

**QANU Research Review**  
**Archaeology Leiden**

**QANU, February 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](mailto:info@qanu.nl)  
Internet: [www.qanu.nl](http://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

<b>1. The review Committee and the review procedures</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Insitute level</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. Programme level</b>	<b>16</b>
Human Origins	17
European Prehistory	19
Archaeology of the Roman Provinces, Middle Ages and the Modern Period	21
Classical Mediterranean Archaeology	22
Archaeology of the Near East	24
Carribbean and Amazonia	26
Mesoamerican and Andean Cultures	28
Material Culture and Artefact Studies	30
Archaeological Heritage Management in a Global Context	32
Bioarchaeology	34
Computer Applications in Archaeology	36
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>39</b>
Appendix A: Curriculum vitae of the Committee members	41
Appendix B: Explanation of the SEP scores	43
Appendix C: Programme of the site visit	45

## 1. The review committee and the review procedures

### Scope of the assessment

The Review Committee was asked to perform an assessment of the research in the Faculty of Archaeology at Leiden University. This assessment covers the research 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. Stephen Shennan (chair), University College London;
- Prof. Gabriel Cooney, University College Dublin;
- Dr. Friedrich Lüth, Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Berlin.

A 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 the information required by the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP), with appendices;
2. Copies of the key publications per research programme.

### Procedures followed by the Committee

The Committee proceeded according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 (SEP). Prior to the Committee meeting, each programme was assigned to two reviewers, who independently formulated a preliminary assessment. The final assessments are based on the documentation provided by the Faculty, the key publications and the interviews with the management and with the leaders of the programmes. The interviews took place on 8 and 9 November 2012 in Leiden (see the schedule in Appendix C).

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

Committee discussed the scores and comments. The texts for the committee report were finalised through email exchanges. The final version was presented to the Faculty for factual corrections and comments. The comments were discussed in the Committee. The final report was printed after formal acceptance by the Board of Leiden University.

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

## 2. INSTITUTE LEVEL – Faculty of Archaeology

### 1. The institute

The Faculty of Archaeology of Leiden University studies the development of human societies across the globe, on the basis of material remains, from the earliest hominins to the post medieval expansion of western societies and its consequences.

The Faculty took its present form in 1997, with a merger between the Faculty of Archaeology, that concentrated on prehistoric archaeology, and the Department of Archaeology of the then Faculty of Arts, focused on the Classical World, the Near East, Asia and Ancient America. Since 1983 these two entities had been housed in one building, the Archaeological Centre, and had started cooperating in the teaching programme. In 1997 this process resulted in the new Faculty.

The self-assessment report states that the broad spectrum of areas around the world covered by the Faculty's research is regarded as an important asset and that the Faculty wants its teaching to remain research-driven. To increase the robustness of the organisation, the scope has been broadened in terms of research-related teaching programmes, through cooperation with suitable partners and through accreditation of some existing specializations. The Faculty acknowledges that the diversity in terms of themes, regions and time periods has brought a certain risk of fragmentation of research, but states that integration has been achieved through (methodological and theoretical) cooperation between researchers in the Faculty, joint PhDs between chairgroups and other mechanisms.

The Faculty is responsible for the following degree programmes in archaeological education:

- Three-year Bachelor Archaeology, with the following six specialisations in year 2 and 3:
  - Archaeology of North-western Europe
  - Archaeology of Indian America
  - Archaeology of the Classic World
  - Archaeology of the Near East
  - Palaeoecology
  - Computer applications
- One-year Master Archaeology, with the following fifteen specialisations:
  - Archaeology and Anthropology of Mesoamerica and the Andes (MA)
  - Archaeology of the Caribbean and Amazonia (MA)
  - Archaeology of East and Southeast Asia (MA)
  - Archaeology of Egypt (MA)
  - Archaeology of the Near East (MA)
  - Classical and Mediterranean Archaeology (MA)
  - Archaeology of the Roman provinces, the Middle Ages and Modern Period (MA)
  - Heritage Management in a world context (MA)
  - Museum Studies (MA)
  - Field Archaeology (MA)
  - Palaeolithic Archaeology (MA)
  - Prehistory of North-Western Europe (MA)
  - Artefact Studies (MSc)<sup>1</sup>
  - Palaeoecology (MSc)
  - Human osteology and funerary archaeology (MSc)

---

<sup>1</sup> The MSc degree programmes are provided in collaboration with Delft University of Technology.

- Two-year Research Master Archaeology, with the following four specialisations:
  - Human Origins
  - Prehistoric Farming Communities in North-Western Europe
  - Town and Country: Mediterranean Region and the Near East
  - Religion and Society: Native American cultures.
- PhD programme (organised by the Graduate School of Archaeology).

The Graduate School and Undergraduate School of Archaeology were introduced in 2008. In 2009 the existing structure of four sections<sup>2</sup> was abolished and replaced by the creation of chairgroups, which resulted in increased cooperation and visibility. The chairgroups do not have a fixed existence, because success is regarded as highly dependent on individual skill and competence. This also implies that there is no core research. If a professor moves or retires, the Faculty will not necessarily try to fill that position.

A new chairgroup for the archaeology of the Roman provinces, the Middle Ages and the Modern Period was created in January 2012 with the appointment of prof. dr. Frans Theuws to the chair of Medieval Archaeology. The University of Amsterdam had decided to abolish the chair for Medieval Archaeology, and the core of the chairgroup was incorporated into Leiden's Archaeology Faculty by the end of 2011.

The current chairgroups are:

1. Human Origins;
  2. European Prehistory;
  3. Archaeology of the Roman Provinces, Middle Ages and the Modern Period;
  4. Classical Mediterranean Archaeology;
  5. Archaeology of the Near East;
  6. Caribbean and Amazonia;
  7. Mesoamerican and Andean cultures;
  8. Material Culture and Artefact Studies;
  9. Archaeological Heritage Management in a Global Context;
  10. Bioarchaeology;
- with
11. Expert Centre for Computer Applications in Archaeology.

The assessments of the research programmes of these groups are presented in the second part of this report.

## **2. Quality and academic reputation**

The self-assessment report (SAR) states that since 2010 cooperation with the Institute of Anthropology and Development Sociology of the Faculty of Social Sciences (FSW) has strongly increased, resulting in jointly organised conferences, joint grant applications and some joint teaching. The creation of an MA in Museum Studies was a joint FSW/FdA initiative.

The Faculty sees potential for more sustained cooperation with parts of the Faculty of Humanities and some institutes such as IAS (International Institute of Asian Studies) and NINO (Netherlands Institute for the Near East). This potential is demonstrated by the current

---

<sup>2</sup> The four sections were: 1. Prehistoric Archaeology; 2. Classical, Mediterranean and Near Eastern Archaeology; 3. Ancient America; 4. Science-based Archaeology.

'profile area' on Global Interactions. In this priority research focus area of Leiden University, there is close cooperation between the Faculty of Archaeology, parts of the Humanities Faculty, and the Institute of Anthropology. This was further enhanced by a joint application under a new grant scheme (Gravitation) introduced by NWO in the beginning of 2012.

Cooperation also exists with the Science and the Medical Faculties on DNA research, physical anthropology and pathology, with the botanical gardens and National Herbarium, and with Naturalis/National Centre for Biodiversity.

A series of Memoranda of Understanding called "The Leiden League" has been signed with all municipal archaeological services in the province of South Holland. This makes the Faculty a 'preferred partner', which guarantees professional training options and internships for students (theses, internships, and fieldwork), research options for prehistoric, provincial-Roman and (post-) Medieval archaeology and all the thematic chairgroups, and possible cooperation in larger projects.

Through the Centre of Arts and Archaeological Sciences (CAAS), the Leiden Department of Arts and the Faculty of Archaeology cooperate with different departments of Delft University of Technology. This cooperation is not only in education, but also in several research fields, including luminescence dating, photoacoustic tomography and archaeometallurgy. The Centre will be connected to a similar Centre for Archaeological Science (CAS) in Leuven through a joint MSc in Artefact Studies.

### **Assessment/remarks**

The committee was impressed by how much the Faculty has developed since the last research assessment, with a significant increase in staff numbers and in the different fields covered. It has made very effective use of strategic opportunities that have arisen. It has sustained and further strengthened its claim to be a centre for global archaeology, with a unique position that combines the strengths of both Anglo-American anthropological archaeology, with its interest in theory and interpretation, and European approaches with a strong commitment to deep knowledge and rigorous analysis of data. Its recent inauguration of a major focus on archaeological heritage management from a world perspective is also important here.

The committee believes that the creation of a new structure based on chairgroups exploiting the Faculty's strengths has been a productive development, giving the Faculty greater flexibility. The fact that the quality of virtually all the programmes reviewed was rated at least 'Very Good', with half of them rated as 'Excellent' speaks for itself. While it was not under review the committee was also impressed by the future plans and potential of the new Roman, medieval and modern chairgroup. As noted in some of the programme reviews, in the thematic chairgroups there is some tension between carrying out 'bread-and-butter' contract work for the money and producing research of the highest standard. However, it is worth pointing out that the work of some of the thematic groups underpins the excellent performance of the region/time-period based chairgroups. On the one hand this demonstrates that the integrated approach of the Faculty is working, but on the other it can also make it difficult for the achievements of the 'thematic groups' to be transparent.

The committee also commends the close collaborations the Faculty has developed both within and outside the University, which have increased the range of research opportunities. The growing links with the Institute of Anthropology, the archaeological science collaboration with Delft and the creation of the 'Leiden League' links with local municipal archaeological services are worth particular mention here.

In summary, the Faculty has grown in both strength and reputation to the point of being a leading player on the world stage. The committee commends the strategic vision of the Faculty and the quality of its leadership, which have been key to its reaching its current strong position and developing a sustainable strategy for future development

#### *Significant developments since the report was written*

It was a very striking feature of the site visit to see just how much has happened since the SAR was initially compiled – a real sign of the dynamism of the Faculty.

### **3. Resources**

#### *Number of students*

The Faculty currently receives about 60% of the nation-wide intake of first year archaeology students. It has 42.4 fte staff members (including support staff), around 450 undergraduate and graduate students, and 35 (23.4 fte) employed PhD candidates and another 45 formally registered external PhD students (March 2012). Of these external students, 10 are resident in Leiden, facilitated by the Graduate School of Archaeology. The Faculty aims at maintaining the current number of BA students and increasing the number of MA/MSc, RMA and PhD students.

#### *Teaching load*

The formal relation between education, research and administrative tasks is 60:30:10. The Faculty states that the balance remains precarious and that there is a constant danger of erosion of research time. Although the streamlining of education in the undergraduate school has been successfully realized, staff are investing more time than ever in the tutoring of first year students, an honours class, and other procedures and measures that make teaching more labour-intensive. The total available technical support time has slightly decreased over the last 5 years while the number of scientific staff has greatly increased.

#### *Funding*

The SAR reports that the Faculty suffered both generic and specific budget cuts in primary financing in the period under review. The semi  $\beta$ -level funding was replaced by lump sum funding. On the other hand, secondary financing through grants has reached a level over 50%; this success goes far beyond that what other Faculties in Leiden University have achieved.

#### *HRM policy*

The Faculty has adopted a policy of semi-tenure track appointments called “talent track”. New staff members are now appointed only in a temporary position for a period of at most 4 years, and are expected to be successful in obtaining an NWO VENI, VIDI, VICI<sup>3</sup> or an ERC starting grant during that time, or in specific cases another grant type. A tenured position will be offered at the end of the contract if the candidate fulfils the conditions. Promotion in later years is dependent on obtaining other grants such as VIDI, VICI, major EU or NWO project grants or other comparable schemes. It presupposes adequate publications, teaching and supervision of PhDs. Obtaining a VICI or an ERC advanced grant will lead to a proposal for appointment to the rank of professor.

---

<sup>3</sup> VENI: for researchers who have recently taken their PhD; VIDI: for researchers who want to develop their own innovative line of research; VICI: for senior researchers to build their own research group.

Full professors are expected to have an average of 1 PhD award per annum, measured over 3 years. As of 2011, more PhD dissertations lead to a financial bonus for the budget of the chairgroup concerned, while lack of a PhD completion leads to a cut of the budget to the same amount.

The Faculty has hired an increasing number of foreign scholars. Together with the strongly internationalized community of PhD students, these add to the international appeal, the general work climate and the attractiveness of the Faculty for prospective new colleagues.

The very strong growth in recent years had led to acute shortages of office and laboratory space. This could only be solved by spreading parts of the Faculty over several buildings (no less than four by the end of 2011). A suitable building (the fully refurbished Veth-Building) adjacent to the Hortus and to the Academy Building will become available in 2014. For the intermediate period, space has been found in a building quite close to the Faculty so that most staff and PhDs are spread over only two locations directly opposite each other with a small group still housed separately in the Academy building.

An acute shortage of space and a change in policy of the University Library (UB) led to the closure of the archaeology library and its absorption in the UB, directly opposite the Faculty. Apart from much better opening hours and better staffing, this also meant that additional office space could be created in 2010.

In the review period, a new well-equipped laboratory for osteoarchaeology was realised. The equipment of the existing laboratories for palaeobotany, archaeozoology and material sciences were expanded and improved. The ceramics laboratory has been refurbished and a new member of staff was appointed in April 2012 in a dual position with Materials Science of the TU Delft. Cooperation in CAAS and with CAS provides access to equipment in Delft and Leuven.

Field technicians are mainly provided by Archol BV, though many chairgroups organise their own fieldwork. Archol is a commercial company that is part of the Leiden University Research and Innovation Services (LURIS). Archol currently has 27 staff and works commercially in Dutch archaeology as well as in support of the Faculty's fieldwork. Archol is also a prime vehicle for students to gain practical experience in fieldwork as well as an important outlet for young archaeologists. Plans exist to expand internationally and compete for international tenders, but they have not yet been realised.

### **Assessment/remarks**

Despite some funding cuts the committee finds the Faculty to be in a strong position in terms of resources. It has been able to make use of changes in the academic landscape of the Netherlands as a whole to make strategic developments in staffing and it has an outstanding record in obtaining grants. While the laboratory and other facilities currently available are good by most standards, with a new osteoarchaeology laboratory and a refurbishment of the ceramics laboratory in recent years, pressure on space has led to fragmentation of the Faculty; the move to a new building in 2014 will mark a major improvement and has the potential to lead to more intense and fruitful collaboration among Faculty members. The provision of this building by the University is also an important indication of the value it attaches to the Faculty.

The committee commends the policy of increasing the number of Masters, Research Masters and PhD students while keeping the number of undergraduate students at current levels. It approves of the measures the Faculty has taken to streamline undergraduate teaching but notes that the

increasing demands made by undergraduate teaching and their effects on research time are not restricted to the Netherlands and are increasingly prevalent internationally.

The ‘talent track’ policy established by the Faculty provides a strong framework for the making of new appointments. It ensures that only new members of academic staff who reach the high standards required for the Leiden Faculty of Archaeology to continue enhancing its world reputation will obtain tenure.

The presence of adequate support is also essential for an effective working environment. In this respect it seems that the incorporation of the Faculty library into the University Library has been a benefit rather than a cost and the existence of Archol, the in-house fieldwork company, means that the Faculty does not need to employ field technicians and draughtspeople. Adequate laboratory support, however, is essential, as the Faculty recognises, and must be maintained.

Overall, the Faculty recognises that the future funding landscape is not predictable but has taken all sensible measures to ensure resilience and continuing success.

#### **4. Productivity**

The SAR states that the publication output is as broad as academia itself. Some is in the sciences tradition with papers in prestigious peer-reviewed journals, some in that of the humanities realm where books are written, and some is in-between. Some groups regard publications in Dutch as an essential part of their output. An international citation index across archaeology does not exist, and an unambiguous valuation of research output is therefore difficult. An analysis of the output has shown that publishing papers in prominent journals has improved, but that more attention should be paid to publishing books with international publishers.

Output in numbers of PhD students varies significantly across the Faculty. This is related to differences in the capacity to obtain grants, but also in the attraction of chairgroups to “self-funded” PhD students. There is a minimum requirement for PhD graduations per year, and additional PhD dissertations in a chairgroup are financially rewarded, but the Faculty honours the principle that in the end it is the professor who decides whether or not to take on the responsibility of accepting someone as a PhD student.

#### **Assessment/remarks**

The committee commends the very high level of productivity in the Faculty as a whole across all the key performance indicators: numbers of refereed publications, grant funding and numbers of completed PhDs. It agrees that different fields have different requirements in terms of where they publish, not least the importance of addressing Dutch as well as international audiences. However, it notes the considerable variation in the obtaining of grants across the chairgroups and recommends that the Faculty take measures to improve success rates in the areas with lower success rates, perhaps by improving its internal mentoring and draft grant evaluation processes.

The committee also recommends a continued focus on rigorous evaluation of productivity as an indicator of research excellence; this is critical to the vitality and sustainability of research.

#### **5. Societal relevance**

At least four chairgroups (Human Origins, Prehistory, Provincial Roman and Medieval as well as Caribbean archaeology) participate in preventive archaeological work in the Netherlands, Germany, and Caribbean islands, carried out by the Faculty’s ‘in-house’ excavation company Archol BV. The laboratories of the Material Culture and Bioarchaeology chairgroups also

regularly cooperate with Archol. This company was established by the Faculty and carries out archaeological projects on the basis of contracts with external parties.

A new spinoff supported by the Faculty is CommonSites, an open-source web platform that uses instant reporting and shared publicity as a way of connecting practitioners with communities.

The self-assessment report states that many other avenues for valorisation are being actively used. There is a regular collaboration with museums in exhibitions, and a steady output of popular lectures, books and other publications both nationally and in other countries. In particular the Archaeological Heritage Management and the European Prehistory chairgroups are consulted by national authorities and have had an important input in policy formation, such as the evaluation of the Monuments Act of 2007 implementing the Valletta Convention. The Archaeological Heritage Management group is also consulted by international GOs such as UNESCO and the Council of Europe as well as NGOs such as ICOMOS and foreign national or regional heritage management organisations. The cooperation in “The Leiden League” (Het Verbond van Leiden) with all the local municipal archaeology services is another example of societal relevance of the research.

### **Assessment/remarks**

The committee was impressed by the Faculty’s strong commitment to ensuring the societal relevance of its work. This is demonstrated in the range of different indicators reported by the chairgroups, including preventive archaeological work in cooperation with local authorities, work with indigenous groups and other communities, involvement in national policy formation and many contributions to museum exhibitions and popular media.

The committee recommends a continued focus on societal relevance to demonstrate the social value and impact of archaeology to contemporary society and sees great future potential in the continuing development of the Archaeological Heritage Management chairgroup, both through internal collaborations, such as that with the Caribbean chairgroup, and external ones, especially in the building of further links with the Institute of Anthropology and in the funding opportunities provided by the new collaborative partnership between the universities of Leiden, Delft and Rotterdam.

## **6. Strategy for the future**

The self-assessment report states that in 2006-2008 the Faculty of Archaeology survived an attempt to force a merger with the Faculty of Humanities. In 2011/12 the option of a merger with the Faculty of Social Sciences (FSW) was investigated, in view of the existing cooperation with the Institute of Anthropology, but moving to FSW proved to be too costly for technical reasons. At the same time, important new initiatives were taken by the national funding agency NWO that make a joint operation and a location in close proximity desirable for Archaeology, Humanities and Anthropology, along the lines of the Leiden University priority focus area on Global Interactions. The University now plans to develop a ‘human sciences’ campus in the area between the Academy building and the University Library. This will include various institutes in addition to the two Faculties and independent institutes already there such as IIAS and NINO. This could lead to a reorganisation of parts of Faculties, with a continuation of the overall present administrative structure, or possibly the creation of one very big new Faculty. In any case, the Faculty expects that the development of this wider university setting will provide a stimulating research environment and new opportunities for all parties. The new building of the Faculty of Archaeology will be strategically placed within this campus.

### **Assessment/remarks**

In the view of the Committee, the Faculty has been extremely successful over the last few years in the development and realisation of a coherent strategy for productive expansion and the consolidation of its position as a centre for global archaeology and heritage. Its aim should be to continue in this direction.

It has emerged strongly from the threat of its absorption into the Humanities Faculty and justifiably regards itself as well-placed to adapt to any institutional changes that are on the horizon. It is also well-situated to take advantage of the university's plans for a 'human sciences' campus, both physically, thanks to the new building, and academically in terms of its existing range of interests and collaborations. Furthermore, the Archaeological Heritage Management chairgroup is poised to take advantage of initiatives arising from the new links between the universities of Leiden, Delft and Rotterdam.

Appropriate systems of incentives are in place to encourage high levels of performance, including the 'talent track system', the criteria for promotion and the rewards for taking on PhD students.

Given future financial and academic uncertainties and the importance of finding and appointing the best possible academic staff, the new policy of not necessarily continuing with any given programme if its leaders leave or retire makes sense. However, it seemed to the committee during the visit that there was ambivalence about whether particular areas were 'core activities' which it was imperative to continue, for example an involvement in Dutch prehistory, and the Faculty may wish to give this further consideration.

Another area the Faculty may wish to examine is the links between the chairgroups. The individual groups clearly function extremely well internally, with strong links between group members, staff and research students, and well-organised and inclusive programmes of activities that enhance cohesion. It may be, however, that there should be more links between the groups, to maintain integration, in which the current 'matrix' system is only partly successful. One possibility here may be the development of comparative research on agreed general themes. A particular issue arises with the thematic chairgroups, which have tended to act as support groups for the interests of the period and area groups and which on average have lower performance levels than the others. These should be continuing to develop their own research agendas and also to be more involved with the area groups in the formulation of the latter's topics and questions.

### **7. PhD training and supervision**

In 2004 the Graduate School of Archaeology was founded within the Faculty, with the task of designing and implementing the PhD track (training, supervision, and monitoring). In 2007 Masters and Research Masters education was also incorporated within the Graduate School, creating an integrated graduate research and education environment.

The Faculty of Archaeology is chair of the national inter-university research school of archaeology, ARCHON. ARCHON initiates, organises and coordinates an educational programme including conferences, lecture series, thematic workshops, multi- and interdisciplinary courses and skill courses for RMA students and PhD researchers in archaeology.

A key objective of the Graduate School is to train PhD students to become independent researchers who are able to conduct research according to international standards in the discipline.

The PhD training programme consists of 40 ECTS, to be gained over 4 years in a fulltime position (one ECTS is the equivalent of 28 hrs). Of these 40 ECTS, 20 ECTS are taken from the Graduate School (and ARCHON) curriculum, the other half is developed on the individually tailored PDP (Personal Development Plan). The full PhD training consists of:

- General part, 10 ECTS, organised by the Graduate School, obligatory for all resident PhD students, oriented towards the development of broad interest and knowledge, including an Epistemology Course (prof. Corbey) and workshops.
- Specific part, 10 ECTS, related to the specialization field of the PhD student, optional, consisting of research track seminars, specific conferences and workshops (organised by the Graduate School, ARCHON, or other body).
- ‘Personal Development Plan’ (20 ECTS) which may include:
  - a stay in an international context for a certain period (research, course)
  - presenting a paper at an (international) conference
  - teaching (assistance; organisation of a workshop)
  - publication / editing plans (at least one article in a peer-reviewed journal)
  - skills-training courses.

The programme entails roughly 15% of the working time: the remaining 85% is dedicated to research. PhD students are encouraged to attend courses and conferences abroad, relevant for their research. They have a ‘personal travel budget’ of 1000 euro. Self-funded resident PhD students can apply for a Graduate School ‘travel’ grant when they present a paper abroad at a conference (800 euro).

In the period 2000-2007 ca. 25-30 % of the PhD candidates completed the dissertation within the set period, a relatively high percentage when compared to the success rate in the Netherlands in alpha-gamma disciplines, which is 15 %. Over 50% of the archaeology PhD students finish within 6 years. Delay is usually caused by taking on a job at the end of the PhD trajectory. Combining a job with completing a dissertation is hard – so the job market is a competitor in this respect. In 2012 there will be at least 8 PhD graduations (already taken place or scheduled).

The Faculty does not have specific funds for PhD or postdoctoral fellowships. The PhD candidates and postdoctoral positions are always externally funded, usually by NWO and European funds (ERC, Marie Curie). Post-graduate researchers more often than not find a job in archaeology, in the Netherlands or abroad. In the assessment period, two PhD graduates have found a tenured job in academia at the Faculty, and five young doctors were recruited for temporary (post-doctoral and replacement) positions at the Faculty. Three PhD graduates are lecturing in universities and five found a postdoctoral position abroad.

### **Assessment/remarks**

The committee was impressed by the coherent and well thought-out system of PhD training in the Faculty, with its clearly stated educational goals, and by the systematic monitoring and evaluation system; it noted the inclusion of the MA and RMA students into the Graduate School since 2007. Students also benefit from the Faculty’s role in the recently revived national inter-

university research school of archaeology, ARCHON. In addition, the committee noted with approval the way in which graduate students, from Masters onwards, are closely integrated in the activities of the chairgroups with which they are associated.

However, the committee believes that there is still room for improvement in the 4-year completion rate of PhD dissertations and was also concerned that there may not be equality in training between funded and unfunded students and also between chairgroups. It recommends that both these matters are given attention by the Faculty.

### 3. PROGRAMME LEVEL

The committee assessed the following programmes:

		<b>Q</b>	<b>P</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>V</b>
1	Human Origins	5	5	5	5
2	European Prehistory	4	4	4.5	4
3	Archaeology of the Roman Provinces, Middle Ages, and the Modern Period	-	-	-	-
4	Classical-Mediterranean Archaeology	3.5	4	3.5	3.5
5	Archaeology of the Near East	5	5	5	5
6	Caribbean and Amazonia	5	5	5	5
7	Mesoamerican and Andean cultures	5	5	5	4
8	Material Culture and Artefact Studies	4	4	4	4
9	Archaeological Heritage Management in a Global Context	5	5	5	5
10	Bioarchaeology	4.5	4	4	4
11	Computer Applications in Archaeology	4	4	4.5	4

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



To maximise the career potential of PhD students the group has adopted the approach of building theses from published papers. Most students finish within 4-5 years. The involvement of MA and Research MA students in the group's research has been effective in assisting the group's productivity

#### *Societal relevance*

The group makes strong efforts to link to the general public, including involvement in the organisation of exhibitions and high-profile media activity including a TV documentary. They have also been involved in a major preventive excavation in Germany and their collaborative work in the North Sea is of great importance for the national Heritage Service because of the large-scale quarrying that is going on there.

Joordens from the group has worked with evolutionary medicine specialists on aspects of palaeodiet relevant to present-day diseases, and the project that is being developed on the impact of fire on the human dietary niche in collaboration with food studies specialists in Wageningen University also has great potential here.

#### *Viability, feasibility and vision for the future*

As noted above, the group is heavily dependent on external grant income and non-tenured staff but continues to take a very pro-active approach to ensuring that the flow of money to carry out cutting edge research continues. Prof. Roebroeks continues to identify and bring into his group leading young scholars who will provide the foundations for continuing this chair group into the future. The very active integration of MA and PhD students into the work of the group is noteworthy.

The overall aim for the future is to continue the current focus of working directly with the material and addressing 'big questions'. It is the capacity to do both these things that distinguishes this chair group and its work. This is a valid strategy for the future when one sees the quality and achievements of the young scholars Prof. Roebroeks has brought into his group, who share his aims and have the potential to sustain his achievements.

#### **Conclusion**

This is a group of world-leading researchers producing outstanding work; the research of PhD and MA students is productively integrated into that of the group as a whole. The group's aims for the future are realistic and will ensure its continuing relevance as well as the likelihood of future funding in a time of fewer resources. A very active approach has been taken to succession planning by bringing in high-quality young researchers.

The committee recommends that the Faculty takes a positive view of the continuation of this chair group when Prof. Roebroeks retires.

**Programme 2: European Prehistory**

Programme director: Prof. H. Fokkens

Research input 2011 (tenured) : 2 fte

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

*Brief description*

The programme studies Late Prehistory (c. 3000-0 BC) of Europe, using a methodology that studies data in detail, but never takes traditional approaches and interpretations for granted and seeks alternative and complementary approaches. The focus is on the transition to fully-fledged farming landscapes (later Prehistory from the 3rd millennium BC), with a keen eye to the unfamiliar “ritual” aspects in their ordering such as sacrificial zones and barrow landscapes. Two important research fields and areas of expertise are Early Farmers (Fokkens) and Bronze Age (Fontijn). The research generally focuses on settlement and landscape of prehistoric farming communities in NW-Europe.

*Quality*

The committee considers the research to be original and to be making a significant contribution particularly to the field of Bronze Age studies internationally; the chairgroup is the leading national research group in its field with important international collaborations. The chairgroup leader (Prof. Fokkens) and other principal investigator (Fontijn) have a clearly articulated research programme which is being pursued through an integrated structure. Research has already had substantial impact in the field with the potential for greater impact when the investment in international collaboration has been realised.

*Productivity*

There is a very good and consistent published output (7 refereed articles per full-time equivalent tenured staff member) and a good mix of international publications (peer-reviewed journals and chapters in monographs). It should be noted that alongside the peer-reviewed papers several of the books are internationally peer reviewed and that in this research area there is a strong tradition of publication in the form of book chapters. Five PhDs were completed in the period under review and 15 (8 resident and 7 external) are in progress.

*Societal relevance*

The chairgroup has a very good record in this area. It has a significant impact at national level both in the conduct and the research value of archaeological field practice and on archaeological policy formation. It has strong links with the Faculty archaeological consultancy, Archol, and Jansen (0.4fte, non-tenured) is the municipal archaeologist for the town of Oss. It is clear that several of the projects of the chairgroup have been successful in the dissemination of knowledge and knowledge valorisation at the level of both the public and commercial archaeologists.

*Viability, feasibility and vision for the future*

The chairgroup recognises that the workloads of the two principal investigators are and have been a potential issue in this area. There is a clear awareness of the need for a strategy to ensure viability and sustainability, but much of the detail of that is still to be realised.

## **Conclusion**

The committee commends the chairgroup on its important contribution to the research profile of the Faculty and also the major contribution of the principal investigators to the teaching and administrative programmes of the Faculty.

The committee recommends that the chairgroup should build on its strong integrated approach to focus on more international peer-reviewed publications. The responsibilities of the chairgroup principal investigators need to be profiled, prioritised and carefully managed by them to maximise high-profile research productivity.

Given the importance of the research area of the chairgroup at a national and international level, the committee would recommend that a clear plan for its sustainability and vision for the future should be a priority. The appointment of the honorary professor is to be welcomed and that role should be integrated into planning for the future.

**Programme 3: Archaeology of the Roman Provinces, Middle Ages, and the Modern Period**

Programme director: Prof. F.C.W.J. Theuws

Research input 2011 (tenured): 0.4 fte (in 2012: 3 fte)

Assessments: Quality: -  
Productivity: -  
Relevance: -  
Viability: -

***This chairgroup came into being as of the 1st of January 2012 and thus falls outside the scope of this research assessment.***

*Brief description*

The group studies the archaeology of the Roman Period, the Middle Ages, and the Modern Period through an interdisciplinary engagement with a variety of data, the results of research in other disciplines and the theoretical positions taken by scholars in fields such as history, anthropology, art history, linguistics and sciences. One of the aims is to relate studies of the research period in Western Europe with those in the Near East and Eurasia, and thus contribute to a better understanding of Roman, medieval and modern globalization.

**Note**

Although this new chairgroup was not included in the research assessment, the committee was pleased to have the opportunity to discuss the current status and future plans of the chairgroup with Prof. Theuws.

The committee noted the very positive initiative by the Faculty in bringing Prof. Theuws from Amsterdam. The chairgroup has very significant potential to add to the diversity and quality of the Faculty and to complement and work collaboratively with other chairgroups, with excellent opportunities for cooperation and the initiation of new research projects which are being very actively pursued.

**Programme 4:** **Classical-Mediterranean Archaeology**  
Programme director: Prof. J.L. Bintcliff  
Research input 2011 (tenured) : 2.9 fte

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

#### *Brief description*

The group combines traditional Greek and Roman Archaeology and Art History with a wider interest in the long-term archaeology of the circum-Mediterranean lands (prehistory, medieval and post-medieval eras). The central theme is 'Town and Country'. This involves field survey and excavation on rural and urban sites, recording and analysis of historic buildings from Antiquity to today, the study of acculturation in the Greco-Roman World (artefactual and architectural studies in Rome, Sicily, Turkey, Alexandria), and the topic of migration in the Roman world.

It should be noted that the chairgroup leader for the period under review was Professor Bintcliff who is currently on long-term sabbatical. The committee is aware that this chairgroup is in transition and welcomed the opportunity to hear of current research and the strategy for the future from Dr. Versluys.

#### *Quality*

The chair group has an overall theme of 'Town and Country' and this was articulated clearly in relation to the overall strategy of the faculty. While the chairgroup produced work that made a valuable contribution to the field in the period under review it would have benefited from a more critical self-assessment of the research focus and coherence of the group.

#### *Productivity*

The committee notes the satisfactory output in terms of productivity (8.9 papers per tenured full time tenure staff member, with other international refereed publications). The overall strategy is focused on referred papers and book chapters. Eight PhDs were completed and 17 (6 resident and 11 external) are in progress. The chairgroup has made a significant contribution to the field.

#### *Societal relevance*

The chairgroup has a very strong international profile and impact. The valorisation of this research was achieved through involvement with communities in research areas, the organisation of museum exhibitions and conferences and the application of virtual reality technology to convey knowledge of ancient urban environments.

#### *Viability, feasibility and vision for the future*

In the self-assessment report this is the aspect of the research of the chairgroup that was perhaps least clearly articulated. While the SWOT analysis recognised the potential weaknesses and threats to the viability of the future of the chairgroup, the strategy that was stated should have been more detailed and coherent.

#### **Conclusion**

The committee is aware that this chairgroup is in transition and rejuvenation. In discussion with Dr. Versluys as a member of this chairgroup he outlined the exciting range of projects which

group members are leading and new projects being commenced. It is clear that the chairgroup has potential to have a viable and sustainable future.

**Programme 5: Archaeology of the Near East**

Programme director: Prof. P.M.M.G. Akkermans

Research input 2011 (tenured) : 1.5 fte

Assessments:	Quality:	5
	Productivity:	5
	Relevance:	5
	Viability:	5

*Brief description*

On the basis of sound empirical data, the group is pursuing a broad array of theoretically-informed research projects into issues relevant to archaeology in general, such as neolithisation, urbanisation, settlement histories, material culture, subsistence practices, landscape archaeology, marginality, and palaeoecology. The research combines scholarly efforts in many different fields, from archaeology to languages and the natural sciences.

Four research foci have been defined:

- (1) The archaeology of settlement, material culture and social transformation in the North-Mesopotamian plains and the Anatolian highlands in the Late Neolithic (c. 7000-5000 BC);
- (2) The archaeology of empire and the material expression of socio-political affiliation in Syria and the Levant in the Late Bronze Age (c. 1500-1000 BC);
- (3) The archaeology of marginal landscapes in the Near East, from Prehistory to the Middle Ages;
- (4) A new, fourth, research focus in the field of Byzantine Archaeology in the wider Near East will be added in the near future, as a consequence of the recent appointment of Dr. Joanita Vroom.

*Quality*

In the short period since this chairgroup was established (2010) it has developed a distinct research profile of its own in which members of the group are making an important and substantial impact in the field. The four research foci are being enabled through strong leadership and the development of a collaborative research environment with colleagues and institutions in Leiden, nationally and internationally. The quality of the research is demonstrated by the level of success in securing funding which has enabled the growth and stability of the chairgroup.

*Productivity*

The group is achieving a very high level of productivity with 10 peer reviewed papers per full time tenured staff member and other important international publications. Seven PhD projects were completed in the period under review (going back to before the formal establishment of the group in 2010) with 9 PhDs (7 resident and 2 external) currently in progress in the chairgroup.

*Societal relevance*

The chairgroup demonstrated its concern and active engagement with increasing public awareness of the richness and global significance of the cultural heritage of the Near East, both in the region itself and in the Netherlands. This is seen in both the focus and fieldwork of some of the current research projects on important issues of contemporary relevance. Valorisation is facilitated by the excellent collaborative networks in which the chairgroup actively participates.

*Viability, feasibility and vision for the future*

The self-assessment report provides a clear and well-argued demonstration of reasons for confidence in the future with potential for further growth based on the international prominence and reputation of the chairgroup.

Key drivers for the viability of the group are the experience and international recognised expertise of the chairgroup members, the range of multi-disciplinary field projects it is engaged in, success in securing funding and growing PhD numbers.

Critically the next generation of research leaders is in place.

**Conclusion**

The committee commends the chairgroup on its development built on two challenging transitions in terms of staff and the emergence of Near Eastern Archaeology as an independent chairgroup.

The committee recommends that the chairgroup continue to apply for grants from as diverse a range of funding agencies as practicable, broaden the number of countries in which it is actively involved in the Near East and maintain its strong focus on collaboration with researchers and institutions both in the Near East and the Netherlands.

**Programme 6:** **Caribbean and Amazonia**  
Programme director: Prof. C.L. Hofman  
Research input 2011 (tenured) : 1.3 fte

Assessments:                      Quality:            5  
                                          Productivity:    5  
                                          Relevance:       5  
                                          Viability:        5

#### *Brief description*

The group conducts research into the Amerindian past of the Caribbean using the archaeological record, and aims to achieve real benefits for the local Caribbean communities and a high level of involvement of local researchers. Geographically the research focuses on the Antilles and areas of the three American continents surrounding the Caribbean Sea, as well as the Guianas and Brazil, collectively the circum-Caribbean region and adjacent areas. Temporally the research covers the pre-colonial to early colonial societies of the Caribbean islands and present-day Amerindian societies of Amazonia. There are five foci: 1) mobility and exchange, 2) settlement organisation, 3) life and death ways, 4) ethnoarchaeology and anthropology of the Guianas, and 5) archaeology and cultural heritage of the Dutch Caribbean.

#### *Quality*

This group developed out of the previous Mesoamerica section and since it started in 2007 has undoubtedly developed into the world's foremost group in this field, under the outstanding leadership of Prof. Hofman, producing research and publications of world class, as indicated by the key publications submitted for consideration. The group has been extremely successful in obtaining funding for its work, again especially thanks to the success of Prof. Hofman, but also with significant contributions from Dr. Hoogland, now in the Bioarchaeology chairgroup. A strong and productive group of young researchers has been developed and there are extensive international collaborations for both research and social valorisation in terms of links with local communities. At the same time, this is a tight-knit group internally with close contacts maintained with PhD and research Masters students through weekly meetings.

#### *Productivity*

The group has been extremely productive in terms of all measures, with very high levels of grant income, large numbers of publications, and significant numbers of PhD students and completed dissertations. For understandable reasons the great majority of the publications have been in the specialised literature on the Caribbean and adjacent areas rather than in international journals but it may be that this should be rebalanced somewhat in the future so that the Caribbean figures more prominently in world archaeology discussions. The outstanding grant success has been essential to maintaining and expanding the activities of the group and the recent successful ERC Synergy grant application will ensure a continued high level of production .

#### *Societal relevance*

The chairgroup has a strong commitment to ensuring the societal relevance of its work and contributing to the raising of local cultural consciousness. There are close connections with local governmental and non-governmental institutions in the Caribbean, including a summer training programme for Caribbean archaeology in association with the Museo del Hombre Dominicano in the Dominican Republic. In addition, members of the group take part in public outreach activities through the media in both the Caribbean and the Netherlands.

### *Viability, feasibility and vision for the future*

This is a vibrant chairgroup thanks to its outstanding success with grant applications and the strong leadership of Prof. Hofman. After the visit the group heard that it had been successful in obtaining an ERC Synergy grant which will see its work developed and expanded and secure its future for a number of years to come. This will also involve a very significant expansion of the chairgroup's heritage and societal relevance interests through internal collaboration with members of the Archaeological Heritage Management chairgroup. The putting together of the application for this highest level European grant scheme demonstrates the strong vision for the future shown by the group.

### **Conclusion**

This is an extremely impressive and productive chairgroup with great achievements to its credit and imaginative plans for the future. The ERC Synergy grant ensures continued viability well into the future. Moreover, the Dutch dimension to the Caribbean research provides a strong justification for continuing involvement in this region.

One specific recommendation is that the group should aim for more publications in international journals in order to make the field of Caribbean Archaeology more visible internationally.

**Programme 7: Mesoamerican and Andean cultures**  
Programme director: Prof. M.E.R.G.N. Jansen  
Research input 2011 (tenured): 1.2 fte

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

#### *Brief description*

The programme aims to answer questions about the graphic and artistic records in which ancient societies recorded their universe of memories, knowledge and symbolic thought, by interpreting and contextualizing specific works of visual culture of ancient Mesoamerica (i.e. indigenous Mexico and Central America), such as ancient Mexican pictorial manuscripts. Iconographic and semiotic analysis is combined with studies of archaeological contexts and historical documents, as well as of tangible and intangible cultural heritage in present-day descendant communities. This implies a specific interest in cultural continuity and change.

#### *Quality*

This is a world-class group in its field though that field is almost entirely focused on Mesoamerica, so including the Andes in the title appears to be somewhat misleading. The basis for its high standing is the work of Prof. Jansen, on whom the chairgroup therefore depends very heavily. His publications represent a world-leading contribution to the understanding of native Mesoamerican religion and symbolism. The quality of his work is matched by his outstanding grant-getting success, especially his recent ERC grant, and it is also reflected in invited presentations at international conferences and membership of key commissions. The recent award of a VENI grant to Dr. Geurds suggests that the younger generation has potential and effectively his appointment has addressed the issue of appointing an archaeologist in this field raised in the last assessment. A particular feature of this group is the strong links it makes between pre-Columbian and present-day ethnographic studies. It benefits from the presence of Amerindian linguistics in the Humanities Faculty, as well as the presence of the American department in the National Museum of Ethnology, though this cooperation could be improved. There are also extensive international connections.

#### *Productivity*

The chairgroup is highly productive, especially in the area of books and book chapters, which is in keeping with the nature of publication in this field. It attracts PhD students and has seen eight through to completion in the last five years. The students are closely involved in the work of the chairgroup through regular meetings and seminars.

#### *Societal relevance*

Ensuring that the work it carries out has societal relevance to local communities in Mesoamerica is one of this chairgroup's major aims. Its members collaborate closely with members of local communities and indigenous experts have completed PhDs at Leiden. Results are conveyed to descendant communities through exhibitions, workshops and consultancies with local NGOs and a textbook for teaching the written Mixtec language to local people has also been produced. These activities have been recognised by Mexican awards.

### *Viability, feasibility and vision for the future*

The chairgroup has a strong short-medium term future because of its recent outstanding grant success. However, despite recent junior appointments it is heavily dependent on Jansen, who will retire in the next few years, and it is a very specialised area of minority interest within the broader Netherlands context, so therefore potentially vulnerable in the light of the Faculty's decision not to guarantee the future of chairgroups when leading figures leave or retire. However, Prof. Jansen is working hard to secure the future of the group and the junior permanent staff members are developing new research lines.

### **Conclusion**

This chairgroup has outstanding leadership and major achievements to its credit, not least those related to its determination to be relevant to members of local communities. Its future is secure for the next five years but beyond that it is less certain.

It is recommended that the Faculty works to overcome the weaknesses pointed out in the self-assessment and during the committee's visit concerning the connections with the Americanists in the Humanities Faculty and in the Museum of Ethnology. Better cooperation here could perhaps provide the foundation for a long-term future for this important research and the associated community engagement.

**Programme 8: Material Culture and Artefact Studies**

Programme director: Prof. A.L. van Gijn

Research input 2011 (tenured) : 1.8 fte

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

*Brief description*

The programme studies material culture from a 'biographical' perspective through the development and application of analytical techniques and methodologies rooted in the natural sciences. The aim is to construct an empirical basis for social and theoretical interpretations of material culture, by combining ethno-archaeological and experimental approaches with more traditional scientific techniques.

During the entire review period the research was carried out in two laboratories and associated research sections: the Ceramic Laboratory (formerly led by dr. A. van As) and the Laboratory for Artefact Studies (led by Professor A.L. van Gijn). In January 2012 the chairgroup was established with the appointment of Prof. Van Gijn to the chair of Archaeological Material Culture and Artefact Studies.

*Quality*

The committee considers the research to be original and innovative in the two focal areas of the chair group's research and laboratory analysis; artefact studies (Prof. Van Gijn) and ceramics (Braekmans). The particular strength of the research is the combination of a strongly interpretative approach, the 'biographical perspective', with scientific methods and analyses which provide a rigorous empirical basis. Understandably given its development from an Expert Centre the chairgroup provides an important contribution to the research profile and excellence of other chairgroups in the Faculty, notably Human Origins, European Prehistory and Caribbean and Amazonia (Van Gijn) and Archaeology of the Near East and Caribbean (Braekmans).

Good collaborative networks exist and the international reputation of the chairgroup is valorised by the attraction of international researchers (including a Marie Curie IEF Fellow). However, while the commercial work carried out has helped the group to obtain money and equipment this has arguably been at the expense of a strongly focussed concentration on research of international quality and interest and its grant success has been limited to date.

*Productivity*

There is a very good and consistent published output (7 refereed articles per full-time equivalent tenured staff member). A good mix exists of international publications and those aimed primarily at a national audience. In this area of research there is a tradition of publication in the form of book chapters and several of these are internationally peer reviewed. Technical or specialist reports form an important output in this area of research. Three PhDs were completed (note: all co-supervised with other chairgroups) and three are in progress (2 resident and 1 external) in the period under review. Again though the commercial work has had some effect on research productivity.

### *Societal relevance*

The chairgroup has a very good record in this area. It has a significant impact at national level both in the conduct of commercial or applied research in artefact studies and in informing museum exhibitions and reconstructions. It has strong links with the Faculty archaeological consultancy, Archol. An exciting recent development is the experimental research centre in the Flevopolder in collaboration with the State Forestry Service. This will inform research and heighten public awareness.

### *Viability, feasibility and vision for the future*

The chairgroup SWOT analysis identifies the key issues. There is a clear awareness of the need for a strategy to ensure viability and sustainability, but much of the detail of that is still to be realised.

### **Conclusion**

The committee notes that during the period of evaluation Material Culture and Artefact Studies was an Expert Centre and only became a chairgroup with the appointment of a full professor (Van Gijn) in January 2012 and it recognises the impact of this on the group's profile.

The committee commends the chairgroup on its important contribution to the research profile of the Faculty, including its major contribution to, and collaboration with, other chairgroups, which has great potential for further development in the future.

The committee recommends that there should be a transparent mechanism developed which facilitates clear recognition of the contribution of the chairgroup to the overall Faculty research profile, as opposed to a service role.

The committee recommends that the chairgroup develop a clear and coherent research vision and programme built on its strength in two areas of analytical excellence when the Laboratory for Archaeological Material Analysis is established in the new Faculty Building. In this context attention should be given to achieving the right balance between opportunistic projects arising from commercial work and more strategically directed research likely to achieve international recognition.

The responsibilities of the chairgroup principal investigators need to be profiled, prioritised and carefully managed by them to maximise high-profile research productivity.

Given the importance of the research area of the chairgroup at a national and international level, the committee would recommend that a clear plan for its sustainability and vision for the future should be a priority.

**Programme 9: Archaeological Heritage Management in a Global Context**

Programme director: Prof. W.J.H. Willems

Research input 2011 (tenured) : 2 fte

Assessments:                      Quality:        5  
                                            Productivity: 5  
                                            Relevance:    5  
                                            Viability:     5

*Brief description*

The chairgroup was established in 2010. The current focus of the research is on:

- (1) theoretical reflection on the role of archaeological remains as heritage;
- (2) challenges related to archaeological heritage management in third world contexts, both from a practical (conservation, capacity building) and an analytical perspective (effect of western missions, comparative legal frameworks);
- (3) comparative analysis of systems of quality management and quality assurance frameworks in archaeological heritage management;
- (4) world heritage issues.

*Quality*

The committee considers the research programme of this chairgroup to be innovative and at the forefront of the field both nationally and internationally. In the short time since its establishment (2010) it has established a reputation as a research group with a global focus that is having a substantial impact in the field through its critical perspective and linkage of a theoretical perspective with practical engagement. The chairgroup has a clear research agenda and objectives but also provides an archaeological heritage management dimension to other chairgroups in the Faculty.

*Productivity*

There is a good and consistent published output (3 refereed articles per full-time equivalent tenured staff member), recognising that the chairgroup is chaired by the Dean of the Faculty, and a good mix of international publications with high impact. Two PhDs were completed in the period under review and 11 (2 resident and 9 external) are in progress. In the case of the latter the global spread of the PhD students should be noted, linking with the global spread of the research projects of the chairgroup

*Societal relevance*

The valorisation of the study of the past and its role for contemporary society is at the heart of the research mission of the chairgroup. At a national level the chairgroup through Prof. Willems and Dr. Van den Dries plays an important role in heritage policy formation and evaluation. The chairgroup is actively and centrally involved in a range of international collaborative networks with universities, NGOs and governments. The active involvement of the chairgroup with the research of other chairgroups in the Faculty helps to raise the overall public profile of the Faculty.

*Viability, feasibility and vision for the future*

The chairgroup has excellent potential to build and expand on its development to date. The availability of the chair (Prof. Willems) to lead the group and develop its vision for the future on the completion of his term as Dean of the Faculty at the end of 2013 is very important for the sustainability of the chairgroup.

**Conclusion**

The committee notes the rapid development of this chairgroup and its potential for further growth and development.

The committee commends the chairgroup for both its own clear and distinctive research vision and its role in providing an archaeological heritage management perspective to other chairgroups in the Faculty.

The committee recommends that the chairgroup should seek to continue its success in balancing a key role in heritage management at a national level (which is the foundation for its approach and success and social valorization) with its role as a leading player at the global level (critical for its excellent research reputation).

The committee recommends that the chairgroup should formalise a research plan to identify priorities and maximise the contribution of the chairgroup leader when he is in position to engage more fully with the work of the chairgroup.

The committee noted the potential and significance of the selection of Heritage as one of the selected themes in the programme to increase collaboration between Leiden, Delft and Rotterdam universities. A start-up fund will facilitate the development of a new heritage centre in Leiden involving the Faculties of Social Sciences, Humanities and Archaeology and the national museums.

**Programme 10:** **Bioarchaeology**  
Programme director: Prof. Th. van Kolfschoten  
Research input 2011 (tenured) : 3.3 fte

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

#### *Brief description*

The group undertakes investigations into hominin and human evolution, adaptation and behaviour in an ecological and stratigraphical context. The research fields of Archaeobotany, Archaeozoology, Human Osteo-archaeology and Isotope Archaeology each have their own focus within the programme. The chairgroup was formally established mid-2011.

#### *Quality*

The composition of the chairgroup Bioarchaeology has altered since the last assessment (2005). This chairgroup is diverse in terms of interests and specialisms but all areas are characterised by a strong focus on the analysis of material. It carries out world-leading research in some areas, particularly in archaeobotany and archaeozoology, and senior staff have excellent international reputations. There are strong national and international collaborations in high-profile projects. Comparative collections are very good; while current laboratory facilities are not unsatisfactory they will be greatly improved by the move to the new building in 2014.

#### *Productivity*

Productivity is very strong in terms of publications but for a science unit the level of funding is rather disappointing; the number of PhD students is also low in comparison with other chairgroups.

#### *Societal relevance*

There is collaboration with Dutch archaeological heritage managers and contract work is carried out for Archol, the in-house contract archaeology unit. There is also collaboration with the Netherlands Forensic Institute in forensic anthropology. In addition the chairgroup is involved in the development of exhibitions as part of major projects in which its members are involved.

#### *Viability, feasibility and vision for the future*

The legacy of the group's previous status as an expert centre is still visible in its current activities since there remains ambivalence in whether it is providing a service for other chairgroups or developing agendas of its own. For example, Dr. Hoogland's publications are not listed under this chairgroup. However, these issues are recognised and the group has ideas to address them, for example through the creation of a bioarchaeology Research Masters track, and the development of overarching research themes such as the new taphonomy project. The new laboratory facilities available in the new building will also make a major difference. The declared strategy of establishing closer internal cooperation is certainly the right one.

#### **Conclusion**

This group has considerable achievements to its name, with strong senior individuals in post. The new laboratory facilities available in 2014 should make a significant difference to the group. However, as its current leadership is aware, in order to realise its full potential it needs to carry out a number of actions:

- to improve its PhD and post-doc recruitment;
- to increase its success in obtaining funding;
- to develop further its group research themes;
- to participate equally with other chairgroups in the development of regional/chronological bioarchaeology research topics, rather than simply providing a technical service.

**Programme 11:** **Computer Applications in Archaeology**  
Programme director: dr. H. Kamermans  
Research input 2011 (tenured) : 1 fte

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

#### *Brief description*

The expert centre performs methodological research in the field of computer applications in archaeology. Areas of attention include predictive modelling for heritage management, the establishment of a digital data archive for Dutch archaeology, data mining, digital technology for archaeological fieldwork, remote sensing and digital 3D techniques.

#### *Quality*

The expert centre produces work that is nationally leading and internationally competitive. The tenured staff member (Kamermans) is highly regarded nationally and internationally, as indicated by his involvement in large-scale national and European collaborative projects. Research in the development of predictive modelling has been especially important.

#### *Productivity*

Productivity has been high in terms of number of publications but the number of refereed journal articles is small. The funding gained is impressive given that there is only one tenured member of staff and in the same light the PhD student record is satisfactory.

#### *Societal relevance*

Dr. Kamermans' work has made a major contribution to heritage management archaeology in the Netherlands and this has had an important wider European impact.

The work of the expert centre involves collaboration with chairgroups in the Faculty and a range of external collaborations in heritage management in the Netherlands and internationally.

The centre is recognised nationally and internationally for its expertise in GIS (especially predictive modelling) and digital data archiving.

#### *Viability, feasibility and vision for the future*

Dr. Kamermans has been a leader in terms of computer applications and other chairgroups have benefitted greatly from his work. The Centre has thus been very successful in a support role and is also involved in a number of European projects. However, the strategy outlined for the future is vague and as Dr. Kamermans comes up towards retirement (in 2014) the Faculty needs to consider whether it should continue to be a support unit only or should be converted into a chairgroup. In this connection it is worth noting that the distinctly technical European and national projects in which the expert centre is involved are mainly to do with developing and supporting heritage management.

#### **Conclusion**

The expert centre has been very successful in its support activities and has a strong track record in publication and funding. The Faculty will certainly continue to need a high level of computer

advice and support but it now needs to make the decision about whether or not to upgrade it to a chairgroup. If this is done the fields of expertise in which appointments are made would need to be considered very carefully.

Another option, following the comment above, might be to create a position in computer applications (or move the current one) in the Archaeological Heritage Management in a Global Context group, possibly in collaboration with the Computer Science department since it is essential for researchers in this fast-moving field not to be isolated. This sort of 'heritage science' is becoming increasingly important and it is highly likely that there will continue to be very significant European funding opportunities in this field.



## APPENDICES



## Appendix A: Curriculum vitae of the committee members



**Prof. Stephen Shennan** is Director of the University College London (UCL) Institute of Archaeology and Professor of Theoretical Archaeology. From an initial focus on the Copper and Bronze Ages in central Europe, he moved on to pioneer statistical methods in archaeology. He has introduced evolutionary models into the study of later prehistory. His research interests are: Application of biological evolutionary theory and methods to archaeology; Prehistoric demography; Ethnicity; Prehistoric social and economic institutions.



**Prof. Gabriel Cooney** is Professor of Celtic Archaeology at University College Dublin. He was Head of the Department in 2001-4 and Head of School (2008-11). His research interests are focused on prehistory, particularly the Neolithic, but also take a broader turn. He co-directs the Irish Stone Axe Project, covering all aspects of stone axe studies, integrating archaeological and petrological approaches. He is chairman of the Research Committee of the Brú na Bóinne World Heritage Site and an expert member of the ICOMOS International Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management.

Since 2009 he has been chairman of the Historic Monuments Council, Northern Ireland and is a member of the board of the Heritage Council.



**Prof. Friedrich Lüth** is member of the scientific staff of the German Archaeology Institute (DAI, Berlin), and former director of the Römisch-Germanischen Kommission (RGK) in Frankfurt, a department of the DAI. At DAI he is responsible for heritage protection and site management. He is a representative for the Conference of German cultural ministers for negotiations on the UNESCO Charta for the protection of under water archaeology, as well as for the Verband der Landesarchäologen (for European

affairs). He advises the European Council on archaeological heritage management. He is a founding member of the *Europae Archaeologiae Consilium*. His research interests focus on the area of the Ost See, especially the Northern European Meso- and Neolithic between 6000 and 4000 BC. He is involved in several international projects, e.g. MACHU (MANaging Cultural Heritage Underwater; funded by the EU); SINCOS (Sinking Coasts: Geosphere, Climate and Anthroposphere of the Holocene Southern Baltic Sea, funded by the German Research Council).



## Appendix B: Explanation of the SEP scores

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

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

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

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

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

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



## Appendix C: Programme of the site visit

### Thursday 8 November 2012

- 09:00-10:00: Committee meeting
- 10:00-11:00: Institute management (short presentation, interview, reflection)
- 11:00-12:00: Programme 1: Human Origins
- 12:00-13:00: Lunch
- 13:00-14:00: Programme 2: European Prehistory
- 14:00-14.30: Programme 3: Archaeology of the Roman Provinces, Middle Ages and the Modern Period (started January 2012)
- 14.30-15.30: Programme 4: Classical-Mediterranean Archaeology
- 15.30-16.30: Programme 5: Archaeology of the Near East
- 16.30-17:00: Programme 11: Computer Applications in Archaeology
- 17:00-18:00: Individual chats with PhD students (limited number, selected by the Institute, please provide list of names and short description of their projects)
- 19:00: Committee dinner

### Friday 9 November 2012

- 09:00-10:00: Programme 6: Caribbean and Amazonia
- 10:00-11:00: Programme 7: Mesoamerican and Andean Cultures
- 11:00-12:00: Programme 8: Material Culture and Artefact Studies
- 12:00-13:00: Lunch
- 13:00-14:00: Programme 9: Archaeological Heritage Management in a Global Context
- 14:00-15:00: Programme 10: Bioarchaeology
- 15:00-16:00: Committee meeting: conclusions, scores, problems, procedures
- 16:00-17:00: Second meeting with Institute management
- 18:00-19:00: Further conclusions and tasks. Writing session.