured) : fte 14.6 tenured, 31.7 total fte

Assessments:	Quality:	4
	Productivity:	4
	Relevance:	3.5
	Viability:	3

Brief description

The research themes and projects of this research cluster demonstrate the interest in the creation, employment, dissemination and conservation of textual and material artefacts and their roles in society. The researchers involved maintain a broad perspective on medieval and early modern textual culture, combining literary and philological studies with intellectual and religious history and the study of the material dynamics of texts. At the same time, they study the ways in which the liberal and visual arts together functioned in society, focusing on the relation between textual and material artefacts and their public, and thus on the integral study of art and literature, natural history, art history, language history, book history and literary studies.

Quality

Leiden has long been distinguished in Medieval and Early Modern Studies, including the areas covered in LUCAS. Members of the programme continue to produce work of a high standard. In some cases the ongoing projects appear to involve ground-breaking research, although this has not yet been fully published. While of a high standard, many of the approaches and strategies applied at least in the work singled out as representative to the Committee are well established. Particularly noteworthy is the fruitful interaction between the Medieval and Early Modern Programme and the Classics Programme in the field of the Classical tradition. The research pursued in this area successfully combines various lines of investigation that pertain to both the visual, material and textual culture of the Middle Ages and the Early Modern era: solid work has been done, e.g., on the role and function of classical rhetorical concepts in early modern culture and on the combined analysis of textual and material evidence in the development of early modern antiquarianism and natural history. Neo-Latin philology, furthermore, is one specific discipline that clearly profits from this interaction. Several researchers are nationally, even internationally known, and their work is certainly competitive on an international scale, even if it could not be described as world-leading.

Productivity

Beyond the individual, and discrete, projects of separate members and sub-groups of the programme, no productivity strategy has clearly emerged, and given the diversity of interests represented in the programme, it might be unnecessary or even undesirable that any single research approach be applied.

The productivity of members of the programme measured in terms of output of scholarly articles, books, theses completed, and books and articles edited remains fairly constant. Indeed, the number of doctoral theses completed has increased in the last two academic years. Leiden University has excellent research facilities in terms of its library holdings, its proximity to national (and municipal) museums, and its own manuscript, drawing, and print collections, some of which, especially those of manuscripts, are world renowned. These are used both by local and

foreign scholars and visitors. There is a good stream of work coming out of various parts of the programme, although not all the ongoing research projects have led to results as yet. The very successful series “Intersections” (general editor: Karl Enekel) may be singled out for special praise, as it has provided and continues to provide an excellent forum for the interdisciplinary research the Medieval and Early Modern Programme pursues.

Societal relevance

The programme members report their individual involvement with schools and public education in the arts. Several individuals write for more general publications; others have been involved in the organisation of exhibitions. The question that remains open is how much these activities are identifiable with the programme as such, rather than with the individuals concerned. One example: the participation of Prof. Van der Sman in a major international exhibition is commendable, but the role of Leiden in this activity is unclear.

The programme, while praiseworthy to the extent that it is involved with society, misses a number of opportunities that are present right at hand. The first of these involves non-European cultures, and their study; connections with this area in terms of formal arrangements are made largely, it seems, by students, and through the requirements that LUCAS establishes for undergraduate art historians, not for or in the research programmes (and graduate teaching) themselves. The programme does not directly reach out in this direction (described by the university under the rubric of programme themes as Asian Challenge and Global Interactions). Perhaps the apparently impending appointment of a successor to Prof. C. Jörg will remedy this.

Secondly, the absence of a professor or a clear definition of a group of scholars in Dutch art impedes possible outreach to concerns of heritage, tourism, education, and museums. Perhaps because of the determinations of the Faculty or institute administration as a whole, this concern does not any longer seem to be a priority of the programme, even though training of curators and museum educators, as a practical matter, could be involved.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

The programme has demonstrated outstanding capacity for gaining grants, especially from the NWO. Members of the programme have also won Marie Curie and ERC grants, awards given after intense competition and scrutiny. These demonstrate the viability of the programme. The age mix is also good, and there are outstanding younger scholars present.

Despite these accomplishments, the importance of the programme does not seem to have been sufficiently supported, as members of its staff also noted in interview. The institute administration seems to have done its best at dealing with difficult situations, and coming up with the best answers that it could, given financial constraints. However, the rationale for certain decisions has not been made thoroughly transparent to members of the programme. The larger issue, of course, is university funding.

In any case it is indisputable that a number of fte's have been lost. To be specific: the chair occupied previously by Prof. R. Falkenburg has been combined with that of Prof. Van Eck. A measure taken with the pro tempore appointment of Prof. M. Meadow that might have led to productive cooperation with museums in Leiden and a promise of future work ended abruptly and unfortunately, apparently in part because of lack of funding. The absence of a chair dealing with the visual (pictorial or sculptural) arts in the early modern period severely hampers the teaching, research, and outreach of the programme. Moreover, it makes conditions difficult for application for major grants, in some cases. Although three or four people do work in this general area, the absence of more extensive research or teaching in Dutch art of the sixteenth and

seventeenth centuries, and especially the absence of someone doing Dutch art at the professorial level, is part of a larger national problem. Outside of Nijmegen there will soon be no professor of Dutch (or Netherlandish in general) pictorial art of the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth century on the professorial level anywhere in the country. This is a major issue considering where Leiden is located, and what the history of the university is, too.

After an interval of several years, the chair previously occupied by Prof. W. Fock does seem to be in the process of being filled. However, this chair is being shifted to the area of design, and shared with Delft. Although the appointment has not yet been made, the shift seems to be to the Modern Area, with its designation as a position in Design. The shift of emphasis would seem to support the contention of the programme that it (and Classics) are being slighted in favour of an emphasis on the modern.

The chair occupied by Prof. C. Jörg is apparently being redefined in such a way as it is to be held jointly with LIAS. It remains to be seen who is appointed; if this is not someone in the Medieval or Early Modern field, it will be a loss for the programme, if not for the institute. Such an appointment would also have repercussions for the viability of the programme. At present, as suggested above, little is being done or thought about how the Medieval and Early Modern programme could open to and be connected with non-European, especially Asiatic, cultures, as envisioned also by the global profile for which the university is striving. Beyond that, tendencies to move to a more encompassing view of the Early Modern are present in many universities in many countries. It would be unfortunate if Leiden were to miss out both on the global and the local in the Early Modern area.

Conclusion

Several issues beyond the programme's and institute's control affect its viability. These include the constraints of funding; the lack of additional support and increase in bureaucratic duties. In addition, the government's revised funding policy which means that students who have already completed a doctoral or master's programme are no longer funded for further study seriously affects the number of art history students. Despite these difficulties the programme seems to be thriving.

Programme LUCAS 3:**Modern and Contemporary Studies**

Section:

Programme director:

Prof. dr. A. Visser and Prof. dr. C.J.M. Zijlmans

Research input 2011 (tenured) : fte 27.5 tenured, 38.0 total fte

Assessments:	Quality:	3.5
	Productivity:	4
	Relevance:	4.5
	Viability:	4

Brief description

The Modern and Contemporary Period programme takes the late 18th century as its starting point and focuses on the role of artistic and cultural forms of expression in the production of meaning. Such processes are investigated by paying special attention to the accompanying historical, cultural and political aspects. Topics of research in this programme show an orientation towards regional, national and global interactions and crossovers between various artistic practices and media, and between textual and visual culture in all kinds of societal and scholarly domains (for example, the Life Sciences).

Quality

Modern and Contemporary Studies by its very nature is certainly the most diverse cluster within the LUCAS institute. So what is true for LUCAS as a whole is especially true for this programme: at the moment it is in a phase of transition. The old disciplinary structure still remains quite relevant on the teaching side and therefore also for the financial situation, while in terms of research, at the institute level a policy giving greater emphasis to thematic axes and therefore towards larger entities is well on the way. In this diverse field, combining several modern philologies with art history, it is especially difficult to find a rationale between individual research and a fruitful engagement within larger networks. The internationally visible research of staff yet remains on a disciplinary level. Though the quality of staff is undisputed, the dwindling disciplinary cores can no longer be said to be internationally leading in their fields.

The Committee acknowledges that leaders and staff have taken up the challenge to make the best of the situation and get this largest and most heterogeneous cluster to work in a more effective way. The staff visibly accepted and embraced the need for interdisciplinary projects and stronger research units as well as for LUCAS' three thematic axes. This is bound to result in applications for funding on a larger scale, but they have not yet produced results. The Committee's advice would be that the programme needs to be given the time needed to bring in the results of the ongoing re-orientation.

Productivity

The output of the programme seems to be good to very good and numerically is the highest within LUCAS. This applies to publications, academic and extra-academic activities as well as to educational output and PhDs. Key publications, with the notable exception of some edited volumes, are still mainly the results of individual disciplinary research.

Societal relevance

The main relevance of the programme of course is the output of human capital, people with the skills of orientation in and interpretation of international and global contexts of art and culture. The scholars of the programme have strong ties with museums, schools and other public

institutions within and outside the Netherlands. There is a considerable output of material aimed at non-academic audiences. Studies as well as activities of the programme visibly contribute to public discourse.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

The dwindling number of students applying for some of the key disciplines united in LUCAS remains a problem. While student numbers for Film & Literary Studies are growing steadily, the programmes in German, Dutch, French and Italian Studies attract less and less students. It was noted, though, that among students, once embarked on their studies, interest in the modern and contemporary periods generally prevails. While the disciplinary core units, usually staffed with just a few scholars, must generally be seen at the verge of precariousness, the programme structure as a whole seems to be sound. This is particularly true for the PhD training.

The programme leaders convinced the Committee of their efforts to keep the variety of subjects while at the same time aiming for larger research units in order to successfully apply for larger grants. The general orientation towards global studies and visual studies is consistent with the thematic axes defined by LUCAS and also fits into some of the key areas defined by Leiden University. The vision is there, and the Committee is convinced that the strategies developed for the programme are heading in the right direction.

Conclusion

The Modern and Contemporary Studies programme is the one most affected by the decline in the number of philology students in the Netherlands in general and the restructuring of Humanities at Leiden. While the disciplinary cores have become precarious units, the reorientation process towards larger interdisciplinary research units and agendas has been tackled by programme leaders and staff. Within the PhD-programme, positive results can already be seen, while in terms of application for larger funding and output of research publications more time is needed to reap the harvest of the initiated process.

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 candidates 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