

RESEARCH REVIEW
THE LEIDEN INSTITUTE FOR AREA STUDIES
LEIDEN UNIVERSITY
2012-2017

ONDERZOEKERIJ

De Onderzoekerij
Vondellaan 58
2332 AH Leiden

Phone: +31 6 24812176

Email: info@onderzoekerij.nl

Internet: www.onderzoekerij.nl



Contents

Preface.....	4
1. Introduction.....	5
1.1 Terms of reference for the assessment.....	5
1.2 The Review Committee.....	5
1.3 Procedures followed by the Committee.....	5
2. Organisation of the Institute.....	6
3. Assessment of the research.....	7
3.1 Quantitative assessment.....	7
3.2 Research quality.....	7
3.3 Societal relevance.....	8
3.4 Viability.....	8
3.5 PhD programme.....	10
3.6 Research integrity.....	11
3.7 Diversity.....	11
4. Recommendations.....	12
Appendix A – Curriculum Vitae.....	13
Appendix B – Programme of the site visit.....	14
Appendix C – Tables.....	16
Appendix D – Meaning of the scores.....	18



Preface

The Review Committee of the Leiden Institute for Area Studies (including the Leiden University Centre for the Study of Religion) met for two days in June 2019. The Committee consisted of members from the UK, Germany, Norway, and the USA, providing a broad international context to our observations of the organisation and the workings of the Institute. The scholarly specialties of the Committee members include China studies, Indology, Korean studies, Japanese studies, Iranian studies, and Assyriology. This breadth of expertise gave us a wide view of the many specialist topics represented in LIAS. In terms of gender, our composition was less representative (one woman and four men, with a male chair and a female secretary) – a circumstance that did not lead to friction or awkwardness, but that may well be avoided a next time around. In terms of ethnicity our group was all-white – I hope that in the future Leiden University will be more aware of the importance of diversity in assessment.

Our meetings were intense, not to say strenuous, but also unusually cordial and pleasant – one would almost say 'gezellig'. I wish to thank the members of the Committee for their commitment to a fair assessment of an Institute we all know and love.

I am most grateful to Dr. Annemarie Venemans, who was assigned to the Committee as secretary, but whose competence and contributions well exceeded that title. She led us through the entire process, asked pertinent questions, prodded us where necessary, while also keeping track of practical issues. Marcel Belderbos took care of logistical matters, including our travel and stay, and did so most competently.

I hope this Review will contribute in some small way to the health and longevity of the Leiden Institute of Area Studies.

Niek Veldhuis, chair of the Committee



1. Introduction

1.1 Terms of reference for the assessment

The quality assessment of research of the Leiden Institute for Area Studies (LIAS) is carried out in the context of the assessment system as specified in the Standard Evaluation Protocol for Public Research Organisations by the Association of Universities in The Netherlands (VSNU), the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO), and the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW).

The Review Committee (hereafter the Committee) was asked to assess the scientific quality and the relevance and utility to society of the research conducted by LIAS, including the Leiden University Centre for the Study of Religion (LUCSoR) of Leiden University in the reference period 2012–2017, as well as its strategic targets and the extent to which it is equipped to achieve them.

Accordingly, three main criteria are considered in the assessment: research quality, relevance to society, and viability. In addition, the assessment considers three further aspects: the PhD training programme, research integrity, and diversity.

This report describes findings, conclusions, and recommendations of this external assessment of LIAS.

1.2 The Review Committee

The Board of Leiden University appointed the following members of the Committee for the research review:

- Prof. dr. Niek Veldhuis, University of California at Berkeley
- Prof. dr. Mette Halskov Hansen, University of Oslo
- Prof. dr. Axel Michaels, Heidelberg University
- Prof. dr. Alan Williams, University of Manchester
- Dr. James Lewis, University of Oxford

More detailed information about the members of the Committee can be found in Appendix A. The Board of Leiden University appointed dr. Annemarie Venemans of De Onderzoekerij as the Committee secretary. All members of the Committee signed a declaration and disclosure form to ensure that the Committee members made their judgements without bias, personal preference or personal interest, and that the judgment was made without undue influence from LIAS or stakeholders.

1.3 Procedures followed by the Committee

Prior to the site visit, the Committee received detailed documentation comprising: The Self-assessment report of LIAS and the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) 2015–2021. In addition, the Committee studied the midterm review report and assessment report of the previous assessment.

The Committee proceeded according to the SEP. The assessment was based on the documentation provided by the Institute and the interviews with the management, a selection of researchers of the Institute, and PhD students. The interviews took place on 12 and 13 June 2019 (see Appendix B).

The Committee discussed its assessment at its final session during the site visit. The members of the Committee commented by email on the draft report. The draft version was then presented to the Institute for factual corrections and comments. Subsequently, the text was finalised and presented to the Board of Leiden University.



2. Organisation of the Institute

LIAS is one of the seven academic institutes of the Faculty of Humanities. As part of a restructuring of religious studies within the Faculty of Humanities in 2014, the Leiden University Centre for the Study of Religion (LUCSoR) was administratively embedded in LIAS. Per the first of January 2023, LUCSoR will be fully integrated into LIAS.

The Institute is headed by a Management Team (MT) consisting of an Academic Director (head of the institute bearing overall responsibility), an Academic Director of Research (responsible for the development of the research profile of the Institute), an Education Director (responsible for staffing the teaching programmes in which the Institute participates), and an Institute Manager (responsible for the Institute's operational affairs, particularly finances, personnel, and internal organisation). The MT receives policy input from the Institute's Advisory Council, which is composed of a cross-section of the Institute's staff and meets twice-monthly. Two years ago, there was a crisis between management and membership of LIAS, leading to a full replacement of the MT by a new MT. The Academic Director and Academic Director of research will stay for one more year.

Besides individual research initiatives, research of LIAS is organised in groups, clusters, and units, mostly contained within one of two main areas, namely Asia and the Middle East. In addition, there are six cross-regional networks along thematic and disciplinary lines, started through bottom-up initiatives and supported by the leadership. The networks are intellectual clusters that are responsive to evolving research interests and collaborations inside and outside LIAS.



3. Assessment of the research

3.1 Quantitative assessment

The Committee was asked to assess the Institute both quantitatively and qualitatively. For the quantitative assessment a four-point scale is used, according to the standard evaluation protocol 2015–2021. The explanation of the criteria underlying the scores can be found in appendix D. According to the SEP protocol, 1 means 'world leading' – a concept that the Committee found misleading in the fields of social sciences and humanities, where excellent world class scholarship typically builds on and integrates previous research. Therefore, the Committee decided to interpret "1" as world class/excellent. The qualitative assessment of the Institute can be found in the next sections.

According to the SEP scoring system, the Committee has awarded the following scores to the Institute:

Research quality:	1 (world class/excellent)
Relevance to society:	2 (very good)
Viability:	4 (unsatisfactory)

3.2 Research quality

LIAS is an excellent Research Institute that continues to build on a long history of "oriental studies" at Leiden University and on the successful foundation of the Institute in 2009. The aim of LIAS is to be a leading player in the development of "new area studies" with a focus on the Middle East and Asia, further energised by the inclusion of religious studies expertise. Displaying outstanding linguistic and philological competence in a great number of Asian languages, its members bring to bear deep cultural knowledge to study vast areas of the world outside of the West. They engage in critical reflection on the notion of translation, draw on a variety of disciplines, pursue work in innovative digital humanities projects such as "open philology," and are developing outreach programmes for school teachers, government, and the wider public. The Committee also finds the commitment to balancing premodern and modern fields across LIAS laudable and prudent.

In terms of the research it produces, the Institute is extremely successful. Members of the Institute are producing world-class research on a wide range of relevant research topics. The research is disseminated largely in terms of academic publications (monographs, edited books, journal articles, and book chapters), which are published in very reputable, often very prestigious, venues. The fact that a large number of publications appear in peer-reviewed journals and leading presses indicates the originality, significance, and international reputation of LIAS researchers.

The international academic reputation of LIAS is also demonstrated in the awards and prizes various academic staff members have received for their research achievements and the success of members in winning competitive grants. In addition, LIAS researchers have been invited to deliver keynote lectures and serve on international PhD committees. Some staff members are part of advisory boards, editorial boards of prestigious journals, or external academic institutions and committees. There is also a high number of guest professorships.

Grant-based earnings during the period of evaluation were very impressive. Members of the Institute were awarded 33 different grants. Much of the current funding comes from very competitive sources, such as the European Research Council, and the NWO.

LIAS prepares PhD candidates in a conscientious and demanding way. This is reflected in the fact that 122 PhD candidates defended in the reporting period and in the fact that a relatively large number of LIAS graduates continue to work in academia.

LIAS Researchers can make use of the very richly endowed research infrastructure in the University of Leiden libraries and Special Collections. The Committee was impressed by these excellent library facilities.



The only point of concern the Committee wants to raise with regard to research quality is the level of interdisciplinary research of the Institute. Although the Institute implemented research networks, the research is still too narrowly organised in traditional disciplinary concentrations. The Committee is of the opinion that the Institute needs to look for more and better ways of promoting and facilitating collaboration between disciplines within the Institute and with scholars from disciplines beyond those covered by LIAS.

In summation, the Committee is impressed that even with the relatively heavy teaching loads and extensive administrative obligations, with no system for periodical individual research sabbaticals, and having suffered a period of serious internal conflict, LIAS is outstanding in respect of its research quality.

3.3 Societal relevance

The areas of the world on which LIAS focusses host about 60% of the world's population, include the second (China), third (Japan), and sixth (India) largest economies in the world as measured by nominal GDP, and are the home of three (Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam) of the world's most popular religions.¹ Despite the importance of what the members of LIAS study, the societal relevance of LIAS and similar institutions in other Western countries is routinely overlooked. LIAS takes its societal obligations seriously. According to the self-evaluation report, LIAS engages with a wide variety of governmental, professional, or societal partners. The Committee noted that the Institute clearly places much value on societal relevance and is committed to further strengthening this aspect. In the period covered, LIAS produced 195 publications aimed at a more general public. The popular texts indicate clear attempts to make specialised fields accessible and societally relevant.

While there are traditional methods of evaluating societal relevance, the newer fields of social media engagement and outreach programmes have yet to be adequately valued for their societal impact and relevance. A few researchers are already actively engaged in social media (for example blog/twitter account/and website on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea).

Furthermore, teaching is not only a way of reaching wider audiences but also a basis for innovation and a source for attracting new talent. LIAS' contribution to society through education is impressive and growing. Besides the training in the bachelor, master's, and doctoral programmes, the Committee also took special note of the initiative being pioneered by members of LUCSoR to reach out to teachers in primary and secondary schools and provide expertise on difficult cultural subjects. Such initiatives help mediate the dispersal of expert knowledge from the generators of new knowledge in universities to the next generations of citizenry and create an informed general public. The initiatives bypass traditional trickle-down methods of disseminating expert knowledge and offer a new frontier for universities to fulfil their societal role. However, the value of such initiatives is not yet sufficiently recognised.

Although the Institute places much value on societal relevance, the Committee could not always determine how structured and sustained the outreach activities are now or will be in the future, and to what extent they will be expanded. In part that is because some activities offer only occasional and inevitably short-term opportunities. The Committee is of the opinion that the valorisation of the research is very project-dependent and is not integrated into the policies of the Institute. It seems to be largely left to the individual scholar to take the initiative or to respond positively to, for instance, media requests. The Institute seems to lack a clear policy or strategy related to societal dialogue. The Committee recommends that a more systematic approach would allow the Institute to perform better in convincing the general public of the societal relevance of its research. Such an approach would include incentives for its research staff as recognition for their often time-consuming efforts to increase public outreach.

3.4 Viability

At the time of the review, LIAS appears to be in the midst of significant and ongoing changes. The self-assessment report stated that LIAS encountered internal difficulties in 2017. This was caused primarily by a widespread perception that performance and excellence were not fairly recognised, that decision making

¹ Population: <https://www.worldometers.info/world-population/asia-population/>
Economies: <https://www.focus-economics.com/blog/the-largest-economies-in-the-world>



in the Institute was not consensual and, particularly in the field of career development, lacked transparency. A lack of mutual respect, both in feelings and in interaction, exacerbated the widespread discontent.

In meetings with staff members, managers and students, the Committee noted that these difficulties have had an observable detrimental impact. The internal difficulties appear to have taken their toll on research in terms of both morale of staff and their productivity. In addition, projections of further increases in student numbers and heavier teaching loads suggest that there are structural problems that may not disappear very soon. The Committee had a long discussion, about the grading of the 'viability' at LIAS wavering between 3 (good) or 4 (unsatisfactory). Eventually it agreed that LIAS' viability is insufficient, while noting that some of the factors contributing to this situation are not under the control of the Institute.

After the breakdown in trust and what some interviewees called the 'meltdown' of the Institute just two years ago, the Committee wishes to commend the Institute, the MT, and the Advisory Council for having done remarkable work in restoring relationships, building channels of communication, and creating more transparency in decision making. This work is not completed but the very considerable progress is recognised by all involved and has been achieved in a relatively short period of time.

Three steps taken by the current MT have apparently been successful:

- The elimination of the extra-constitutional "Professors' Committee" has helped to flatten the governance structures;
- The importance given to the LIAS-LUCSoR Advisory Council as a mediator between MT and the researchers has sought to dissolve confrontation between the MT and the researchers;
- The diversity of the Advisory Council (PhD candidates upwards to full Professors) is a very visible democratic arrangement.

In short, the new MT has made great efforts to restore a general trust in the administration and management structures. That the Committee still considers the viability of LIAS 'unsatisfactory' is based on the following issues that may threaten the fabric of LIAS and its position as a world-class research Institute.

1. The teaching load has grown to levels that seem to be unsustainable. The standard of six contact hours per week per semester (that was explained during the site visit) is already on the high side (but not unusual internationally). The Committee was made aware of other pressures on time, already present or looming: increased teaching administration; supervision of large numbers of bachelor and master theses; extra contact hours resulting from language teaching and/or participation in the bachelor International Studies; teaching responsibilities beyond the individual's main expertise. Such pressures have brought many members of LIAS to a point where teaching takes up 100% of their regular working time and their research is marginalised, relegated to evenings, weekends, or vacations. The 80% rule (80% teaching and administration and 20% research) is felt by many as a number that has no meaning in practice. The absence of a regular sabbatical system in the Netherlands adds to this situation in a negative way. Most worrying is that an increasing teaching load is a trend that does not yet seem to have reached its peak (and probably will not for some time given the increasing importance of Asia) and that, while LIAS depends on student numbers for much or most of its funding, it is not fully in control of its own teaching.

The Committee considers the large degree of separation of the responsibility for research and teaching between LIAS and the bachelor programmes as highly unusual internationally and as unsustainable. It recognises that LIAS cannot be held responsible for this situation. The very wide range of disciplines represented by LIAS and the high number of bachelor programmes create pressure to teach many different courses: this is a situation only exacerbated by the obligation to serve the financial incentives of attracting more students. LIAS will have to find ways to work very closely with the programme directors in order to find creative ways to reduce the number of courses, for instance by combining courses or by offering course sequences in two-year cycles. The MT team will have to take a more assertive stance towards the bachelor programmes and negotiate about ways to stop the increase in teaching pressure and, where possible, reduce it. Even though the MT is not formally responsible for classes and thesis requirements, defending staff time and well-being is a core responsibility of the MT. The involvement of all research staff, from professors to postdoctoral staff, in research-led teaching is recommended as a way to promote efficiency, innovation, and integration in the teaching curriculum and in research. In other words: teaching is currently entirely driven by the demand side and LIAS will have to assert more power on the supply side. Limiting the number of bachelor and master theses might be another way to reduce the load.



The problem might also be redressed by diversifying the Institute's income streams in a creative fashion, mitigating the pressure to attract more students. The following will require creative entrepreneurial approaches. Examples of diversifying are:

- Monetising outreach programmes, for example, LUCSoR's potential for outreach to primary and secondary schools. Many other types of outreach could be developed that could offer a quantum boost to Dutch general education (language summer schools, cultural training for business, and others)
- More teaching experience by PhD students. Teaching experience is essential professional training and is often the key factor that gets a young researcher into their first academic job. There should be creative ways around legal limitations.
- Considering the establishment of consultancies. As with outreach programmes, the monetization of a researcher's casual cultural and political and perhaps even economic knowledge is possible.
- Endowments that offer security for small, vulnerable subjects that attract few students. Endowments can pay entire salaries and produce surpluses to fund small and large research activities as well as scholarships for PhD students.

2. LIAS currently does not have any formulated research strategy or clear ways of planning. The Institute seems to depend entirely on a 'bottom-up' approach, which means that researchers come up with their own projects and priorities. The Committee recognises that repairing the Institute's atmosphere and culture had and has priority and it happily acknowledges the splendid success of the bottom-up approach in the so-called 'networks', where researchers from different disciplines meet and exchange ideas around broadly defined topics. Still, on the longer term the Institute may find it difficult to set priorities, to divide its limited financial funds, or to convince outside (financial) contributors without a strategic plan, and the absence of such a plan negatively influences the viability of LIAS. It would be necessary to involve staff members in an organised process of strategic planning in order to create a strategic plan with full backing from the staff. The Committee does not recommend that any strategic plan becomes the only way for the Institute to see its future, but that it is used for guidance when interests conflict

3. There is an inherent inequality between the approximately 10% of the researchers who have big grants and the 90% who don't, and the equally problematic inequality between those subjects/research areas that have many students and those that don't. These imbalances in terms of research time and income from students really require that the MT develops very good procedures to, at least to some extent, transfer resources between groups. If this is not done very consciously and systematically, important research areas that just happen to have few students or happen to not attract research grants for a period of time will too easily lose out.

4. The Committee is pleased that the transparency of promotion and career-planning has improved in the past year. However, there is still great room for further improvement. Annual assessments are useful; these should be accompanied every two or three years by a fair and open discussion of the possibility and desirability of promotion within the framework of the LIAS budget and Dutch law. This is particularly important with the influx of non-Dutch staff members who may have a hard time understanding the particulars of Dutch universities and Dutch law.

3.5 PhD programme

In the period 2009 – 2013 a total of 35 PhD students enrolled in LIAS (including LUCSoR). Of 35 started projects, 7% of the projects were completed in 4 years, 31% of the projects were completed in 5 years, 57% of the projects were completed in 6 years, 71% of the projects were completed in 7 years and 81% of the projects were completed in 8 years. Another 15 projects were still pending by the end of 2017 (see also Appendix C, table 4). According to the Committee, the average time for PhD completion (5 and one-half years) is a concern, not only when it negatively affects the terms of any particular grant award, but also for the personal lives of the students involved, who make large investments in their future with very uncertain returns.

The Graduate School of Humanities provides the organisational infrastructure within which PhD candidates participate in advanced training and supervised research. It offers courses that cover a range of general subjects and transferable skills. In addition, LIAS is developing its own PhD curriculum, tied to the research networks. In 2018, LIAS appointed a Director of Doctoral Studies, who is in charge of the LIAS PhD programme.



The PhD candidates of LIAS are represented by the PhD Council, consisting of nine members. It discusses all matters relevant to the training and development of the PhD candidates. The PhD Council collaborates with and advises the Management Team whenever matters related to the PhD programme warrant this.

A previous assessment Committee noted that the organisation and structure of the graduate programme were poor. The current Committee found that much has been done to improve this situation, and that a 'change of culture' had been successfully established. The Committee commended the range of new initiatives that had been put in place to expand the training programme and to monitor PhD progress. The Committee found that the PhD programme was described in very positive terms by the students.

PhD students normally have two supervisors. If the project so requires, they can have three. In general, the PhD students feel well guided and supported by their supervisors, and those the Committee met gave the impression they were guided by their supervisors but yet independent in defining their own research topics and given freedom to explore new theories.

The Committee formed the impression that there are three ways in which the PhD programme might be strengthened. First, as PhD students noted, there should be more consistent communication about courses and resources, in particular for international students. For example, PhD students are not all aware of courses available to them, such as linguistics courses, nor were they uniformly aware about the fee for Dutch language courses.

Second, the Committee is of the opinion that LIAS should explore measures to enable external PhD students to contribute to and derive support from the research environment, for instance financial support for field work. More structured participation in the research community and PhD courses would also contribute to the development of better awareness amongst the external students of the academic standards and customs in which the PhD is situated.

Third, external and self-funded PhD students are currently not allowed to teach, despite the fact that teaching experience for PhD students counts for a lot in academic job applications. The Committee encourages the Institute to explore ways to offer all PhD students opportunities to gain teaching experience.

3.6 Research integrity

LIAS conforms to the Leiden University policy with respect to research integrity issues. In addition, LIAS has invested in the founding of a data management protocol containing guidelines with respect to the storage and retention of research data. All PhD students are obliged to attend a Faculty of Humanities seminar on academic integrity in the first year of their PhD research.

The Committee is pleased with the processes in place for ensuring research integrity.

3.7 Diversity

The self-assessment report states that LIAS employs females in about one third of its positions. The female: male ratio is well balanced at the PhD level, but women remain underrepresented at higher levels. The Institute has a very international composition, with more than half of the staff having a foreign nationality.

The Committee is convinced that LIAS recognises the importance of diversity, as it eloquently articulates this point, and notes the relatively high number of women and people with a non-Dutch nationality working at the Institute, including in the higher ranks. However, as known from other universities and research into gender and diversity in higher education, neither awareness in leadership, nor a balanced ratio at PhD level, is in itself sufficient to secure a proper gender and ethnicity balance at the levels of full professor and associate professor. The Institute is encouraged to secure transparent processes of promotion and hiring and work towards a better gender and ethnicity balance at the highest academic levels in the near future.



4. Recommendations

In summary, there is generally a world-class level of research quality and a very good level of societal relevance across the Institute. However, the Committee has the impression that LIAS has not yet raised its full potential due to excessive teaching load, lack of incentives, and lack of strategic planning. The Committee is of the opinion that the Institute should actively look for ways to tackle the issues mentioned in the report. The Committee invites LIAS to especially consider the following suggestions:

With regard to research quality:

- Make efforts to ensure that researchers focusing on different languages, geographical areas, or theoretical frameworks cooperate and seek cooperation with scholars outside of LIAS, for instance in a coordinated doctoral research programme or in collaborative research projects.
- Further support the networks, perhaps by designing small research grants to encourage individual and collaborative research

With regard to societal relevance:

- Develop a more systematic approach towards societal relevance including a greater recognition towards scholars doing excellent and time-consuming work in societal relevance.

With regard to viability:

- Define an explicit research strategy at the Institute level including choices about preferred themes for interdisciplinary research, and means to ensure sufficient research time to all.
- Take further concrete measures that allow the research staff to spend a substantial amount of their time in research, definitely more than the 20% guaranteed today. This is an urgent matter that will require creative solutions.
- Develop procedures that increase a culture of equality between individual researchers of the Institute.

With regard to the PhD programme:

- Better communicate about courses and resources for PhD candidates;
- Develop a programme that will include teaching possibilities and financial recourses for external PhD candidates.



Appendix A – Curriculum Vitae

Prof. dr. Niek Veldhuis is a Professor of Assyriology at the Department of Near Eastern Studies, University of California, Berkeley. His main research project is the online Digital Corpus of Cuneiform Lexical Texts (DCCLT). The aim of this project is to publish on the web all lexical lists from Ancient Mesopotamia. Lexical lists are comparable to modern dictionaries and played an important role in the education of scribes and in the intellectual life of the period.

Prof. dr. Halskov Hansen is a Professor in China studies at the Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages of the University of Oslo. She has studied society and politics in China since the late 1980s, and has published widely on topics related to, for instance, ethnic relations in China, rural education, processes of individualization and environmental issues. She has served as Dean of Research and Chair of two different departments, and is currently directing a larger interdisciplinary research project about human dimensions of air pollution in China.

Prof. dr. Axel Michaels is a Full Professor for Classical Indology, South Asia Institute at the Heidelberg University. In addition, he is Vice-president of the Heidelberg Academy of Humanities and Sciences, Founding Director of the Heidelberg Centre for Asian and Transcultural Studies (CATS) and Head of the research unit "Documents on the History of Religion and Law or pre-modern Nepal." Prof. Michaels is the author of several books on culture and history of India and Nepal including most recently "Homo Ritualis: Hindu Ritual and Its Significance for Ritual Theory" (Oxford University Press).

Prof. dr. Alan Williams is a Professor of Iranian Studies and Comparative Religion at the Department of Religions and Theology, University of Manchester. His research focusses on Iranian religion and literature; he has published books on ancient, medieval and modern Iranian texts, as well as essays on comparative literature, social anthropological themes and translation studies. Currently he is producing a multi-volume study and metrical translation of the *magnum opus* of the 13th C. mystical poet Jalāluddīn Rūmī, the *Masnavi*.

Dr. James Lewis is the Associate Professor of Korean History, Oriental Studies, University of Oxford, and a Fellow of Wolfson College. Recent books include *The East Asian War, 1592-1598* (Routledge, 2015) and *Korea's Premier Collection of Classical Literature: Selections from Sō Kōjōng's (1420-1488) Tongmunsŏn* (Hawaii'i, 2019). He is currently researching Chosŏn-period economic history and translating and writing a commentary on Amemomori Hōshū's *Kōrin Teisei* (1728).



Appendix B – Programme of the site visit

Tuesday 11 June

Time	Part	Collocutors
17.00 - 18.30	Internal meeting about the SEP and the Dutch research system	Committee
18.30 -	dinner	Committee

Wednesday 12 June

Time	Part	Collocutors
08.30 - 9.30	Site visit preparation	Committee
09.30 - 10.30	Meeting with Institute Management and Dean Humanities Faculty Dean	Prof. dr. Mark Rutgers Prof. dr. Erik Jan Zurcher Prof. dr. Nira Wickramasinghe Ms. Pia Teeuw Dr. Nathal Dessing
10.30 - 11.30	LIAS researchers - Meeting about research quality and societal relevance	Prof. dr. Caroline Waerzeggers Prof. dr. Petra Sijpesteijn Prof. dr. Remco Breuker Prof. dr. Peter Bisschop Prof. dr. Gabrielle van den Berg Dr. Jonathan London Dr. Deniz Tat
11.30 - 11.45	Break	Committee
11.45 - 12.25	Meeting with PhD candidates and PhD alumni	Eftychia Mylona Nicholas Kontovas Guanmian Xu Elly Mulder Dr. Priya Swamy Dr. Sacha Goldstein Dr. Jochem van den Boogert
12.25 - 12.45	Meeting with Director of Doctoral Studies and Coordinator of Doctoral Studies	Prof. dr. Maghiel van Crevel Dr. Nicole van Os
12.45 - 13.45	Lunch	Committee
13.45 - 14.15	Meeting with LIAS Advisory Council	Dr. Koen de Ceuster Prof. dr. Ab de Jong Dr. Ashgar Seyed Gohrab Dr. Radhika Gupta Monica Klasing Chen



14.15 – 15.00	Meeting with junior staff (Postdoc, Junior University Lecturer)	Dr. Nico Staring Dr. Elena Paskaleva Dr. Cristiana Strava Dr. Peter Webb Dr. Alp Yenen
15.00 – 15.30	Break and Committee meeting	
15.30 – 18.00	Review research School NISIS	
18.00	dinner	Committee

Thursday 13 June

Time	Part	Collectors
08.30 – 09.15	Meeting with staff members about viability of institute	Dr. Sanjukta Sunderason Dr. Lyndsay Black Dr. Ben Haring Dr. Ethan Mark Prof. dr. David Henley Prof. dr. Olaf Kaper
09.15 – 09.45	Meeting with LUCSoR researchers	Prof. dr. Ab de Jong Prof. Dr. Judith Frishman Prof. dr. Maurits Berger Dr. Corey Williams Dr. Markus Davidsen
09.45 – 10.00	Break	
10.00 – 10.30	Meeting with MT about integration LUCSoR	Prof. dr. Erik Jan Zurcher Prof. dr. Nira Wickramasinghe Ms. Pia Teeuw Dr. Nathal Dessing
10.30 – 11.00	Break	
11.00 – 11.45	Meeting with Network chairs Ancient Worlds, LPEg, Canonical Cultures	Prof. dr. Caroline Waerzeggers Dr. Crystal Ennis Prof. dr. Peter Bisschop Dr. Jonathan Valk
11.45 – 12.45	Lunch	
12.45 – 13.15	Formulating questions for management	Committee
13.15 – 13.45	Meeting with Institute Management (last questions)	Prof. dr. Erik Jan Zurcher Prof. dr. Nira Wickramasinghe Ms. Pia Teeuw Dr. Nathal Dessing
13.45 – 15.30	Evaluation Committee, writing conclusions	Committee
15.30	Presentation first results	plenary



Appendix C – Tables

Table 1A Number of staff and research FTE LIAS (excl LUCSoR)

	2012		2013		2014		2015		2016		2017	
	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE
Scientific staff	62.5	13.9	61.1	13.7	66.0	15.4	71.0	16.7	69.2	15.7	74.7	18.0
Post-docs	12.0	12.4	12.8	11.9	13.4	11.4	10.2	8.3	11.0	7.4	15.9	9.7
PhD students - employed	15.8	12.7	19.3	16.0	22.0	18.1	21.7	17.2	22.0	17.7	17.4	15.0
PhD students - contract	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.6	0.3	0.6	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.0
Total research staff	90.3	39.0	93.9	42.2	101.7	45.4	103.0	42.4	101.7	40.9	108.0	42.6
Support staff	9.5	2.3	11.1	2.4	8.8	2.1	10.4	1.6	8.8	2.1	16.1	4.0
Visiting fellows	5.0		9.0		5.5		14.0		5.5		16.0	
Total	104.8	41.3	114.0	44.5	116.1	47.5	127.3	43.9	116.1	47.5	140.1	46.7

Table 1B Number of staff and research FTE LUCSoR

	2012		2013		2014		2015		2016		2017	
	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE
Scientific staff	18.0	4.0	15.7	3.5	12.4	2.3	8.0	1.6	10.0	1.9	10.9	3.1
Post-docs	4.0	3.1	2.1	1.8	1.8	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
PhD students - employed	3.6	3.0	5.3	4.3	5.0	3.4	4.0	1.7	3.4	2.5	3.7	2.5
PhD students - contract	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total research staff	25.6	10.1	23.1	9.6	19.2	7.8	12.0	3.5	13.4	4.4	14.6	5.7
Support staff	0.6	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Visiting fellows	3.0		6.0		5.0		3.0		2.0		4.0	
Total	29.2	10.4	29.2	9.7	24.2	7.8	15.0	3.5	15.4	4.4	18.6	5.7

Table 2A Main categories of research output LIAS excl LUCSoR

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Refereed articles	57	47	45	42	50	49
Non-refereed articles	7	3	7	13	3	9
Books	9	6	16	16	14	12
Book chapters	56	86	66	54	35	40
PhD dissertations	8	13	15	21	18	22
Conference papers	33	12	13	11	8	16
Professional publications	38	15	8	20	17	22
Publications aimed at the general public	33	26	26	17	33	31
Other research output	66	116	90	76	79	72
Total	307	324	286	270	257	273



Table 2B Main categories of research output LUCSoR

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Refereed articles	6	7	5	2	5	3
Non-refereed articles	2	0	1	2	0	4
Books	1	3	1	1	0	2
Book chapters	7	16	7	6	10	8
PhD dissertations	4	6	6	2	2	5
Conference papers	3	7	0	1	0	0
Professional publications	7	19	3	5	2	2
Publications aimed at the general public	2	0	7	7	4	9
Other research output	35	44	26	15	15	10
Total	67	102	56	41	38	43

Table 3 Funding (LIAS incl LUCSoR)

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Funding in FTE						
Direct funding	20.0	16.6	18.3	19.8	22.2	19.6
Research grants	23.8	27.3	24.1	14.7	16.1	16.9
Contract research	7.8	10.2	12.8	12.9	8.5	15.8
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total funding	51.6	54.2	55.2	47.4	46.8	52.4
Expenditure in €						
Personnel costs	3,417,875	3,529,640	3,623,689	3,212,050	3,201,821	3,766,564
Other costs	303,357	324,789	514,119	506,500	612,342	476,525
Total expenditure	3,721,231	3,854,429	4,137,808	3,718,550	3,814,163	4,243,090

Table 4 PhD candidates

Enrolment				Success rates															
Start ing year	M	F	M+F	Graduated in year 4 or earlier		Graduated in year 5 or earlier		Graduated in year 6 or earlier		Graduated in year 7 or earlier		Graduated in year 8 or earlier		Total		Not yet finished		Discontinued	
				#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	2	3	5	0	0	2	40	3	60	4	80	4	80	4	80	1	20	0	0
2010	3	6	9	1	11	5	56	6	67	7	78	8	89	8	89	1	11	0	0
2011	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	3	60	3	60	–	–	3	60	2	40	0	0
2012	5	0	5	1	20	3	60	3	60	–	–	–	–	3	60	2	40	0	0
2013	1	5	6	0	0	1	17	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	17	5	83	0	0
Total	14	16	30	2	7	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	19	63	11	37	0	0



Appendix D – Meaning of the scores

Category	Meaning	Research quality	Relevance to society	Viability
1	World leading/ excellent	The research unit has been shown to be one of the few most influential research groups in the world in its particular field	The research unit makes an outstanding contribution to society	The research unit is excellently equipped for the future
2	Very good	The research unit conducts very good, internationally recognised research	The research unit makes a very good contribution to society	The research unit is very well equipped for the future
3	Good	The research unit conducts good research	The research unit makes a good contribution to society	The research unit makes responsible strategic decisions and is therefore well equipped for the future
4	Unsatisfactory	The research unit does not achieve satisfactory results in its field	The research unit does not make a satisfactory contribution to society	The research unit is not adequately equipped for the future

