QANU Research review
Leiden University Centre for Linguistics
(LUCL)

QANU, March 2013

Contents

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 Centre for Linguistics (LUCL) 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. Aafke Hulk, director NIAS (KNAW)/University of Amsterdam, chair;
- Prof. Mirjam Fried, Charles University in Prague;
- Prof. Larry Hyman, University of California at Berkeley;
- Prof. Jost Gippert, Universität Frankfurt;
- Prof. Colin Phillips, University of Maryland.

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 unit under review, including all information required by SEP.
2. 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 institutes, the key publications and the interviews with the management and with the leaders of the programmes. The interviews took place on 29 and 30 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.

1. The Institute
The Leiden University Centre for Linguistics (LUCL) was established on 1 September 2005 and unites all the linguistic research at Leiden University.

The mission of LUCL is to study linguistic diversity from different theoretical perspectives. In doing this, LUCL aims to encourage the interaction of data-driven and theory-driven linguistic research, thus capitalising on its broad coverage of the world's languages, and to further develop an interdisciplinary approach to linguistic phenomena.

As a research institute and department of the Graduate School of the Faculty of Humanities, LUCL is responsible for (1) the coordination and facilitation of linguistic research by tenured faculty and research fellows, and (2) the training of PhD students in linguistics.

The research is organised in three programmes:

1. Formal Theoretical and Experimental Linguistics.
2. Language Use and Language Description.
3. Language and History.

During the restructuring of the Faculty of Humanities in 2008, the Faculty Board decided that the Leiden Institute for Area Studies (LIAS) would be in charge of all budgets and personnel policy related to language teaching within the Bachelor's and Master's programmes of the Faculty for the areas Asia and the Middle East, and LUCL would be in charge of those related to language teaching within all other Bachelor's and Master's programmes.

The Academic Director of LUCL is appointed by the Board of the Faculty of Humanities. The Academic Director is one of the full professors working within LUCL and is in principle appointed for a three-year term of office. The Academic Director is formally responsible for all institutional affairs. In practice the Academic Director, the Institute Manager and the Director of Studies together form a Management Team that runs the institute on the basis of 'collegiate administration'.

The LUCL Management Team is advised by three boards. The Advisory Board (1) meets with the Management Team approximately 6 times a year, and gives advice on current and future issues of the institute, including research policy. The members are appointed by the Board of the Faculty of Humanities. The Institute Council (2) comprises all members of the institute. The Academic Director meets with the Institute Council at least twice a year, to keep the members informed of all current and future issues related to the institute. The PhD Council (3) discusses affairs relating to PhD students on a regular basis.

The full professors and extraordinary professors within LUCL function as programme leaders in their own specific field of expertise and as leaders of the three LUCL research programmes.

Assessment/remarks
The institute underwent a relatively substantial internal reorganisation only a few years ago. The changes have been largely successful, although not to the same degree across all programmes; it is clear that the institute is still in transition and searching for strong strategic initiatives in some areas. The Management Team is aware of this state of affairs and is working toward consolidating

the functioning of the institute as a whole. The review Committee takes it as a positive feature that the individual programmes are given freedom in setting and conducting their research agendas. However, this open structure without formally designated programme coordinators, coupled with the broad range of research interests as well as a theoretically and methodologically varied scope embraced by the institute, also carries a certain danger: developing internal coherence for each programme and a strong vision for the future has evidently been a challenge that has been met with varying success within different programmes. The Committee recommends that especially in this transitional stage the institute Management Team take a more active role in providing strategic guidance in areas where strengthening of a programme's mission is evidently needed. The interviews with the Management Team revealed that there now is a methodologically framed overall view that crucially defines the institute as a whole; this view should be taken as the starting point for any strategic initiatives the institute will now take.

2. Quality and academic reputation

The self-assessment report states that LUCL researchers have broad expertise in a large number of the world's languages: many languages of Africa, North and South America, Asia, Oceania and Europe are taught and investigated. The rich variation in the world's languages is studied in terms of both its historical evolution and its contemporary manifestations, including many endangered languages. LUCL also brings together descriptive, historical, theoretical, and cognitive linguistics, as well as psycho- and neurolinguistics, sociolinguistics and pragmatics.

In the last seven years, LUCL has taken several initiatives to encourage cooperation between the three programmes. One example is that LUCL has offered and awarded 5 PhD positions with the specific requirement that the projects should contribute to the Institute's mission and objectives, and involve supervisors from different research programmes. The self-assessment reports lists a number of other examples of collaboration between the programmes. The division into research programmes is dynamic, with many overlaps in individual research and research projects.

LUCL has played an important role in the foundation of the Leiden Institute for Brain and Cognition (LIBC). In this institute, language is one of the central areas of research, and linguists from LUCL work closely with psychologists, biologists and medical researchers. In addition, LUCL researchers also collaborate with researchers from other disciplines, including anthropology, archaeology, genetics, history and literary studies.

The Executive Board of Leiden University selected LUCL's research as one of the eleven research profile areas in the University: Language Diversity in the World. The self-assessment report regards this as an indication of the quality and scientific relevance of LUCL's research.

The self-assessment report states that LUCL's quality and scientific relevance are manifested by its output in terms of national and international publications, PhD graduates, acquired projects and signs of recognition for its research staff. These are specified for each research programme.

According to the self-assessment report, the linguistic research carried out at LUCL is of an internationally authoritative calibre. This is evidenced by the partnerships with other research institutions around the world, and by the active role played by staff members in relevant research networks and various international committees. The most prominent staff members serve on the boards of national and international scholarly organisations, and as general editors of important national and international journals. Several journals edited by LUCL members have been given A-status in the ERIH list. A selection of the most important signs of recognition for the LUCL

research staff is provided for each research programme.

Assessment/remarks
The institute's output is impressive in its quality, often representing international-level research and in some cases even world-leading research. While the overall quality can be judged as fairly consistent across the programmes, there are visible differences in their contribution, manifesting a combination of factors: partly it is the individual contribution of high-achieving senior researchers, partly it is strong team work. Though this is not a strict requirement in SEP, the Committee was surprised that no indications were given as to where the institute stands in relation to other linguistics programmes in the Netherlands or what can be taken as a benchmark against which to judge the quality of the output as compared to the institute's peers nationally.

3. Resources
On 1 September 2012 the tenured academic staff of LUCL consisted of 15 full professors (13.2 fte), 4 associate professors (UHD; 3.6 fte), 26 assistant professors (UD; 19.1 fte), and 28 language instructors (docent; 15.2 fte), totalling 51.1 fte. The institute also employs 14 temporary postdocs (10.3 fte). The LUCL support staff comprises one Institute Manager (0.8 fte), two technical support staff (1.26 fte) and three secretaries (1.8 fte). LUCL currently has 103 PhD students.

The tenured staff members at the Faculty of Humanities have an official percentage of 75% teaching time. This leaves 22% for research and 3% for administrative tasks. In order to increase the research time of its members, LUCL encourages them to apply for grants as often as allowed by the granting agencies.

In the period covered by this report, 73 projects have been financed by external organisations, mainly NWO and the EU. In total this amounts to M€ 23.7. In 2012 the LUCL had the second highest share of external funding of all the institutes in the Faculty.

The Faculty's budget cuts in 2008 and the reorganisation that took place in that year resulted in the loss of 10.4 fte, with expertise in – among others – Caucasian, Turkic, Himalayan, Nilo-Saharan and Bantu, and Middle American languages, which could not be replaced.

Eight members of LUCL working on languages of Asia and the Middle East hold formal joint appointments in LUCL and the Leiden Institute for Area Studies (LIAS).

LUCL receives an amount for the so-called Unica (in 2012: K€ 466), which are unique and often small areas of expertise in the Netherlands. The funds allocated by the Faculty are not sufficient to guarantee these fte for the Unica in relation to the actual salary costs, so they have to be matched by LUCL.

The self-assessment report states that the library facilities can be considered excellent in comparison with other linguistic research institutes in and outside of the Netherlands, and include important digital research resources. The equipment and infrastructural research environment for experimental linguistics are also considered very good, thanks to the collaboration with other research institutes within Leiden University via LIBC.

Assessment/remarks
With respect to financing, the institute members have been quite successful in actively seeking and securing external funding for their research and it will clearly be necessary to keep these efforts up. However, the institute resources are lagging behind in accommodating the rapidly

shifting focus of linguistic research toward becoming a strongly empirically based, computationally and quantitatively supported science, comparable to lab-based scientific research. The lack of beta financing that would afford institute members independent resources for conducting up-to-date empirical research puts the institute's competitiveness in a disadvantage at the international level. The institute's management must take an active role in advocating the needs of its researchers at the faculty and university level.

There are also reasons to be concerned about the teaching load, which is heavy and appears to be unevenly distributed within the institute, partly in relation to the differences in student numbers across teaching programmes. The Committee was happy to learn that the Management Team is aware of this situation and the Director of Studies has already taken concrete steps in developing a system that would ensure a more equal teaching load across the programmes in the languages. The decision to have a programme in general linguistics in which students with various language backgrounds participate is also a good move and should further help relieve the financial pressures connected to teaching loads.

4. Productivity
With a total research staff of between 91.4 fte and 84.3 fte in the years 2006-2011, about 3.5 publications were produced on average for each full-time equivalent of research time.

The Institute as a whole produced 1874 publications in the period under review, including 769 refereed academic articles, 53 books, 354 book chapters, 76 PhD theses, 151 professional publications and 62 publications for the general public.

LUCL publications	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	
Refereed articles	143	154	159	114	105	94	769
Non-refereed articles	9	14	15	6	6	3	53
Books	10	10	14	5	8	10	57
Book chapters	41	35	58	85	69	66	354
PhD theses	15	9	8	17	12	15	76
Conference papers	1	0	2	3	4	14	24
Professional publications	17	27	32	38	28	9	151
Publications aimed at the general audience	12	17	6	12	4	11	62
Other research output	59	57	61	50	53	53	333
Total publications	**307**	**323**	**355**	**330**	**285**	**274**	**1874**

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
On the whole, the institute is very productive and for the most part has maintained its productivity in spite of the loss of faculty due to the recent budget cuts. The productivity levels differ somewhat within and across the individual programmes (there is, however, a somewhat conspicuous drop in Programme 2). The institute could make better effort in ensuring higher visibility of the institute's output, especially as concerns the dissertations in descriptive linguistics (whether published or not) and perhaps in articulating general guidelines for publication strategies, in order to encourage its scholars to aim for the highest quality outlets within their specialties. In addition, more efforts should be undertaken for the younger members to engage in competitive publication; this issue is actually connected to a broader problem that concerns faculty development strategies, which will be addressed in section 7.

5. Societal Relevance
The self-assessment report states that LUCL is keenly aware of the increasing importance of the nexus between universities and society at large. LUCL makes an important contribution to high-profile networks that enhance the visibility and relevance of research. LUCL considers it important to pay attention to demand – i.e. what potential partners need, and how that is compatible with what LUCL has to offer – and to establishing structural partnerships with cultural and educational institutions, media, NGOs, government and business.

Language description and documentation involves working with the local communities, and as a consequence LUCL researchers get involved in activities for and by the community. This may involve advice on matters regarding orthography and mother tongue education, help in the preparation of primers, publication of reading materials or assistance in production of maps to substantiate use of land by the community and defend land against claims from outside.

The self-assessment report also lists a large number of other activities for non-academic audiences, such as lectures for high-school students, public symposia, interviews, newspaper articles, media appearances, advisory work, fundraising and practical language courses.

Assessment/remarks
The institute research brings along two natural sources for providing socially relevant impact: the overarching theme of linguistic diversity and the equally strong tradition in Dutch linguistics. Linguistic diversity is increasingly important in the globalised world and it is certainly a challenge for Europe; the scope of issues and areas that can benefit from the institute's applied research is broad (social issues, environmental, cultural, political, health etc.) and some of this potential is already being realised in various ways. On a more local level, the institute provides good public service through various forms of public outreach. The institute is in an excellent position for staying engaged with larger societal concerns and could be even more active in helping identify relevant areas and in targeting new funding resources which are specifically concerned with "big societal challenges"

6. Strategy for the future
The self-assessment report states that the research programmes of LUCL are well established, and a very effective research organisation (with only a few hierarchical layers) is in place. The research programmes collaborate and fit in very well with the relevant key research areas of the University (e.g. Language Diversity in the World (LUCL) and Brain Function and Dysfunction over the Lifespan (LIBC).

Five important strategic lines are at stake:
* further internal collaboration and integration;
* further inter- and multidisciplinary collaboration outside LUCL;
* new lines of research;
* the relationship between linguistic research and teaching;
* long-term research policy and budgetary freedom.

Internal collaboration and integration
Further and deeper collaboration and integration should take place between the three LUCL re-search programmes. Theoretical linguists are increasingly collaborating with descriptive linguists in various research projects to enrich theoretical models and test experimental designs. Theoretical and experimental linguists collaborate in a number of projects to experimentally test theoretical proposals. A third type of integration takes place between theoretical linguists and

historical linguists. A fourth type of integration is between historical linguists and specialists in language use. A fifth type of integration is between experimental linguists and descriptive linguists. The self-assessment report states that all these types of collaboration and integration should be intensified and new types of internal collaboration and integration should be encouraged (for example between experimental linguists and specialists in language use).

Inter- and multidisciplinary collaboration outside LUCL
At the institute level, inter- and multidisciplinary collaboration with partners outside LUCL takes place with social and natural sciences, especially psychology and biology, within the framework of LIBC. On a more individual basis, LUCL members work together with scholars in disciplines such as anthropology, archaeology, genetics, history and literary studies. In the coming years, LUCL wants to intensify and deepen these types of cooperation. Firstly for academic reasons, because Linguistics in general and LUCL research in particular can contribute a great deal to what can be called 'the interface between cultural studies, social studies and sciences'. Secondly, this type of collaboration also offers opportunities for interesting grant applications.

New lines of research
LUCL intends to encourage more research in the following domains:
- diversity in aspects of language use, which would require additional expertise in (historical) sociolinguistics and pragmatics;
- diversity and second language acquisition;
- multilingualism, a topic that is receiving increasing attention globally, but especially within the European Union.

The relationship between linguistic research and teaching
Linguistics programmes and courses have to attract enough students to create the financial resources that will enable LUCL to maintain and strengthen its existing research programmes and start new lines of research. LUCL intends to take initiatives to make Linguistics programmes and courses – at both the Bachelor's and Master's level – more attractive for students within and outside the Faculty of Humanities and, on the other hand, making the Bachelor's teaching in particular more efficient by teaching larger groups of students from several Bachelor's programmes. As a consequence of this every LUCL member is expected to be able and willing to teach in different programmes at the Bachelor's and Master's level.

Long-term research policy and budgetary freedom
LUCL has to return any financial surplus at the end of each financial year to the Faculty of Humanities, which makes it impossible for LUCL to keep its own reserve funds and develop a real long-term policy. In the near future LUCL hopes to remedy this, in close cooperation with the other research institutes within the Faculty of Humanities.
LUCL wants to develop a long-term personnel policy because in the next five years some senior members will retire. Furthermore, LUCL wants to make it possible to offer career prospects to excellent assistant professors and postdocs, preferably through a functional tenure track system.

Assessment/remarks
The mid-term report included in its recommendations a new chair in second language acquisition. The Committee was initially puzzled that the institute appeared to reject this suggestion in its response to the mid-term report, yet mentioned second language acquisition among its future priorities in this review. However, this issue was clarified satisfactorily. Research in second language pedagogy specifically is related to the institute's language teaching responsibilities, but does not align well with the institutes research focus areas, and hence is not regarded as a priority for a new chair. On the other hand, research in second language acquisition and multi-lingualism

from a basic science perspective is certainly relevant to the institute's overall goals, both with regard to the themes of language diversity and brain and cognition. LUCL members, especially some in Programme 1, are developing new research in this direction, including spearheading a European network proposal on multilingualism. But institute members do not appear to regard this area as a priority for a new chair. The Committee agreed with this assessment of the place of second language acquisition among LUCL's priorities.

What is crucial, though, is another recommendation the midterm report made, to which the institute has not given any priority so far. Specifically, having a chair in typology is indispensible to the success of the research programme of an institute such as LUCL – not only for strengthening the diversity scholarship, as noted in the midterm report, but particularly for providing a conceptual anchor in Programme 2 and thus for helping to develop it into an internally coherent unit. Moreover, having a chair in typology will complete the fundamental methodological framing for the whole institute, mentioned in section 1. This Committee recommends that as soon as a chair in Programme 2 becomes available, it ought to be advertised as a chair in typology, with a possible focus on one of the regions covered by Programme 2.

As already mentioned in section 4, the institute can do a lot more to fully embrace the paradigm shift that is under way within the linguistic field in general and that increasingly defines linguistics as an empirical science. To stay truly competitive internationally, the institute's research orientation should move more visibly in this direction and this can be done through a number of forward-looking initiatives. The practical side of this vision involves focus on providing adequate resources in terms of necessary equipment (the Committee is happy to know that first small steps in acquiring such resources have already been taken), to support experimental, computational, and corpus-related scholarship across the whole institute, including digital archiving of data; securing beta financing for building the institute's independence would be highly desirable and is fully justified by the rapidly changing character of the field. But the institute should also encourage all its programmes to articulate innovative collaborative research within and across programmes that would be in line with this general direction toward cutting edge empirical approaches. The Committee also concurs with the Dean's concern about being more proactive in identifying possible new sources of financing (e.g. through the European Horizon 2020 programme) and exploring concrete ways in which the institute's research can fit in such frameworks.

Finally, the vitality and future success of the institute will to a great extent depend on its ability to address the most problematic aspects of its career development system. It will be crucial for the institute's competitiveness to be able to not just identify and nurture young talent, but above all to keep it, as the necessary foundation for the institute's continuing strength. The current system of fixed positions with hardly any prospects for moving up in the seniority ranks or along a clear career path is rather discouraging for junior scholars and in the long run will only continue to hurt the institute as a whole. The Management Team expressed great willingness to serve as a test case for the whole faculty in trying to institute a more open, tenure-track-like system which uses step-by-step promotions based on quality. The Committee certainly encourages such a move and recommends that the institute be given this opportunity. A related problem has to do with the ius promovendi as currently applied; the Committee would favour a system in which even assistant professors can be promoters, based on their experience and proven capacity for leading a dissertation. All in all, the current practice of career opportunities creates a great imbalance in terms of age. When combined with the equally striking asymmetry in terms of gender (e.g. there are hardly any women in structural positions), the system calls for serious rethinking in terms of diversity, not only in order to stay in touch with current realities of the workplace, but also in its own interest: the waste of promising talent will negatively affect the institute's competitiveness.

7. PhD Training

The Management Team of LUCL is responsible for the graduate programme in Linguistics. The programme makes use of activities organised by the national research school for linguistics, LOT (*Landelijke Onderzoekschool Taalkunde*). These activities include national summer and winter schools, PhD thesis publication services, and activities announced by LOT members through the weekly newsletter.

The PhD programme is intended for standard and contract PhD students (with their own funding). All openings for standard PhD positions are advertised in an open competition.

During the first year of the PhD, the students attend a number of academic courses in their field of research and develop their initial research proposal. The training programme of the PhD phase consists of the following components:

1. All students are expected to attend the LUCL Colloquium, a series of monthly lectures on all topics in linguistics. The series includes both internationally renowned guests and LUCL researchers.
2. All students participate in the PhD discussion group, which meets roughly once a month and where students present their research to their peers.
3. All students are required to take part in at least two LOT summer or winter schools, where they not only take courses within their own line of research but also courses that are not directly linked to their research, in order to broaden their linguistic scope.
4. The various research programmes within LUCL organise many different research activities. Research programmes have their own reading groups; some meet regularly over lunch with a presentation by a group member or a guest, and some have a lecture series. Most thesis defences are followed by a one-day dedicated colloquium. Some research programmes organise summer schools or participate in internationally organised schools. These activities are open to all. Students tend to participate at least once every two weeks in an event of this kind. In addition, there are talks, conferences and colloquia at other universities in the Netherlands, such as Amsterdam or Utrecht, both of which are nearby.
5. PhD students are encouraged to attend at least two international conferences, and to spend a semester abroad. Students who work within the field of descriptive linguistics spend a considerable amount of time abroad to do fieldwork.
6. PhD students are offered the following practical courses: Teacher Training; Academic English; Dutch, if applicable; and at the end of the project, Career Orientation.

In principle all senior staff members can supervise a PhD student. A full professor is always involved and responsible for the supervision as the so-called promotor, because this is required in the Dutch system. Standard PhD students are supervised by a team, never by a single staff member. A Training and Supervision Plan includes the composition of the supervision team, the frequency of supervision, courses to be attended, courses to be taught by the PhD student, large financial expenditures, and a detailed plan of action for the project. Every year there is an evaluation meeting attended by the PhD student, the promotor, any other supervisors and a member of the Management Team. The PhD student is asked to write a detailed report on progress and results of the past year.

PhD students share offices, with a maximum of three PhD students per office. All PhD students have an individual computer at their disposal with access to the internet and the Library, with its online text journals. Social events are regularly organised to promote the social cohesion of the group of PhD students.

LUCL provides PhD students with support for fieldwork and other research costs, travel expenses for two international conferences, participation in the LOT summer and winter schools and costs of printing the dissertation, all of which amounts to a 'personal budget' of about € 2,500 for the full period of their PhD appointment.

The standard period for a PhD is four years. It should be taken into account that many students opt for a part-time PhD position, which allows them five years of PhD appointment, and that there is on average 6 months between completion and the public defence and publication of the thesis. The average time for completion of a PhD is 4.8 years. This is a relatively good success rate within Leiden University.

During the third and fourth year of the PhD appointment, career plans are discussed with the students. The LUCL staff and the student's thesis supervisors spend considerable time and effort on coaching the candidate, for instance in the process of writing a grant proposal for a postdoctoral position.

Assessment/remarks
The institute attracts impressive numbers of PhD students and from a very diverse pool. The students seem quite happy with their situation as students, and particularly appreciate the dedication and active role of the Director of Studies and the Institute Manager in helping them navigate their PhD career. The students' experience with their dissertation supervisors is varied, as could be expected, and the institute could be perhaps more attentive to this aspect, in letting the students know explicitly enough that there are instruments for addressing their problems early.

The Committee recommends that LUCL continue to pay special attention to the way PhD students receive meaningful coaching in preparation for their future job prospects, also in view of the rapid changes in the field. The students ought to be encouraged to develop sufficiently broad and versatile profiles that would make them attractive to employers, including the university itself: it emerged from the interviews that the successful candidates for academic jobs in the future will be increasingly expected to bring more diverse teaching and research capacity. The training of the institute's PhDs should explicitly reflect this general preference. The Committee believes that the PhD students need to have broad research and teaching skills if they want to qualify for a career in a general linguistics context. The students themselves did show an awareness that teaching experience was important for their future careers.

Programme 1: Formal Theoretical and Experimental Linguistics

Programme coordinator: (all full professors are programme directors)
Research staff 2011:   14.5 tenured, 40.4 total fte

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

This programme brings together formal linguists and experimental researchers. Researchers in theoretical linguistics study the different traditional fields of linguistics: lexicon, phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics. Research in experimental linguistics includes psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics, experimental phonetics and computational linguistics.

Quality
The scope of the research in Programme 1 clearly shows the ways in which linguistic research is undergoing a transformation as a science. The group has a number of highly visible and productive staff in the standard areas of theoretical linguistics (phonology, syntax, semantics), and also has expertise in areas of linguistics that clearly belong to the laboratory sciences. This includes phonetics, psycholinguistics, and child language acquisition. The programme's experts in these areas are engaged in high quality research that is yielding a very good level of publications, often in prominent outlets. However, this solid foundation is significantly enhanced by the ways in which Programme 1 members are proactively engaged in pushing research in creative new directions, leading to an impressive level of dynamism in the research. Relative to the other programmes at LUCL, Programme 1 covers areas that are widely represented in the Netherlands and internationally, and hence it is correspondingly difficult for this programme to achieve national or worldwide leadership. The Leiden group is among the leading groups in the Netherlands and is internationally competitive, but it probably does not have a reputation as a world leader, except in the profiles of certain highly accomplished individuals. However, the ways in which the programme is innovating both internally and externally provide the potential for it to achieve a higher level of international recognition.

There is little formal leadership structure in the programme, but in the case of Programme 1 this may not be a concern, since there is clear leadership in the way that the best of the senior faculty present a coherent vision for the group and serve as a model for all staff in their energetic and forward-looking approach to science. This is an instance where the 'light' managerial structure of the institute is effective in allowing creative research to flourish.

The research output of Programme 1 is of a high quality, appearing in many of the most important journals in linguistics and psycholinguistics. And there is no doubt that many of the group's members are highly regarded in their field, as reflected in editorships, awards, and invitations. It is more difficult to gauge the influence of the work, and the group members could have done more to provide an assessment of this in the self-assessment report and in their presentation. The research receives a solid level of impact, as reflected in measures such as citation counts, but less research would be classified as highly influential in the field. The prominence of the research varies substantially across group members, and much of the internationally visible research is being generated by a smaller number of researchers. The

strength of the group's research profile would be greater if more of the staff at the UD and UHD levels showed a publication trajectory consistent with future professor-level status, especially in terms of consistently publishing work in leading international journals.

There are numerous examples of the ways in which Programme 1 members are pursuing research in innovative directions. Experts in specific languages or language families are taking advantage of other language resources at Leiden – Programme 1 members expressed enthusiasm about the benefit of having expertise in diverse languages in the institute (other groups did not appear to reciprocate this interest to the same extent). Theoretical linguists are collaborating with experimental linguists, and some are engaged in very creative collaborations with scientists outside language – Johan Rooryck's new Horizon project is particularly notable in this regard. Experimentalists are supervising projects on psycholinguistics in less studied languages. Other group members are expanding into research related to clinical populations, or related to multilingualism.

The research in Programme 1 is also benefitting from an expansion of its lab resources, with new facilities recently or soon to be added for testing infants, eye-tracking, and event-related brain potentials. Importantly, these facilities are located close to LUCL, rather than on the other side of the city, and so this should increase the possibilities for engagement of more institute members in the experimental research.

Productivity
The published output from Programme 1 is very good in terms of quantity, though with much variation across programme members. The publications of group members have appeared in a number of high quality international journals. Almost 50% of the Programme 1 research output appears in refereed journals, a figure that is unusually good, both for linguistics in general and for LUCL. However, this profile is based on uneven contributions, and is boosted significantly by Prof Schiller's strong record of publication in top cognitive (neuro)science journals. The breadth of the group's research strength would be improved by publication strategies that emphasise publications in prominent international journals.

Programme 1 members have been successful in securing external funding for research, with a total income of 9.4M euros in 2006-2011, distributed across many researchers. This includes 3 VENI, 7 VIDI, and 1 VICI awards, plus a number of open competition awards from NWO, and a couple of notable European awards. The earning capacity of Programme 1 is healthy.

The programme generated 29 PhD graduates and 45 are currently under supervision. LUCL produced an overview of the job situation of LUCL's PhD graduates, which shows that they were successful in finding employment in and outside an academic environment. The quality of the PhD students and the success of the programme's graduates is an important contributor to its (inter)national profile.

Societal relevance
At its best, theoretical linguistic research has a high level of societal relevance. Linguists and psycholinguists are often reluctant to view their work in these terms, but research that meets the goals of understanding common principles of human language and its variation is relevant to many different applied areas in technology, education, and health. The Committee was happy to see that researchers in Programme 1 do not shy away from placing their work in this societal context, and it enriches the group. Members have been engaged in research on cochlear implant patients; they are taking the lead in a collaborative effort on multilingualism; they are engaging with European priorities and with local institutions; many project members are active in public

communication, in some cases with high visibility (van Oostendorp). Overall, Programme 1 shows that it takes seriously the importance of societal relevance of science.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future
The vitality of Programme 1 is a great strength, and it is clearly a model for all of LUCL in this regard. The size of the group is good, and is consistent with other leading programmes both in the Netherlands and internationally. There are no concerns about age or retirement of programme leaders. If anything, a greater threat would be the danger of loss of its leaders to other institutions. The group is well prepared to respond to rapidly changing demands on science, and to take advantage of emerging opportunities. The Committee was impressed with the resourcefulness and creativity of the group, and with the sense of common purpose that the group conveyed. Programme 1 members are innovating in many ways in their research, exploring new areas and moving outside their comfort zones. This is very healthy. There is good mentoring of junior faculty, specifically in the area of preparing grant proposals for the highly sought after VENI, VIDI, VICI competitions. Junior faculty expressed satisfaction with the support that they receive in this regard. It is less clear to what extent other mentoring and career development activities are used to build a next generation with similar capacity to the programme's current leaders. The lack of a tenure-track system holds back this group. The Dean expressed to the Committee the wish that LUCL should more proactively engage with emerging research oportunities at the national and international level, so it was particularly striking to hear from Programme 1 about the ways in which it is already active in this regard. Prof. Cheng is an articulate leader for the group in this regard.

Like the other programmes at LUCL, the programme in Formal Theoretical and Experimental Linguistics is strong. It deserves to be counted among the leading groups in its area in the Netherlands, and it is internationally visible, if not at the level of a world leader. The quality and quantity of the research output is strong, and more importantly it shows a high degree of vitality. However, Programme 1's vitality is probably higher than its visibility – the broader linguistic community may not be sufficiently aware of the programme's strengths and its creative outlook. The programme should seek ways to broaden awareness of its strengths, through on-line communication and other methods. The programme's research has a profile that increasingly makes it hard to distinguish from research in behavioral sciences: this is consistent with broad trends in linguistics, but the programme's funding model lags behind its research practices. The programme's lab-focused research efforts deserve classification as a beta science.

Programme 2: Language Use and Language Description

Programme coordinator: (all full professors are programme directors)
Research staff 2011:   14.1 tenured, 27.5 total fte

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

This programme brings together descriptive linguists and researchers studying language use from a variety of theoretical perspectives. The central focus is on data from actual language use. They apply and develop various methodological and theoretical tools for drawing conclusions about the structural properties of both grammar (lexicon, phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics) and pragmatics (discourse, stylistics, rhetoric and argumentation) and their variation. The languages in which these topics are mostly studied are Chinese, Dutch, English, Japanese and Russian.

The programme is presented as consisting of two subgroups: (1) cognitive linguistics and discourse-based research, including Dutch linguistics; (2) language description. The first puts emphasis on usage-based approaches to language, studying its cognitive grounding both synchronically and diachronically, and usage based research in Dutch linguistics, including links to journalism and new media. The second represents Leiden's traditional commitment to descriptive linguistics, with current strengths in specific language areas of Africa, Asia, South America, and the Pacific. While some of the work within the second group undoubtedly has to do with language use, descriptive linguists draw from formal as well as functional insights of general linguistic theory, from the expanding field of typology and language universals, and from historical linguistics (reconstruction, dialectology, contact phenomena etc.). The review Committee thus had some difficulty identifying a common purpose or vision to the two parts of programme or how they have or can be working together. The oral presentation report on slide 7 concerning interactions within the programme: "for obvious reasons: few joint projects/publications" gave us the impression that faculty working on different languages do not see a way to define a way to work together. In our view programme 2 is the logical place for language specialists to collaborate, and for further involvement in the rapidly expanding field of linguistic typology, in which Leiden should play a greater leadership role. We did note the extensive interdisciplinary cooperation with anthropology, archeology, biology, history, political science, and literary and cultural studies.

Quality
The Committee immediately recognised that programme 2 represents two long-standing traditional strengths of Leiden, perhaps those for which Leiden is best known within the field of linguistics in general. The researchers in programme 2 are world-class: the full professors are distinguished and well-known leaders in their respective fields, and the younger scholars show considerable accomplishment and promise. Still, Leiden has undergone significant loss of expertise in its coverage of other language areas (Altaic, Dravidian, Sino-Tibetan). Whether this can be made up for by reconceptualising the bipartite grouping in programme 2 remains to be seen. We were concerned that those present at our meeting could not articulate an on-going common vision other than in the most general terms. The Committee was reassured by our second meeting with the institute management, who made clear their commitment to the two areas and their belief that the two parts were in the process of coming together.

Productivity

As mentioned, the members of programme 2 have been highly productive, publishing four books, and over 50 articles and book chapters in important journals and collections. There also were 7 edited books and other editorial work, among which the editing of the Leiden-based Journal of African Languages and Linguistics and Prof. Adelaar's Languages of the Andes project. The faculty have both actively presented their work at conferences, many as invited keynotes, and have organised topical workshops and general conferences as well, e.g. the annual Leiden Conference on African Languages and Linguistics (CALL). Still we were concerned that those we spoke with could not explain why there had been a precipitous drop in the number of refereed articles from a high of 63 in 2006 to a low of 26 in 2011. If this had been due simply to this programme bearing the major brunt of the loss of 10.4 FTEs, we would have expected for all of the numbers to go down proportionately, whereas the number of books and book chapters have remained constant over the same years. During this period the programme 2 faculty have also effectively directed a large number of PhD dissertations, including an impressive series of grammars of un- or underdescribed languages, some of which have seen their way into publication, e.g. by Brill. We believe that our proposal to add links to the list of all dissertations on the LUCL web page, so that PDFs could be downloaded, would especially benefit this group, which should also consider a separate website publicity to highlight the descriptive grammars in one place, if not all of the accomplishments of both faculty and students in each of the two subparts of the programme.

Societal Relevance

The programme members have interacted with society at several levels, and in multiple ways. Their participation in the *Leiden Communicatiestad* and cooperation with *Museum Volkenkunde* were noted, as Prof. Mous' public contributions, Prof. Van Haaften's chairing of the board of the *Digitale Bibliotheek Nederlandse Letteren*, among many other contributions. The group's involvement with journalistic language and the description and preservation of endangered languages are additional added societal benefits on both a local and global scale.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future

As outlined above, the faculty and recent PhDs have produced a strong scholarly output over the past six years. In addition, they have been quite successful at raising external funding for their projects and for supporting graduate students. However, as mentioned, the Committee was concerned about the loss of FTEs in this area as well as the coherence of this programme. While this may simply represent the transitional stage in which this programme finds itself after the recent restructuring, we urge them to consider self-identifying as typologists who work on cognitive and pragmatic aspects of languages and grammar. (Those appropriate language specialists who are not members of the Association for Linguistic Typology should seriously consider it.)

We felt that the group did not seriously consider its weaknesses in its SWOT analysis. The group needs to develop a leadership strategy to deliver a coherent and effective definition of programme 2. To be coherent, thought should be given as to how to relate the traditional strengths in cognitive linguistics and Dutch discourse studies to the descriptive commitments of those writing grammars. As we have suggested, the latter enterprise should be more thoroughly grounded in typology, where Leiden should be acting in a leadership role, perhaps further drawing also on the historical linguistic expertises of programme 3.

Programme 3: Language and History

Programme coordinator: (all full professors are programme directors)
Research staff 2011:   6.8 tenured, 16.4 total fte

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

This programme brings together researchers in the field of historical linguistics and philologists interested in specific languages and language families, such as Indo-European, Semitic and others. They focus mainly on language change in various aspects, including language use in earlier stages of the language. It comprises comparative Indo-European linguistics, historical linguistics (e.g. of Dutch, English, Slavic and Semitic), language contact, historical sociolinguistics, linguistic historiography and the philological study of texts belonging to the older language stages (such as Sanskrit, Aramaic, Old Russian and Late Modern English and Dutch).

Quality
The quality record of Programme 3 is remarkable, given the reduced amount of members on the level of professorships, especially full professorships. The reason for the reduction of the programme's bandwidth mostly consists in the discontinuation of chairs or professorships in consequence of the restructuring of the Faculty between 2008 and 2009; the decrease resulting from this was considerably higher than in the other programmes, and it certainly led to a decrease of coherence that has not yet been compensated totally. Nevertheless the programme members have maintained a remarkably high level of prominence and impact, for parts even world-wide. Given that the fields covered by the programme are rather underrepresented in the academic agenda of today, the programme can be regarded as a unique characteristic of the LUCL; this is especially true for the subject of Historical Sociolinguistics. The programme has raised a considerable amount of funding from external sources to support its research activities, also on an international basis, which is well in balance with the size of the programme in comparison with the other programmes. The programme members are aware of the necessity to care for the sustainability of data their are developing in the course of their projects but have not found a satisfying solution for this yet (cf. below).

Productivity
With the series of Indo-European Etymological Dictionaries (published by Brill), the programme has developed and maintained a highly ambitious publication project that is well esteemed world-wide, has a considerable bearing beyond the academia proper, and is not paralleled anywhere else in the world at present. The series is only available commercially, both in printed form and in digital form. This is regrettable from the point of view of visibility and usability. It would have been advantageous for both the programme and the whole Institute if the declared preference for the principle of open access could have been followed.

Apart from the output in form of (hand)books and book series, the programme members have consistently had a strong record in terms of highly ranked articles, and the programme has generated a remarkable number of successful PhDs.

Societal relevance
Questions concerning etymology and the (pre-)history of spoken languages play an outstanding role in the understanding of the cultural backgrounds of the modern world, and they have always

found peculiar interest with the general public. The publication of a series of etymological dictionaries, lexicons and handbooks on ancient languages is an important contribution to meeting these demands. Additionally, the programme members have been active in terms of outreach to the public in various ways.

Viability, feasibility and vision for the future
With the restructuring of 2008–9 and the loss of fields like Altaic, Caucasian, or Siberian Linguistics, the group of programme members has reached its critical minimum. The present strategy seems to focus on the preservation of the status quo rather than extension or expansion, and there is no clear vision as to the future development of the Programme and its staff; this is comprehensible, given that subjects concerning historical linguistics are endangered today wherever national funding depends on the mere amount of students taught. Cooperation with other programmes within individual projects has been recognised as a viable way to safeguard the subjects covered and, at the same time, to widen the methodological perspective; the cooperation with Programme 2 in a project on Russian birchbark documents is a promising example of this.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Curricula vitae of the Committee members

Prof. Aafke Hulk, NIAS (KNAW)/University of Amsterdam, chair.
Aafke Hulk is full professor of French linguistics at the University of Amsterdam(UvA) since 1990. From 1999 to 2004 she was member of the general board of NWO and From 2003 to 2008 dean of the faculty of Humanities at the UvA. Since August 2010, she is rector of NIAS, a research institute of theRoyal Netherland Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) in Wassenaar. She continues her research at the University of Amsterdam. Her main research interests are early child bilingualism, in particular cross-linguistic influence and vulnerability, L1 and L2 acquisition of Romance and Germanic syntax, interaction between linguistic theory and language acquisition.

Prof. Mirjam Fried, Charles University in Prague
Since 2011, Mirjam Fried is Chair of the Linguistics Department at Charles University, Prague. In 2008 she was appointed as a docent at the Linguistic Department of the University of Helsinki and till 2011 also worked as a senior researcher in linguistics in the Czech Academy of Sciences in Prague. Between 2001 and 2008 she was Assistant Professor at the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, Princeton University. Before that she taught at the University of California at UC Berkeley, and at the University of Oregon. Her main research interests are the cognitive and functional aspects of language description and analysis, synchronic or diachronic, particularly in morphology and morphosyntax. Her language interests include Czech (Old and Modern, and Slavic material in general), Kannada, Turkish, and Lithuanian.

Prof. Jost Gippert, Universität Frankfurt
Jost Gippert is since 1994 Professor for Comparative Linguistics at the Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt. He directs the development of the text database TITUS, which will be accessible on the Internet and will contain the written sources for indogermanic linguistic comparison. His academic training and activities included comparative linguistics, Japanology, Sinology, Slavisitics, Hellenism and Indology. Since 1985 he specialised in computer-assisted speech analysis and linguistics.

Prof. Larry Hyman, University of California at Berkeley
Larry Hyman is professor of linguistics with a specialisation in phonological theory and African languages at the Department of Linguistics, University of California, Berkeley, since 1988, which he chaired from 1991 to 2002. He has worked extensively in phonology and other aspects of language structure, especially as applied to African languages. His current interests are on phonological typology, tone systems, and the comparative and historical study of the Bantu language family (of about 500 languages) for which he founded the Comparative Bantu On-Line Dictionary (CBOLD), with funding from the National Science Foundation and in collaboration with the Laboratoire Dynamique du Langage (CNRS/Université Lyon 2).

Prof. Colin Phillips, University of Maryland
Colin Phillips is Professor of Linguistics at the University of Maryland and Co-Director of the Cognitive Neuroscience of Language Lab and the Maryland MEG Center, and Associate Director of the Neuroscience and Cognitive Science Program. His research combines theoretical linguistics with language processing, language acquisition and neurolinguistics, with the primary focus on trying to understand the microstructure of linguistic computation. The ultimate objective is to be able to seamlessly integrate models of language, from high-level theoretical models all the way to the neurophysiological level.

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

Excellent (5)	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.
Very Good (4)	Research is considered nationally leading. Research is internationally competitive and makes a significant contribution to the field.
Good (3)	Research is internationally visible. Work is competitive at the national level and makes a valuable contribution in the international field.
Satisfactory (2)	Research is nationally visible. Work adds to our understanding and is solid, but not exciting.
Unsatisfactory (1)	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.
o *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.
o *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.
o *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

LUCL: Leiden Institute for Linguistics, 29&30 November 2012

Thursday 29 November 2012
09:00-11:00:   Committee meeting
11:00-12:00:   Institute management (short presentation, interview, reflection)
12:00-12:30:   Faculty Board/Dean
12:30-13:30:   Lunch
13:30-14:30:   Programme 1 (for each programme 10 minutes presentation, 30 minutes interview, 15 minutes reflection in the Committee, 5 minutes reserve/break)
14:30-15:30:   Programme 2
15:30-16:30:   Programme 3
16.30-17:30:   Interview with PhD students (limited number, selected by the Institute, with list of names and short description of their projects)
19:00:   Committee dinner

Friday 30 November 2012
09:00-11.00:   Committee meeting: conclusions, scores, problems, procedures
11:00-12.30:   Second meeting with Institute management
12:00-13.00:   Lunch
13:00-15:00   Further conclusions and tasks; writing session.