

QANU Research review
Leiden University Institute for History
(LUIH)

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. Insitute level	5
3. Programme level	13
The Unification of the Mediterranean World (400 BC - 400 AD)	13
The Dynamics of European Identity, 1300-1700	15
Political Culture and National Identities	17
European Expansion and Globalisation	19
Managing Migration and Global Interdependence	20
Appendices	21
Appendix A: Curriculum vitae of the Committee members	23
Appendix B: Explanation of the SEP scores	25
Appendix C: Schedule of the site-visit	27

1. REVIEW COMMITTEE AND REVIEW PROCEDURES

Scope of the assessment

The Review Committee was asked to perform an assessment of the research in the Leiden University Institute for History (LUIH) in the period 2006-2011. 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, and to advise how this quality might be improved.

Composition of the Committee

The composition of the Committee was as follows:

- Prof. Jo Tollebeek, Catholic University Leuven;
- Prof. John Darwin, Oxford University;
- Prof. Jean-Philippe Genet, Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne.

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

Roel Bennink 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 report of the units under review, including all the information required by the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP).
2. Key publications per research programme.
3. During the visit the Institute produced a list of four publications of each of the tenured staff members at the request of the Committee.

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 institutes, the key publications and the interviews with the management and with the leaders of the programmes. The interviews took place on 19 and 20 November 2012 in Leiden.

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 Institute for History (LUIH) covers the history of the fourth millennium BC to the contemporary world, and studies a variety of subjects and regions (all but the Middle East and East Asia). The focus of the research is on connections and comparisons in time and space. Five themes are distinguished in relation to the research and the post-BA educational tracks. These themes are translated in five research programmes:

1. The Unification of the Mediterranean World (400 BC - 400 AD).
2. The Dynamics of European Identity, 1300-1700.
3. Political Culture and National Identities.
4. European Expansion and Globalisation.
5. Managing Migration and Global Interdependence.

The programmes contribute to the university profile areas 'Global interactions of people, cultures and power through the ages' and 'Political Legitimacy: Institutions and Identities', and to the overarching theme of the Faculty of Humanities: Dynamics of Diversity.

The main aim of the Institute is to conduct high-quality and (inter)nationally competitive research and publish the results of their work both in academic outlets and in media targeted at a more general audience.

The management team of the Institute for History consists of a scientific director, a director of research, a director of education, and the Institute's manager. The positions of director of research (0.6 fte) and Institute's manager (0.6 fte) are permanent and since 2005 held by the same staff members; those of scientific director and director of education rotate and are taken up for a maximum of three years partly via substitution arrangements.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee notes that the Institute is strongly embedded in the new Faculty of Humanities with its six institutes / centres (and the recently established academy for artistic research). The research programmes are – to a certain extent – also well-grounded in the University's key research areas.

The research programmes developed within the Institute have a clear autonomy. The Committee regards the Institute's research architecture as solid, but has doubts regarding the distinction between the 'European Expansion and Globalisation' programme and the 'Managing Migration and Global Interdependence' programme.

The Institute has deliberately chosen for a lean management in which academic staff members perform the key functions, without an extensive structure of formal committees. The organisation is quite collegial. The Institute's leadership is based on trust and mutual feedback, but the academic director and the director of research are directive at some points, for example in preparing grant applications. The Institute's board and the leadership of the five programmes meet twice a year. The Committee believes that the transparency of the programme coordination at the Institute level could be enhanced.

Though the Committee realises that the Standard Evaluation Protocol does not require this, the self-evaluation report could have been strengthened by a fuller account of the Institute's

seminars, workshops and conferences and by a full list of publications of all tenured staff members.

2. Quality and academic reputation

The self-assessment report states that the history departments of Leiden University, University of Amsterdam and Utrecht University cover a broad spectrum of themes and time periods, but that their research programmes represent complementary profiles. The Leiden strong points are reflected by the five research programmes of the Institute for History. Amsterdam stands out for its holocaust and genocide studies, Dutch Golden Age studies, military history and public history. Utrecht is reputed for its expertise in early medieval history, history of international relations and human rights, and economic history.

The self-assessment report states that the history departments of the University of Oxford, the University of Cambridge and University College London are comparable to the one in Leiden in terms of research goals and ambitions and teaching objectives at the (research) MA and PhD level. All four universities are members of the League of European Research Universities (LERU).

The LUIH has a strong tradition of intensive study of primary sources that are abundantly available in (the vicinity of) Leiden (collections of the Leiden University Libraries and those of the National Archives in the Hague, to name a few) and a solid track record in academic publishing for the national and international scholarly community; some areas of research covered in Leiden are unique in Dutch historical studies, such as maritime history, migration history and the history of European expansion and globalisation – these domains are related to the tradition of studying the languages and cultures of Africa, Asia and the Americas at Leiden University. Another feature of the Leiden research profile is that European history to a great extent is studied in a global context. The Institute is very successful in attracting research funding from national funding agencies and maintains intensive bilateral international collaborations.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee was impressed by the number of grants, awards and prizes that were acquired in the period under review. The editorships of the senior staff members also testify to the strong academic reputation of the Institute.

The Committee saw clear evidence that the strong academic reputation of the LUIH has enabled the Institute to recruit some of the best historians of the younger generations. The LUIH has remained an attractive and prestigious place of research and teaching for many scholars. It has retained a strong visibility.

The Committee finds that the programmes are well chosen and cover a wide variety of periods and topics. The same richness can be seen from a geographical perspective.

The Committee notes that the research traditions of LUIH in political history, the history of European expansion and reactions, have been successfully renewed in the past ten years and can now be described as the history of political culture, the history of globalisation and migration history. New research lines have been developed in a thoughtful way: the history of Reformation and Counter-Reformation, the history of state-formation, philosophy of history. The comparative, international and global approach in much of the research give the Leiden Institute a distinctive flavour.

On a national level the Institute positions itself alongside the University of Amsterdam (UvA) and Utrecht University (UU). The Committee agrees that the strong points of LUIH are complementary to those of Amsterdam and Utrecht, but Utrecht has a wider research profile because its research is also based in cultural history and the history of science.

The self-assessment report and the interviews made clear that the Institute is in a period of transition and that there is much reflection on the internal coherence of the programmes and on their logic. The Committee believes that in this process the Institute should also reflect on the importance of common products and common activities, such as more formalised seminars. This item will be discussed further under the separate programmes.

The Committee found that the programmes could be more innovative in terms of (interdisciplinary) methodology. A methodological reflection might be especially helpful in the direction of both historical sociology and anthropology.

3. Resources

The total research staff of the Institute has shown a remarkable increase since 2009. This has mainly been a consequence of the higher number of externally funded projects carried out by members of the Institute, particularly PhD students. From 2009 the tenured staff is decreasing somewhat in number which is due to the university policy to extend the percentage of non-tenured staff. This should offer institutes more budgetary flexibility and make it easier to respond to changing conditions.

Since 2005 a generation of leading historians has retired and left the Institute, but most vacancies could be fulfilled. This brought a new dynamic in the research community and created novel opportunities for cooperation and exchange. Particularly since 2009 the Institute has focused on talent scouting, the recruitment of female employees and the provision of career development support by encouraging staff members to write research proposals and take part in scholarly enterprises. A sabbatical leave arrangement for senior researchers was introduced in 2010, aiming at the completion of book projects and the development of new research projects.

Most members of the research staff are now in the middle categories in terms of age. This allows for a well-balanced mix between junior and senior scholars and reinforces cohesion and teamwork within the research programmes.

The gender balance among the Institute's tenured staff receives full attention, but is only slowly improving.

The research capacity of the Institute might be negatively affected by:

- cuts in governmental spending from 2014;
- government plans to abolish financial support for (research) MA students;
- reduction of NWO free competition funding;
- additional teaching obligations of LUIH employees in the new BA/MA programme International Studies, which started in September 2012.

The Institute's main building serves as a centre of professional scholarship and an easy accessible meeting place of staff members and students alike. It is laid out with the necessary infrastructure. The Institute occasionally suffers from a lack of space. Recently a number of research groups had to be accommodated in surrounding buildings.

Assessment/remarks

As noted above, the replacement of the generation of historians who retired around 2005 (the ‘changing of the guard’) has been very successful. The new chairs all proved to be outstanding researchers, capable of motivating a new generation of PhD students and postdocs.

The total research staff of the Institute has increased since 2006, but this increase is exclusively the result of a growing number of PhD students. The Institute notes that budget cuts in 2014 might lead to a reduction of the (tenured) staff.

In the opinion of the Committee, the Institute has developed a strong and flexible policy regarding the replacement of teaching duties and sabbatical leaves. This policy has proven to be an excellent instrument in both the writing of new high-quality research proposals (for NWO and other funding agencies) and the completion of books. Again, budget cuts in 2014 might weaken this instrument and thus the earning capacity and productivity of the Institute.

The Committee appreciates that the earning capacity has been very strong in the past six years, in the recent past also on the European level (with an ERC starting grant and an ERC advanced grant).

The Institute can benefit from the nearby University Libraries, which have been centralised in the past years and which house magnificent collections in many specialist fields. For some of the Institute’s programmes the vicinity of the library of the Royal Netherlands Institute of Southeast Asian and Caribbean Studies is of great importance. The Royal Library and the National Archives are located nearby in The Hague.

4. Productivity

With a total research staff of between 63.8 fte and 85.3 fte in the years 2006-2011, four to five publications were produced on average for each full-time equivalent of research time.

The Institute as a whole produced 2097 publications in the period under review, including 538 academic articles, 341 book chapters, 78 PhD theses, 438 professional publications and 212 publications for the general public.

The self-assessment report contains a detailed overview of the research grants obtained in national and international competition, including VENI, VIDI and VICI grants, and prestigious awards and prizes. Major conference activities and editorships by the senior professors are also listed.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee regards the number of publications produced as very good but not outstanding, though we must remark that the distinction between academic output and ‘other research output’ in the self-assessment report was not very clear.

The Institute’s publication culture is characterised by a duality: on the one hand the Institute’s members publish articles (in English) in international peer-reviewed journals, on the other hand some of the best research is published in Dutch in the form of books (and chapters in books). This duality is not uncommon in the disciplinary fields which are covered by (most of) the research programmes under review.

Regarding the publishing in books, the Committee noticed that the number of single-authored books diminishes while the number of edited books increases. This might be a symptom of more fragmented work. We are aware that this is a widespread phenomenon in academia.

Most of the publications are single-authored publications (except in programme 5). A reflection on multi-authored publications (with all its pro's and con's), no longer exceptional in large parts of the social sciences but also in some of the humanities, is recommended.

There is some variation between the programmes regarding the publication strategy. This is a subject that might be considered at Institute level. The discussion should include online publication. Online publication might strengthen the visibility of the Institute and its programmes. The research output might indeed take the shape of more diverse products (not only books, also internet deliverables).

5. Societal Relevance

The recent introduction of societal impact and valorisation as criteria by the Dutch national research council NWO requires a growing awareness among the Institute's staff and the building up of specific experience in order to remain successful in obtaining NWO funding. The research deals with a considerable number of socially relevant themes, such as governance, democracy, migration, integration, globalisation and identity formation. The Institute encourages staff members to link-up to these themes as much as possible, not only in order to account for and justify the selection of research topics towards a general audience, but primarily to relate to societal questions that require context and meaning to be provided by trained scholars and to fruitfully exchange views with policy makers, cultural brokers and media workers being professionally involved in these issues.

The self-assessment report states that valorisation, understood as value creation in the economic sense, rarely applies to the (predominantly fundamental) research conducted by Leiden historians. However, the societal relevance can indeed be identified in initiatives such as public lectures, policy advice, interventions in public debate, workshops on socially relevant topics, and the ongoing training by Institute's staff members of teachers employed in secondary education. Government funded projects conducted by Leiden historians can be headed under the same label. These include specific training for staff members of government departments (notably those of the ministry of foreign affairs who wish to pursue a diplomatic career and whose lecturers have included Leiden historians for many years), the organisation of policy seminars and conferences, and the publication of articles and books addressing pressing social issues.

Assessment/remarks

The Committee concludes that the Institute in general participates well in societal debates on issues such as (national) identity, democracy, political representation, globalisation and migration. There is some variation between the programmes in how far they have thought about societal role systematically. It might be helpful if the Institute management team would think about an overall policy.

The development of such a policy might imply that staff involved in such societal tasks is rewarded for this commitment. In any case, the societal commitment should not be considered to be a loss of time in relation to other tasks in academia (teaching duties, research).

6. Strategy for the future

The self-assessment report states that the Institute is a well-organised, distinctively focused and demonstrably successful community of scholars in terms of research output, research funding and research training. As such it has an excellent starting position to grasp the opportunities offered by Horizon 2020, NWO's *Zwaartekracht* ('Gravitation') and ERC Synergy, and to benefit from intensified collaboration with other institutes in Leiden, such as the African Studies Centre (ASC), the Royal Netherlands Institute of Southeast Asian and Caribbean Studies (KITLV) and the Leiden Institute of Area Studies (LIAS, with a focus on Asia and the Middle-East).

With reference to the detailed SWOT-analysis provided in the self-assessment report, the Institute wants to pursue the following actions in the coming years:

- Ongoing focus on Dutch and European research funding opportunities through a stable production of high-quality proposals.
- Optimal advertising of the Institute's unique selling points through the Institute's website.
- Careful maintenance of the existing monitoring tools to encourage PhD students to timely complete their dissertation and qualify for the job market.
- Formulation of a policy aimed at the self-evident and systematic inclusion of aspects of societal quality, societal impact and valorisation in novel research undertakings through information and discussion sessions and the explicit incorporation of societal activities of staff members in the Institute's annual report.
- Consistent coaching of female talent to increase their share in permanent staff positions.
- Safeguarding the Institute's research capacity in consultation with the board of the Faculty of Humanities.

Assessment/remarks

In the light of possible budget cuts (2014) and decreasing NWO funding, the Committee believes that it is probably a necessary step that the LUIH will try to get more European funding. The Institute is preparing well to secure these European grants and can now be proud of its first successes.

The Committee agrees that efforts to integrate (parts of) the Leiden Institute in larger strategic alliances in order to get funds from new, large-scale national (NWO) and European grant schemes might lead to an increase of financial resources. But this policy might also lead to less visibility of the history programmes and a less distinctive flavour of the Leiden style of historical research and historiography.

The strength of the Leiden research is linked to its renewal of its own research traditions and its capacity to generate bottom-up initiatives of high quality. In a climate in which Dutch and European policy makers emphasise top-down research and restrict 'free competition' it is important to reflect how these qualities can be protected.

The Committee believes that optimising the visibility of the Leiden profile(s) would be a valuable policy instrument to secure the Institute's position in the national and international competitive landscape.

The Committee regards the six major policy actions that are listed in the self-evaluation report for the period 2012-2018, as an excellent starting point to tackle the challenges for the coming years.

7. PhD Training

The number of PhD students finishing their dissertation in time is low and requires serious attention. From 2009 onward PhD projects have been monitored in a much stricter way. The great majority of PhD students enrolled in the Institute since that year is on schedule.

Since 2009 PhD candidates are also offered a more comprehensive PhD training programme, which focuses on the acquisition of knowledge, insight and skills connected to the relevant research programme and emphasises the independent way in which PhD candidates are expected to identify, select and critically evaluate sources, to properly apply concepts, methods and techniques, to plan and conduct research according to a prescribed time schedule and to convincingly present research findings orally and in writing. The PhD training programme is described in detail in the self-assessment report.

All PhD projects are closely related to the five research programmes of the Institute. The PhD candidates are primarily dedicated to conducting research and writing their dissertation under the guidance of their principal supervisor who is a full professor connected to one of the research programmes. In addition, they take a number of courses relevant to their field of research. Some of these courses are offered by the Institute, such as the monthly graduate seminar and the practical educational course. The Dutch national research schools in the field of history play a substantial role in providing supplementary courses aimed at the training of research and presentation skills related to a particular field.

No less than 85% of the available time is invested in research and writing. In order to remain on schedule PhD candidates are stimulated to enter the writing phase of their project at the earliest stage possible. No more than 15% of the time allotted to the PhD candidate may be taken up by teaching activities.

In addition to the employed PhD students (41 in 2011), the Institute currently has 112 externally funded PhD students.

The careers of those PhD's who graduated or terminated their project in the review period demonstrate that no less than 70% of them pursued a career in academia, the majority of them in a non-tenured position.

Assessment/remarks

The number of PhD students has grown over the past five years (from 24 in 2006 to 41 in 2011, not counting the 112 external PhD students), thanks to the earning capacity of the staff. Since there was no change in the number of the tenured staff (about 54), this means that the ratio PhD students/tenured staff has grown from 0.45 in 2006 to 0.78 in 2011. Still, this ratio is not as high as one would expect in such a dynamic Institute. In order to train a sufficient number of next generation researchers, it might be advisable to develop measures that spread the supervision tasks more evenly across the faculty members.

Regarding the diffusion of the PhD projects, the track record of the Institute in the period under review is very good: in 2006-2011 78 PhD theses were published, which means about 15 published theses a year. Nevertheless, the timely completion of the dissertation remains a very serious problem, though not to the same extent in each of the programmes. The self-assessment report does not identify the causes of this problem.

In the interview with the PhD students, the Committee learned that there is a tension between timely completion of dissertations and the desire to have a diverse portfolio (teaching, organising

a conference, publications, etc.). The Institute acknowledges the need for a more effective monitoring system. A more formal and more frequent contact between the PhD student and the promotor is certainly recommended. The Institute might like to consider the model used elsewhere (e.g. in Oxford) in which the promotor/supervisor reports in writing on the progress of the PhD student three times a year.

The PhD students can benefit from the courses which are offered by the National Research Schools (Huizinga, *Politieke geschiedenis*, Posthumus, OIKOS, *Mediëvistiek*). The participation in these courses also gives them the opportunity to meet their peers. However this network of National Research Schools seems to offer few opportunities for the PhD students working in the programme 'European Expansion and Globalisation'.

3. PROGRAMME LEVEL

Programme 1: The Unification of the Mediterranean World (400 BC - 400 AD)

Programme coordinator: Prof. Luuk de Ligt
Research staff 2011: 3.6 tenured, 6.4 total fte

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

The research programme primarily deals with the political unification of the Mediterranean Region and the attendant processes of change. There is a strong focus on the transformation of economic life, urban life and culture, and religion, mentality and cultural identity. The methodological assumptions are threefold: (1) the study of ancient societies should to a large extent be based on the comparative method; (2) extensive use should be made of inscriptions, papyri and legal texts; and (3) unilateral approaches, either from the social-economic perspective or from the perspective of the history of mentality, should be avoided.

Quality

The ancient history research programme has a clear focus: the unification of the Mediterranean World with its transformation of economic life, urban culture and religion, mentality and cultural identity. The study of urbanisation is central to the research, however combined with the study of acculturation (and multiple identity in ancient society).

The completed NWO VICI project ('Peasants, citizens and soldiers'), which has been the backbone of the research within this programme during the past year, has been highly successful (in terms of research output, with prestigious books published by the leading university presses, and in terms of PhD work).

The quality of the work that has been done, is undisputed, but the programme lacks some visibility, also on the national level. Other universities seem to be identified with their ancient history programme in a more explicit way.

Productivity

The research output of the programme is strong, considered its composition. However, there seems to be an unbalance between the academic and the non-academic (professional or aimed at the general public) publications. In 2011 13 publications were published in each category; one expects that the share of the academic publications would be larger than the professional and general public share.

Societal relevance

The societal relevance of the programme is difficult to define, more difficult than is the case with the other programmes. In the self-evaluation report no effort has been done to go one step further than the usual *clichés* and a short criticism on 'administrative tendencies to increasingly emphasise the societal impact and valorisation of research'. This unwilling attitude contradicts with the desire of the Institute's management to develop a more systematic policy regarding this topic.

Viability

The research programme's staff is small. Budget cuts (from 2014 onwards) might make it too small to remain an autonomous programme. An integration of the group in the Faculty of Archaeology (in a larger programme on classical studies) is not recommended: the growing 'technicalisation' of archaeology and the strong historical profile of the Unification programme are counter indications to such an integration. A strong point in this case is also the desire in the ancient history programme to compare the results of its research with those of the 'expansionists' of programme 4.

The number of PhD students is low: 2 in 2009, 3 in 2010 and 2 in 2011. Again, this makes an enduring autonomous existence difficult. However, the new NWO project 'Moving Romans' (from 2010 onwards) and the recently acquired ERC advanced grant (Prof. De Ligt) might strengthen the group. They testify to the academic reputation of the group and the quality of its research.

Programme 2: The Dynamics of European Identity, 1300-1700

Programme coordinator: Prof. Jeroen Duindam
Research staff 2011: 7.2 tenured, 15.7 total fte

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

This research programme focuses on three main topics, state-building, intellectual exchanges, and the formation of collective identities, respectively redefined in 2011 as relations between subject and rulers, transnational networks, cultural identities and cultural transfers, a move which indeed facilitates cooperation with other programmes of the Institute. But the relation between them, and between them and the three main sub-programmes is altogether not clear, since the approach is neither always comparative nor always transnational. Allusions are made to programmes supplementing Prof. Pollmann's VICI project, but their content is not detailed. However, one of the big assets of this programme is the fact that it encompasses a very large chronological period (medieval and early modern times) and that, while two of the programmes are mainly concerned with the Netherlands, its geographical extension has been greatly enlarged by the new programme 'Eurasian Empires'.

Quality

The overall quality of the programme is very high. This quality is also widely recognised, as evidenced by the research grants and funding obtained. In view of the success in obtaining funds, the Committee believes that other deliverables than books could also be thought of, for instance new editions of texts or archival materials, databases or on-line material, anything which could be offered to the historians' scientific community as a result on which to build on. There is one exception: the VRE Early modern memory, described as a deliverable of Prof. Pollmann's VICI project.

There is no effort to introduce new or innovative methodologies, which could be derived from a more interdisciplinary approach. Comparative history is on the agenda, mostly in the 'Eurasian Empires' project, but the other sub-programmes are a bit shy in this matter: even Prof. Pollmann's book which makes frequent comparisons between the situation in the Netherlands and the situation in France does not develop a systematic comparison, and only the brilliant textbook by Blockmans and Hoppenbrouwers has a truly European dimension: otherwise, comparison seems mostly confined to South and Northern Netherlands, and it has been good news to learn that Prof. Hoppenbrouwers is considering comparison with Italian cities as an important part of his on-going programme.

As a whole, this programme does not seem overambitious as regards its deliverables, and this may explain why, despite its undoubted quality, it has not yet attracted European funding: the academic reputation of the programme will only be established if there is an outcome which can be identified by the community of historians as the result of the programme as a whole.

As regards the organisation, the promoters of the three main programmes must be careful to strengthen their cooperation through joint seminars and workshops, and to address the theoretical questions surrounding the complex question of identity more fully: cohesion can only benefit from such a move.

Productivity

The Committee regrets to have only quantitative data at its disposal: the rough total of 702 publications for 15 members of staff and 5 PhD students (2011 figures) does not mean much; it all depends of the quality of the publications. It is also clear that the number of people involved in the programme has peaked in 2009 to 29 and then decreased to 20 people, for reasons which are not obvious. But this gives substance to the complaint that the teaching load of the members of the team has increased, a point which seems to have been taken in by the Faculty.

Societal relevance

The three main topics of the programme are of considerable interest for contemporary society. It is clear that the members of the programme do their best to reach a wider public, and their dedication to this aspect of research is impressive.

Viability

The vitality of the programme is obvious but the strategy of the programme ought to pay more attention to the kind of products it wants to offer and to keep theoretical and methodological debates going on between its participants.

Programme 3: Political Culture and National Identities

Programme coordinator: Prof. Henk te Velde
Research staff 2011: 13.5 tenured, 27.4 total fte

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

Within this programme research is conducted into national political cultures of individual European and American countries. This includes the cultural aspects of politics, the broad socio-cultural and cultural-intellectual embedding of politics and the political aspects of culture. All research within this field has been included in the university research profile area 'Political Legitimacy: Institutions and Identities'. This interdisciplinary framework brings together historians, political scientists, legal specialists and scholars of public administration working on questions related to the perceived gap between politics and the people in contemporary Europe and America. The central theme under study is the tension between institution and identity, now and in the past.

Quality

This programme is certainly very broad and the description given in the self-evaluation report seems to present it as the somewhat artificial linkage of activities in the framework of the university profile research area 'Political legitimacy: Institutions and Identities', and of others coming from a much stricter comparative inspiration. However, the interview made clear that, though the participants came from different horizons, this point has been thoroughly discussed and that there is a real collaborative and mutually inspirational approach in the group, as is amply demonstrated by be the two collective (and comparative) latest publications of the programme, one of which has already been issued this year, while the other is due in 2013. The existence of a common seminar is also an advantage.

There is no doubt about the very high quality of the publications, at least of those which were brought to the Committee's knowledge. However, here again, as for several other programmes of LUIH, there is no identifiable by-product of the programme as such, neither in terms of editions, archives publication or repertories, or of data bases, on-line or otherwise. The consequence is that it is very difficult to assess the academic reputation of the programme itself, which can only depend upon identifiable results or products of the programme as such, despite the fact that most of its individual participants personally enjoy an excellent scientific reputation.

It must also be remarked that there is apparently no special attention paid to new methodologies (digitalisation of data and computing in general, computational linguistics, data analysis etc.).

The self-evaluation report makes clear that it may be difficult to run such a broad programme with only one chairman and one coordinator. The research programme covers many areas and the associated BA and MA programmes attract a large number of students, also in the new BA International Studies. It is suggested that a coordinating committee that meets on a regular basis could offer a better solution. This might be linked to the existing common seminars or workshops.

Productivity

The programme seems to have attracted a lot of funding (in the self-evaluation report, it is only second to the ‘European expansion’ programme) and it has also attracted a large number of PhD students. On the other hand, it has produced fewer publications than ‘The dynamics of European Identities’ with more members, 18 members of staff and 15 PhD students, a number which seems rapidly increasing (but this is simply a purely quantitative remark).

Societal relevance

This programme’s main topics have an obvious relevance to important issues and debates in the society at large and there is no doubt that the activities of several of its members have a direct impact on political and societal aspects of Dutch contemporary political community. The participants in the programme are clearly aware of the importance of these aspects of research and the survey given in the self-assessment report is quite impressive.

Viability

Cohesion seems vital to keep the programme going, and a good way of strengthening it might be to develop more common reflections on theoretical issues, which seem to be somewhat neglected. This could also help to reduce the gap between “national” perspectives on the one hand and comparative approaches on the other.

Programme 4: European Expansion and Globalisation

Programme coordinator: Prof. Jos Gommans
Research staff 2011: 7.2 tenured, 23.1 total fte

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

The research centres on the study of global interaction processes and on the origins of the transfer of people, goods and ideas within and among the continents. Globalisation is understood as the emergence of a world economy, worldwide migration flows, the birth of nation states and many other related phenomena. It includes the early activities of the chartered trading companies, the rise of colonial empires and enterprises, resistance movements, and wars of independence and decolonisation, all of which have left their archives whose unique character stems from the interaction between expanding and contracting Europe and the rest of the world.

Quality

The quality is very impressive and the scope of research interests that emerged at the interview was both imaginative and wide-ranging, deploying as it does the unique value of Dutch archival sources to interrogate a variety of different forms of global “connectivity”. It is particularly striking that these have been deliberately extended beyond the distinctive focus on Indonesia to embrace South Asia and Africa. The additional project area of the Dutch Atlantic fits quite well into this scheme, linking as it does Africa and the Americas (an additional point is that South Asian textiles were regularly traded for slaves in West Africa and that African slaves were found in South Asia).

Productivity

There has been significant output and a clear productivity strategy is in place.

Societal relevance

In the interview, it emerged that societal relevance had not been explicitly thought about to the extent that was true in some of the other programmes. Nevertheless, the programme contributes significantly to the Netherlands’ engagement with South and South East Asia (especially through the academic programmes with India and Indonesia), and its publications and other output cater to the growing public interest in global history and the history of globalisation.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

The programme has passed through a period of transition following the retirement of several senior figures of world-wide reputation. There are further retirements pending. However, there appeared to be a clear awareness of the challenge this posed, and a vigorous new set of initiatives in place. The retirement of Prof. Ross is to be met by a further appointment in African history and a new link with Ghana with its links (19th century and before) to the Netherlands.

Programme 5: Managing Migration and Global Interdependence

Programme coordinator: Prof. Leo Lucassen
Research staff 2011: 6.4 tenured, 12.7 total fte

Assessments: Quality: 4
 Productivity: 4.5
 Relevance: 4.5
 Viability: 3

The research on the migration and globalisation since the Middle Ages has as its core themes the migration and settlement processes of migrants and the social changes that these bring about. Theoretical inspiration comes from various angles linked to the field of global history. The programme studies the growing interconnectivity of the world since the end of the 15th century. A second theoretical angle is found in global (comparative) migration studies that differentiate between various forms of cross-cultural migrations and which analyse the conditions under which these lead to all sorts of social, economic and cultural change. Finally, there is a great interest in how migrants find their place in new societies. The members of the programme combine theoretical models from the social sciences with insights from historical studies. In all approaches mentioned above the comparative method is central.

Quality

The Committee was impressed by the quality of the research being pursued as well as with its range. It was also positively impressed by the commitment of the programme to the employment of social scientific methods, and by the shared feeling that this was a distinctive bond between the members of the group.

Productivity

There was convincing evidence of the productivity of the group in the period under consideration and of the plans for a range of outputs in the forthcoming period. The success in attracting external funding had been especially striking.

Societal Relevance

This was an especially strong characteristic of this programme. The central themes of migration and urban social history have obvious societal relevance and have clearly evoked significant public interest. Potentially (not least in migration studies) this might be a non-trivial burden on the researchers concerned. It is less clear how far this also applies to the two early modern projects to be directed by Dr. Antunes: the Committee was unable to question her on this point.

Viability

The urban, crime and migration history elements of the programme have a clear synergy, not only in their overlapping concerns but also in methodology. The Committee was strongly impressed on this point. A vigorous defence was made in the interview of the value of retaining the early modern projects on empire within the programme – on the grounds that there was overlap with the interest in urban networks and economic history of other group members. However, the Committee was unconvinced by the logic of retaining Dr. Antunes' projects within the programme and saw more obvious synergy in this case with the projects undertaken in programme 4. A number of retirements are pending which will also need to be taken into account. The staff of the programme should rethink its shape.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Curriculum vitae of the Committee members

Prof. Jo Tollebeek, University of Leuven

Jo Tollebeek is Full Professor of Cultural History since 1750 at the University of Leuven, Belgium. He has published work on university history, the history of historiography, and the history of the humanities in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, including *Writing the Inquisition in Europe and America* (2004); *Men of Character: The Emergence of the Modern Humanities* (2011); and *Henri Pirenne, Historian: A Life in Pictures* (2011, with Sarah Keymeulen). He headed the Belgian *lieux de mémoire* project: *België, een parcours van herinnering* (2008). He was elected member of the Royal Flemish Academy of Belgium for Science and the Arts, the Royal Netherlands Academy of Sciences and the Academia Europaea.

Prof. John Darwin, Oxford University

John Darwin teaches Global and Imperial history at Oxford where he is a Fellow of Nuffield College. His recent publications include *After Tamerlane: The Global History of Empire* (Allen Lane/Penguin Books 2007) which won the Wolfson History Prize in 2008; *The Empire Project: The Rise and Fall of the British World-system* (Cambridge University Press, 2009), which won the Trevor Reese Prize in Imperial and Commonwealth History in 2010; and *Unfinished Empire: The Global Expansion of Britain* (Allen Lane/Penguin Books, 2012). He is a Fellow of the British Academy.

Prof. Jean-Philippe Genet, Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne

Jean-Philippe Genet is Professor of Medieval History in Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne, where he has taught since 1974. He has been scientific coordinator of the CNRS and ESF programmes on the origins of the modern state. He has been director of the *Laboratoire de Médiévistique Occidentale de Paris* (LAMOP) from 1999 to 2005 and Chairman of the CNRS committee « Ancient and Medieval Worlds » (2000-2004) and is presently head of the ERC advanced programme SAS (Signs and State). He has written extensively on English history (*La genèse de l'État moderne. Culture et société politique en Angleterre*, Paris, 2003) cultural history and the comparative history of the European modern state.

Appendix B: Five point scale of the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP)

<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 considered 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 refers to the level of the research compared to accepted (international) standards in the field. As a rule, quality is measured by judging the international academic reputation, the position and the output of the unit to be evaluated. In case of a *national* orientation of a research field, the point of reference consists of other groups in the country.

Productivity regards the relationship between input and output. Output should always be judged in relation to the mission and resources of the institute. When looking at productivity in terms of publications of scientific articles and the like, a verdict is usually cast in comparison with international standards of a quantitative nature. However, this is often not possible when looking at other forms of output (for example health protocols, designs, policy reports). Since many institutes will have variegated output and scientific activities, evaluators are asked to also include other forms of (qualitative) information in their assessment.

Relevance covers the social, economic and cultural relevance of the research. Evaluators are asked to consider one or more of the following three aspects.

- *Societal quality of the work.* This aspect refers primarily to the policy and efforts of the institute and/or research groups to interact in a productive way with stakeholders in society who are interested in input from scientific research. It may also refer to the contribution of research to important issues and debates in society.
- *Societal impact of the work.* This aspect refers to how research affects specific stakeholders or specific procedures in society (for example protocols, laws and regulations, curricula). This can be measured, for example, via charting behavioural changes of actors or institutions.
- *Valorisation of the work.* This aspect refers to the activities aimed at making research results available and suitable for application in products, processes and services. This includes activities regarding the availability of results and interaction with public and private organisations, as well as direct contributions such as commercial or non-profit use of research results and expertise.

Vitality and feasibility regards the institute's ability to react adequately to important changes in the environment. It refers to both internal (personnel, research practice) and external (developments in the field, in society) dynamics of the group.

Appendix C: Schedule of the site-visit

LUIH: Leiden Institute for History, 19&20 November 2012

Sunday 18 November 2012

19:00-20:30: Informal committee dinner

20:30-21:30: First committee meeting (procedures, impressions)

Monday 19 November

09:00-11:00: Committee meeting

11:00-12:00: **Institute management** (short presentation, interview, reflection) : Prof. Leo Lucassen, Dr. Peter Meel, Dr. Dennis Bos, Rebecca Wensma, Eline de Graaf, Femke Vermeer

12:00-13:00: Lunch

13:00-14:00: Programmes (for each programme 10 minutes presentation, 30 minutes interview, 15 minutes reflection in the Committee, 5 minutes reserve/break)

Programme 1: The Unification of the Mediterranean World (400 BC - 400 AD): Prof. Luuk de Ligt, Dr. Frits Naerebout, Dr. Rens Tacoma

14:00-15:00: **Programme 2: The Dynamics of European Identity, 1300-1700:** Prof. Jeroen Duindam, Prof. Judith Pollmann, Prof. Peter Hoppenbrouwers

15:00-16:00: **Programme 3: Political Culture and National Identities:** Prof. Henk te Velde, Prof. Adam Fairclough, Prof. Patricio Silva, Dr. Joost Augusteijn, Dr. Bart van der Boom

16:00-16:30: **Faculty Board** (Dean Prof. Wim van den Doel)

17:00-18:00: **PhD students** (limited number, selected by the Institute, with list of names and short description of their projects): Karwan Fatah-Black, Miriam Groen-Vallinga, Anne Heyer, Jasper van der Steen, Esther Zwinkels

19:00: Committee dinner

Tuesday 20 November

09:00-10:00: **Programme 4 : European Expansion and Globalisation:** Prof. Jos Gommans, Prof. Henk den Heijer, Dr. Thomas Lindblad, Dr. Alicia Schrikker

10:00-11:00: **Programme 5 : Managing Migration and Global Interdependence:** Prof. Leo Lucassen, Dr. Manon van der Heijden, Dr. Jeroen Touwen

11:00-12:30: Committee meeting: deciding on scores and main texts

12:30-13:30: Lunch

13:30-16:00: Committee meeting (continued; writing session) **

16:00-16:30: **Second meeting with Institute management** (preliminary conclusions): Prof. Leo Lucassen, Dr. Peter Meel, Dr. Dennis Bos, Rebecca Wensma, Eline de Graaf.