

Assessment Report

Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society (LUCAS)

Peer Review 2012 – 2017

December 2018

Table of contents

Preface	3
1. Introduction	4
1.1 The evaluation	4
1.2 The assessment procedure	4
1.3 Results of the assessment	5
1.4 Quality of the information	6
2 Structure, organisation and mission of LUCAS.....	7
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 Mission of the institute.....	7
2.3 Management and organisation	8
3 Assessment of the research of LUCAS	9
3.1 Research Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society	9
3.2 PhD training and education programme	12
3.3 Integrity	13
3.4 Diversity	13
3.5 Recommendations.....	14
Annex 1 Criteria and scores of national protocol SEP.....	16
Annex 2 Terms of Reference	18
Annex 3 Programme Site visit LUCAS.....	21
Annex 4 Research data	24
Annex 5 Curricula vitae of the Committee members	26

Preface

This report embodies the findings and recommendations of an international peer review of the Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society (LUCAS), undertaken on October 17-18, 2018.

Our peer review committee was appointed by the board of Leiden University to assess the quality and relevance to society of the research conducted in LUCAS between 2012 and 2017.

The assessment was based on a self-assessment report provided by LUCAS, additional documentation, and two days of meetings with the staff and PhD candidates of the institute. This review report is both prospective and retrospective and contains several recommendations to LUCAS and the Faculty of Humanities.

As chair I wish to thank my fellow evaluators for their expert and sincere contributions to the discussions and final findings. The work was not only intense, but also socially agreeable and academically rewarding.

We thank all members of LUCAS, staff and researchers, for their open and constructive participation in the review process.

We hope this report to be the beginning of another successful period of very good research in LUCAS.

December 2018

Prof. Shearer West
Chair

1. Introduction

1.1 The evaluation

All publicly funded university research in the Netherlands is evaluated at regular intervals in compliance with the national standard evaluation protocol (SEP 2015-2021), as agreed by the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU), the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) and the Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW). The evaluation process, which is applied at the research unit or institute level, consists of a systematic external peer review conducted every six years.

The evaluation system aims to achieve three generic objectives:

- *improvement* in the quality of research through an assessment carried out according to international standards of quality and relevance;
- *improvement* in research management and leadership; and
- *accountability* to the higher management levels of the research organisations and to the funding agencies, government and society at large.

1.2 The assessment procedure

The evaluation procedures followed by the Review Committee were those set out in the NWO/VSNU/KNAW “Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021 for public research organisations”. This protocol entails two main characteristics:

- *Two levels of assessment*: The assessment takes place at two levels of the research organisation, i.e. the level of the graduate school and the level of research groups/institutes¹;
- *Three main criteria*: The research institutes are assessed on the three assessment criteria, i.e. research quality, relevance to society, and viability.

The review committee was requested to report its findings on the research institute in line with the three main criteria, which should always be reviewed in relation to the institute’s mission, especially if this mission restricts the institute to operate only for/within a national scientific community.

With respect to the evaluation of LUCAS the findings should be reported in qualitative terms with a focus on policy and management questions, and for the assessment the verdict should be cast in both qualitative and quantitative terms. In the text, the most important considerations of the committee should be clarified, while the conclusion should be summarized in a single term according

¹ In the case of LUCAS, only the level of the research groups/institutes is relevant for the assessment.

to a four-point scale (annex 1). Checklists and excerpts of the standard evaluation protocol were provided as a tool for assisting in assessment.

The assessment was based on and supported by three main components of evidence:

- A self-assessment report detailing the operation, management, research activities, and SWOT analysis of the institute, written as prescribed in the national standard evaluation protocol;
- An overview of the output of the institute to allow the Committee to examine the quality of the published work;
- Discussions with boards, researchers, PhD candidates and council, academic staff, and research managers about the work programmes, the aims and the strategy for the future of the research institute and its consisting teams.

The site visit took place on 17–18 October 2018 and comprised a number of components, which can be summarised as follows (see annex 3 for the full programme and the names of participants):

- Arrival of the committee on the evening of Tuesday 16 October
- Tour of the campus
- Meeting with Institute Management and Dean of Humanities Faculty
- Meeting with PhD candidates and alumni
- Meeting with LUCAS advisory council
- Meeting with a sample of LUCAS staff
- Meeting with research leaders of LUCAS' three research clusters

The Peer Review Committee consisted of:

- Prof.dr. Shearer West (chair), University of Nottingham (UK)
- Prof.dr. Katlijne Van der Stighelen, KU Leuven (Belgium)
- Prof.dr. Max Liljefors, Lund University (Sweden)
- Prof.dr. Remco Sleiderink, University of Antwerp (Belgium)
- Prof.dr. Richard Hunter, University of Cambridge (UK)

- Dr. Frans van Steijn acted as independent secretary to the committee

1.3 Results of the assessment

This report summarises the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the international peer review of the research at LUCAS. The review covered the period between 2012 and 2017. The written and oral information permitted good understanding of the research institute. The assessment was rated and weighed according to the rationale explained in annex 1. The conclusions, as given in chapter 3 of this report, follow the structure and criteria which are formulated in the Terms of Reference, annex 2.

1.4 Quality of the information

The information that was made available to the committee consisted of:

- Self-assessment report with 19 appendices in accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol
- The Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015 – 2021
- The Terms of Reference for the Assessment Committee
- Programme of the site visit
- Short c.v.'s of the committee members and secretary
- Leiden Protocol for Research Assessment 2015 – 2021
- Samples of societal impact and academic output
- A tour of the present facilities and the outline of the future housing of LUCAS

The committee finds the information ample, honest and adequate.

2 Structure, organisation and mission of LUCAS

2.1 Introduction

The Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society (LUCAS) is one of seven academic institutes in Leiden University's Faculty of Humanities. LUCAS emerged out of the restructuring of the Humanities Faculty in 2008 and is the home of a variety of disciplines, such as modern literatures, art history, classics, and book, film and media studies that are clustered around a key research theme: the relationships between the arts and society. Through research, expertise, and service, the institute strives to facilitate a deeper understanding of the cognitive, historical, cultural, creative, and social aspects of human life.

LUCAS' tenured academic staff counts—on average in 2017—66 professors (full, associate and assistant). Non-tenured are the 43 post-docs and employed and contract PhD candidates. Research time of the tenured academic staff amounted to 14.3 FTE in 2017. The Post-docs and PhD candidates are predominantly employed for carrying out research. LUCAS' budget is ca. € 6.5 million for teaching and research. Teaching programmes include 16 bachelor studies, 14 masters (of which 4 two-year research masters) and 9 minor programmes.

2.2 Mission of the institute

LUCAS' website extensively states its mission as follows:

"LUCAS is a prominent player in the interdisciplinary research fields of the arts and cultural studies. Our Institute's research clusters explore and analyse the complex relationships between art, broadly considered, and society. With an emphasis on collaboration and valorisation, our researchers engage with local and international institutions and partners, and maintain high profiles in both academic and public communities.

LUCAS is one of the few research institutes in the world where experts in the fields of literature, art, architecture, and media collectively study cultural production spanning millennia, from classical antiquity to today. What binds our diverse research clusters is our shared endeavour to understand the relations between cultural products and practices (texts, visual art, artefacts, ideas), and their societal and historical contexts. Importantly, while our research agenda has a single programmatic umbrella (the interaction between the arts and society), it encourages a rich and diverse exploration of this core theme within and across three clusters with their own research agendas, methods, theories, and objects. We value research integrity, diversity, and inclusiveness among LUCAS members of all positions. We believe that this builds a strong foundation for a scholarly community and teaching environment that encourages broad perspectives,

stimulates creativity, and facilitates innovative research. We strive to support all members in offering equitable opportunities to develop their career profiles.”

In other words, LUCAS seeks to understand the relationship between on the one hand cultural products and practices (texts, visual art, artefacts, ideas) and on the other hand their societal context. LUCAS defines itself as a diverse research institute that provides teaching capacity for a multitude of study programmes. LUCAS brings together expertise in the fields of classics, literary studies, literary history and theory; book, film and media studies; and art history.

2.3 Management and organisation

LUCAS is managed by a Management Team (MT) consisting of an Academic Director, a Director of Education/Institute Manager, a General Board Member who is dedicated to research related projects, supported by a project manager. The MT is advised by an (internal) Advisory Council of 5 members who are appointed by the Faculty Board, an Institute Council in which all institute employees (except the MT) participate, and a PhD Council of 5 PhD's. The research activities are financed with research grants from national (NWO) and European (Horizon 2020 and ERC) granting funds, from the Faculty budget for teaching undergraduate, graduate and PhD candidates, and to a small extent from contract research.

Noteworthy, given the extensive teaching obligations of LUCAS' staff, is a dedicated task distribution model that is used to safeguard the staff members' research time.

For the past two years, three era-focused clusters—Classics (800 BCE–600 CE), Medieval and Early Modern (600–1800), Modern and Contemporary (1800–Present)—operate under a cluster leader who acts as a binding element within the body of researchers as well as a conduit between them and the MT (whereof the cluster leaders are no part).

The PhD programme of LUCAS is embedded in the Faculty Graduate School of Humanities, but the researchers also participate in seven national research schools that provide additional training for the PhD candidates of LUCAS. LUCAS also runs its own, specific PhD programme, the LUCAS Graduate Programme. In 2017 LUCAS hosted 18 employed and 9 contract PhD candidates. Furthermore LUCAS' senior professors supported 112 external PhD candidates.

3 Assessment of the research of LUCAS

3.1 Research Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society

Principal Institute	Leiden University, Faculty of Humanities Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society (LUCAS)
Director	Prof.dr. Anthonya Visser
Research input tenured staff 2017	14.3 fte (66.4 pers.)
Non-tenured research staff 2017	25.9 fte (34.9 pers.)

Assessment:

Research quality	2 (very good)
Relevance to society	2 (very good)
Viability	3 (good)

The Centre for the Arts in Society LUCAS has consistently advanced since its establishment in 2008 in the direction of a diverse, but coherent and well-lead research institute. The committee recognizes LUCAS' research is inevitably a disparate collection of subject areas, but the overarching search for the 'arts in society' with interdisciplinary approaches has led to a recognizable community that as such is acknowledged by its members. The committee has assessed LUCAS as a research institute, but due to the national and Leiden University funding model, the group of scholars, in particular the tenured staff, is more occupied with teaching than with doing research. LUCAS has developed a workload model that recognizes this necessity by accounting for 80% teaching time against 20% research time. Exceptions are made when staff are awarded external research grants from NWO, the EU and other sources which include provision for their personal research time. LUCAS is reasonably successful in attracting external grants.

LUCAS' management has successfully overcome the significant financial difficulties the institute suffered before. A range of measures, among which the workload model and policies to foster transparency, equity and career development, have convinced the committee of the quality of LUCAS' leadership. Staff and PhD candidates work together to build a sense of community, with mutual support, embracing serendipity and sharing good practice.

The recommendations of the previous external reviews, in 2012 and—mid-term—in 2015, have been acted upon adequately. The governance structure has been strengthened. Only the recommendation to install an external, international, research advisory board still needs to be realized.

Research quality

The institute's research programme focuses on the relationships between the arts and society, also in historical perspective. The research spans from Antiquity to the present day and is divided into three historical clusters:

- Classics (800 BCE–600 CE)
- Medieval and Early Modern (600–1800)
- Modern and Contemporary (1800–Present)

Common among all the clusters is the researchers' objective to understand the relationship between cultural products and practices (texts, visual arts, artefacts, ideas), and their social contexts and effects.

While the review panel were only able to read a fraction of the academic outputs of LUCAS, the quality and quantity appeared impressive overall, and the national and international academic impact is good and promising. The committee recognizes many high quality individual researchers, with the Classics cluster showing particular coherence. The two other clusters are more varied in reach and impact, but the prognosis of these clusters to develop further seems promising due to upcoming scholars. Researchers publish in high ranking journals and write significant scholarly books. The committee observed some recent decline in the research output—though not in refereed articles. As was noted in the previous external reviews, inadequate research time remains an issue not easily solved, given the funding model within which LUCAS operates.

The institute is successful in acquiring grants and the administrative and academic support for grant applicants appears fruitful. Obviously, researchers with one or more grants achieve a better teaching/research ratio and a higher academic output. However, the committee stresses that the overall quality of research should matter more than whether a grant has been realized. LUCAS should create more possibilities to increase research time when promising high quality results may be expected. An internal fund for sabbaticals may be considered. It might also be desirable that researchers get additional internal research time for writing grant proposals, additional to the support already offered.

The committee feels that the institute's ambitions with regard to its research objectives, in terms of (international) quality, impact, collaboration or the outcomes of grants, could have been articulated in a stronger and more tangible manner. Given the quality of the institute and its members, LUCAS can afford to be more visionary in its thinking, including the opportunities that will be offered by the future relocating of the institute into the renovated Arsenal building.

The committee assesses the overall research quality of LUCAS to be very good.

Relevance to society

The objective to be relevant not only for the advancement of academic knowledge but also for society at large is already apparent in the institute's name of 'arts in society'. The staff appear to be committed to this mission. They frequently undertake public outreach, in a variety of ways and for audiences with very different backgrounds, e.g. a variety of schools in Leiden, museums and public media. Already there are some excellent examples accomplished. LUCAS has the ambition to go further from these engagement activities to 'true valorisation'. That means that at least some researchers from each cluster will have to make outreach activities dominant in their research activities. To that end, opportunities are sought to build links with local museums on focussing on collections and public engagement.

The committee endorses these objectives, but apart from the broad descriptions presented in the self-evaluation report, an explicit impact and communication strategy appears to be absent. In the absence of a common strategic framework, outreach activities remain to a large extent the realm of researchers' individual choices. Relevance should be appropriately included and rewarded in annual appraisals and in promotions. LUCAS also might consider how to reward impact in other ways, for example through prizes.

The panel recommends that LUCAS be supported by the Leiden University communications office to ensure greater visibility of their research in national and international media and social media. This should include taking more care of increasing immediate accessibility of their research on the internet and social media. Also the external (and international) advisory committee-to-be could be very useful in this respect, if it includes research users among its members.

The committee assesses the overall relevance to society of LUCAS to be very good.

Viability

The committee recognizes the structural position of LUCAS within the Dutch university funding system that funds research through the teaching of undergraduate and graduate students. This is particularly pressured in LUCAS as the diversity of the academic subjects means that staff contribute to a large number of teaching programmes which are managed by study programme leaders, many of whom are outside the institute itself. Further problems arise in the fact that PhD supervision is considered to be part of the 20% research workload. That implies that staff with large numbers of PhD candidates feel additional pressure on their research time.

Notwithstanding these funding conditions, LUCAS has made successful efforts to mitigate the problems caused by a system outside their control by introducing a workload model that rationalizes and objectifies the workload. The success of this approach is illustrated by the Faculty of Humanities considering the possibility of introducing this model more widely across the Faculty. LUCAS is advised to work with the Faculty to investigate the possibilities of reviewing and potentially rationalizing (some) teaching programmes in the Faculty. That could create more space/headroom for research across the Faculty as a whole.

The committee felt there was both potential and actual friction between those who get external funding and those who do not. There were also signs of friction between full professors and some of the other tenured staff, upon whom the 80/20 teaching/research split seems to weigh very heavily. The committee advises the institute's management to explicitly address the open communication and personnel policy. LUCAS' plan to consider how it might foster early career colleagues shows they pay attention to the inter-generational issues exacerbated by the structural funding model.

The committee assesses the overall viability of LUCAS to be good.

3.2 PhD training and education programme

LUCAS' PhD programme is embedded in the Faculty's Graduate School of Humanities and is therefore regulated by the faculty and university-wide requirements and procedures. LUCAS' diversity in disciplines and themes is reflected in the subjects of the PhD theses in the reviewed period. Diversity is also reflected by the number of seven national research schools the PhD candidates and their supervisors participate in. The committee felt that there was huge diversity of topics across the three clusters and wondered if PhD candidates might be brought together in new and different ways, e.g. through a thematic research seminar programme or other clustering of common themes.

LUCAS acknowledges that there is a problem with PhD completion rates. Of the previous cohort that started a PhD research trajectory in the years 2009 – 2013, only 3 out of 21 graduated within 5 years and more than 50% did not yet finish or discontinued their PhD project before 2018. These figures only concern the employed and contract PhD candidates; 'success rates' are not applicable to the large number of external candidates.

In the self-evaluation report and during the interviews various explanations were given for these problems with completion. Explanations focused on unrealistic expectations of the candidates themselves about what they could achieve in a four year period (i.e. additional publications, teaching etc.) and the large number of unfunded PhDs candidates, many of whom were part-time and therefore could struggle to complete on time.

The committee recognizes the recent strengthening of training and development for PhD candidates. It is clear that a number of measures have been put in place over the last few years, including a more structured training programme, annual assessments, clearer expectations of delivery, the PhD Council, and regular meetings among the candidates themselves. The committee felt that these initiatives are likely to pay off in time, leading to better completion rates. Although no explicit supervision problems were reported during the interviews, the committee recommends that LUCAS is more explicit with the minimum number of contact hours PhD candidates may expect. In considering evolutions of the current workload model, LUCAS should give further thought to how PhD supervision is incentivized or accounted for in the workload model.

The committee was somewhat surprised by the large number of external PhD candidates. Since there is no obligation to accept candidates, the committee recommends that LUCAS should consider a cost/benefit analysis of taking on unfunded PhDs and consider just how many of these is sensible, given other demands on the supervisory staff.

The committee recommends that LUCAS should devote more attention to tracking the careers of PhD alumni. PhD alumni who are successful in their academic or other careers can enhance the reputation of the programme and help demonstrate LUCAS' value as a strong research institute.

3.3 Integrity

The University and Faculty of Humanities have good policies around research integrity, but it is not clear how well these policies are known and understood among the staff and PhD candidates in LUCAS. The committee has the impression that counsellors and helpdesks may be more approachable and visible than presently is the case. All policies about research integrity, safeguarding, whistleblowing and such should be clearly signposted to all staff and PhD candidates.

3.4 Diversity

There is welcome attention to diversity in LUCAS, particularly around gender. It is not entirely clear how other protected characteristics (ethnicity, disability) are considered. While the committee did not see the detailed data, many LUCAS staff and PhD candidates we spoke to were educated in Leiden or had spent most of their career in Leiden. The research community therefore seems to some extent inward rather than outward facing. While the grant system makes this perhaps almost inevitable, the committee wondered about the extent to which LUCAS was actively attempting to recruit international staff and PhD candidates.

3.5 Recommendations

In the assessment above, the committee has made the following recommendations:

1. Carry out the recommendation of the previous review committee to install an external, international, research advisory board.
2. Create more possibilities to increase research time in cases of expected promising high quality results, regardless of whether or not an individual holds a grant. An internal fund for sabbaticals may be considered. It might also be desirable that researchers get additional internal research time for writing grant proposals, additional to the support already offered.
3. The institute's ambitions with regard to its research objectives should be articulated more strongly and tangibly. That may include the opportunities that will be offered by the future relocating of the institute into the renovated Arsenal building.
4. LUCAS should develop an explicit strategy for impact and communication. Relevance and impact should be appropriately included and rewarded in annual appraisals and in promotions.
5. The committee advises the institute's management to address more explicitly and transparently its personnel policies.
6. LUCAS should seek support by the Leiden University communications office to ensure greater visibility of their research in national and international media and social media.
7. LUCAS is advised to investigate the possibilities to review and potentially rationalize teaching programmes in the Faculty.
8. LUCAS should be more explicit with the minimum number of contact hours PhD candidates may expect. LUCAS should give further thought to how PhD supervision is incentivized or accounted for in the workload model.
9. LUCAS should seek to bring PhD candidates together in new and different ways, e.g. through a thematic research seminar programme or other clustering of common themes.
10. The committee recommends that LUCAS should consider a cost/benefit analysis of taking on unfunded PhDs and consider just how many of these is sensible, given other demands on the supervisory staff.

11. The committee recommends that LUCAS should devote more attention to tracking the careers of PhD alumni.
12. Counsellors and helpdesks for research integrity questions should become more approachable and visible.
13. LUCAS should try to actively recruit more international staff and PhD candidates.

Annex 1 Criteria and scores of national protocol SEP

Criterion 1: Research quality

The committee assesses the quality of the institute's research and the contribution that research makes to the body of academic knowledge. The committee also assesses the scale of the institute's research results (academic publications, instruments and infrastructure developed by the group, and other contributions to science). The following elements are to be considered in assessing this criterion:

- scientific quality
- productivity to the scientific community (in relation to the volume of the tenured scientific staff)
- the academic reputation of the group
- the strategy to provide the output at the highest relevant level possible

Criterion 2: Relevance to society

The committee assesses the quality, scale and relevance of contributions targeting specific economic, social, or cultural target groups, of advisory reports for policy, of contributions to public debates, and so on. The point is to assess contributions in areas that the institute has itself designated as target areas. The following elements—if applicable—are to be considered in assessing this criterion:

- a narrative in which the group demonstrates its relevance for society
- research products for societal target groups such as: professional publications and outreach to the general public, other research output to society
- use of research products by societal groups such as patents, licences, training courses
- projects in cooperation with societal partners (European Union, *Topsectoren*, international funds)
- contract research (including consultancies), also co-publications and use of facilities
- present jobs of alumni
- demonstrable marks of recognition by societal groups such as demonstrated by advisory reports for the government
- media exposure as presentations on radio / TV, invited opinion articles etc.
- membership societal advisory boards

Criterion 3: Viability

The committee assesses the strategy that the institute intends to pursue in the years ahead and the extent to which it is capable of meeting its targets in research and society during this period. It also considers the governance and

leadership skills of the institute's management. The following elements are to be considered in assessing this criterion:

- leadership
- (academic) visibility and recognition
- research vision and strength of the research lines
- innovative strength
- strategic choices and decisions
- composition of the group (expertise, people)
- acquisition capacity

The meaning of the scores for the three main assessment criteria:

Score	Meaning	Research quality	Relevance to society	Viability
1	Excellent / world leading	One of the few most influential research groups in the world in its particular field	An outstanding contribution to society	Excellently equipped for the future
2	Very good	Very good, internationally recognized research	A very good contribution to society	Very well equipped for the future
3	Good	Good research	Makes a good contribution to society	Makes responsible strategic decisions and is therefore well equipped for the future
4	Unsatisfactory	Does not achieve satisfactory results in its field	Does not make a satisfactory contribution to society	Not adequately equipped for the future

Annex 2 Terms of Reference

Terms of reference Assessment Committee Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society (LUCAS)

The board of Leiden University hereby issues the following Terms of Reference to the assessment committee of the Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society chaired by prof.dr. Shearer West.

Assessment

You are being asked to assess the quality and relevance to society of the research conducted by the Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society (research unit) between 2012 and 2017 as well as its strategic targets, and the extent to which it is equipped to achieve them. You should do so by judging the unit's performance on the three Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) assessment criteria:

- Research quality
- Relevance to society
- Viability

Please take into account current international trends and developments in science and society in your analysis.

For a description of the criteria, see Section 2 of the SEP. Please provide a written assessment on each of the three criteria and assign the research unit to a particular category (1,2,3 or 4) in each case, in accordance with the SEP guidelines. Please also provide recommendations for improvement.

In the SEP protocol, indicators of research quality explicitly include qualitative output such as instruments and infrastructure developed by the research unit.

We would like your report to provide a qualitative assessment of the research unit as a whole in relation to its strategic targets and to the governance and leadership skills of its management. Please also make recommendations concerning these two subjects.

In accordance with the SEP, please also reflect on the following three aspects in your report:

- PhD programme
- Research integrity
- Diversity

It is expected that two additional questions are included into the protocol. We ask you to pay special attention to:

1 Promoting our research profile

LUCAS has created a clear focus in the research undertaken by its members: a key aim across our three historical clusters is the endeavour to understand the relationship between on the one hand cultural products and practices (texts, visual art, artefacts, ideas), and on the other their societal context. *What would be effective strategies to actively promote our profile both to the outside world (society at large) and members of the institute?*

2 Nurturing talent

While LUCAS looks out for all its members, it also nurtures its talented researchers. The institute has created support systems, for example, through which these researchers are provided with increased chances to get substantial grants: workshops are organized devoted to writing grant applications, committees are established that read proposals and help improve them, and mock-interviews are organized for researchers who reach the final round of the application process. *What else can LUCAS do to make talented researchers flourish and grow academically?*

Documentation

The necessary documentation will be available on a secure website no later than [date]. The documents will include at least the following;

- Self-evaluation report of the above mentioned research unit plus
- Combined appendices prescribed by the SEP format;
- The Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021;
- These Terms of Reference for the Assessment Committee;
- The programme for the site visit;
- Short CV's of the committee members and secretary;
- Leiden Protocol for Research Assessment 2015-2021.

Site visit

The site visit at the Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society will take place on [date]. During this site visit the committee will have interviews with the management team and researchers of the institute. The coordinator of the assessment process will contact you about logistical matters no later than two months prior to the site visit.

Statement of impartiality and confidentiality

Before embarking on your assessment work, you will be asked to sign a statement of impartiality. In this statement, you declare that you have no direct relationship or connection with the Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society.

Assessment report

We ask you to report your findings in an assessment report drawn up in accordance with the SEP guidelines and format. You must send the draft report

to the Leiden University Centre for the Arts in Society no more than eight weeks after the site visit. The institute will check the report for factual inaccuracies; if such inaccuracies are detected, you will see that they are corrected. You will then send (the corrected version of) the assessment report to the board of Leiden University.

Annex 3 Programme Site visit LUCAS

17 – 18 October 2018

(The committee arrived on October 16 and convened for dinner)

Day 1 17 October, Academy Building, room of Humanities

- 9.00 Start-off meeting committee
- 11.15 Tour of the Campus
- Anthonya Visser *Academic Director & Professor of Modern European, in particular German, Literature and Culture*
 - Rick Honings *General Board Member & University Lecturer of Dutch Literature*
 - Jan Pronk *Director of Education and Institute Manager*
 - Ylva Klaassen *Project Manager*
- 12.15 Lunch (Faculty Club)
- 13.30 Meeting with Institute Management and Dean Humanities Faculty
- Mark Rutgers *Dean & Professor of Social Philosophy*
 - Anthonya Visser *Academic Director & Professor of Modern European, in particular German, Literature and Culture*
 - Rick Honings *General Board Member & University Lecturer of Dutch Literature*
 - Jan Pronk *Director of Education and Institute Manager*
 - Ylva Klaassen *Project Manager*
- 14.45 Meeting with PhD candidates and alumni
- Lieke Smits *PhD candidate in Medieval Studies*
 - Renske Janssen *PhD candidate in Classics*
 - Amaranth Feuth *PhD candidate in English Literature*
 - Looi van Kessel *PhD candidate in Literary Studies*
 - Max van Duijn *PhD alumnus in Language and Cognition, currently University Lecturer at Leiden Institute of Advanced Computer Science*
 - Rosalien van der Poel *PhD alumnus in Art History, currently Institute Manager at the Academy of Creative and Performing Arts*
- 15.45 Committee meeting
- 16.15 Meeting with LUCAS Advisory Council
- Peter Liebrechts *Chair of the Advisory Council & Professor of Modern Literatures in English*

- Adriaan Rademaker *University Lecturer of Greek Language and Culture*
- Sara Brandellero *University Lecturer of Latin American Studies*
- Eliza Steinbock *University Lecturer of Cultural Analysis*
- Céline Zaepffel *PhD Candidate in French Literature*

17.45 Committee meeting

18.00 Dinner Committee

Day 2 18 October, Academy Building, room of Humanities

- 9.00 Meeting with a sample of LUCAS staff
- Tim Vergeer *PhD Candidate in Early Modern Theatre History*
 - Anna Dlabacova *Postdoc in Medieval Dutch Literature*
 - Esther Op de Beek *University Lecturer of Dutch Literature*
 - Susanna de Beer *Senior University Lecturer of (Renaissance) Latin*
 - Stijn Bussels *Professor of Art history, especially before 1800*
- 10.30 Break
- 11.00 Meeting with Research Leaders Classics, Medieval/Early Modern, Modern/Contemporary
- Ineke Sluiter (Classics) *Professor of Greek Language and Literature & KNAW Academy Professor*
 - Geert Warnar (Medieval/Early Modern) *Senior University Lecturer of Dutch Literature*
 - Sybille Lammes (Modern/Contemporary) *Professor of New Media and Digital Culture*
- 12.00 Committee meeting
- 12.30 Lunch (Faculty Club)
- 13.30 Committee meeting
- 15.00 Meeting with Institute Management (for last questions/clarifications)
- Anthonya Visser *Academic Director & Professor of Modern European, in particular German, Literature and Culture*

- Rick Honings *General Board Member & University Lecturer of Dutch Literature*
- Jan Pronk *Director of Education and Institute Manager*
- Ylva Klaassen *Project Manager*

15.30 Presentation of preliminary findings (LUCAS, P.N. van Eyckhof 3, 1st floor)

16.00 Departure (informal drinks)

Annex 4 Research data

a. Composition of LUCAS research staff (fte)

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Academic staff	11.1	11.3	12.1	13.1	13.2	14.3
Post-docs	14.3	13.0	9.3	7.2	8.5	10.1
PhD candidates - employed	14.2	11.6	13.2	14.6	14.5	15.8
PhD candidates - contract [#]	2.3	5.0	5.2	6.3	7.3	8.2
Total research staff	39.6	35.8	34.6	34.9	36.2	40.2
Support staff	5.9	4.6	2.4	2.6	2.2	2.1
Visiting fellows [#]	15	12	12	14	15	7
Total staff	45.5	40.4	36.9	37.5	38.5	42.3

Contract PhD candidates and visiting fellows: figures in numbers; formally they have no research fte

b. Financing structure

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
<i>Funding:</i>						
Direct funding (FTE)	13.6	12.3	13.3	15.1	15.0	14.9
Research grants	27.6	22.6	17.9	18.5	18.9	23.9
Contract research	4.2	5.4	5.6	4.0	4.5	3.5
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total funding	45.4	40.3	36.8	37.5	38.5	42.3
<i>Expenditure(x € 1000)</i>						
Personnel costs	2.755	2.599	2.380	2.445	2.530	2.781
Other costs	277	341	264	344	294	348
Total expenditure	3.032	2.940	2.644	2.788	2.824	3.129

c. Numbers of publications

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Refereed articles	85	71	84	67	59	57
Non-refereed articles	28	13	21	32	17	19
Books	15	12	19	18	14	11
Book chapters	94	110	122	101	96	82
PhD theses	17	18	14	16	16	8
Conference papers	64	50	67	77	55	58
Professional publ.	71	59	50	30	79	32
Publ. for general public	34	43	64	81	52	25
Other Research output	184	213	224	239	237	203
Total publications	592	589	665	661	625	495

Annex 5 Curricula vitae of the Committee members

Prof. Shearer West (chair) is the seventh Vice-Chancellor and President of the University of Nottingham.

Shearer West is a Professor of Art History and has held a number of significant leadership roles in universities and higher education. She obtained her B.A. degree in Art History and English at the College of William and Mary in Virginia, and her Ph.D. in Art History at St. Andrews. She worked as an editor for the Grove Dictionary of Art before taking up her first academic post in art history at the University of Leicester.

In 1996, Shearer moved to the University of Birmingham as Head of the History of Art Department, then Head of the School of Historical Studies, and Acting Head of the College of Arts and Law. She was awarded a personal chair in 2000. In 2008 Shearer was appointed Director of Research at the Arts and Humanities Research Council where she also chaired the Research Directors Group for Research Councils UK. She was appointed Head of the Humanities Division at Oxford in 2011, where she oversaw the launch of the Oxford Research Centre in the Humanities (TORCH) and the Ertegun Graduate Scholarship Programme in the Humanities. She was appointed Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor at the University of Sheffield in 2015.

Shearer has authored and edited many articles and nine books including *Portraiture, The visual arts in Germany 1897-1940: Utopia and Despair*, and *Fin De Siecle: Art and society in an age of uncertainty*. She is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts, the Higher Education Academy and the Royal Historical Society, and has held two visiting Fellowships at Yale University.

Shearer also has a number of international roles, most recently acting as main panel chair for the national research assessment exercise for Humanities in Norway and serving on the steering group to introduce impact into the Excellence in Research (ERA) exercise in Australia.

She has also represented the UK on the Science Europe Humanities Scientific Committee, and has been a jurist for the Spinoza Prize in the Netherlands and the Odysseus and Solvay prizes in Belgium, as well as an Advisory Board member for the Social Sciences Faculty of the University of Vienna.

Prof. Richard Hunter is Regius Professor of Greek at the University of Cambridge and Fellow of Trinity College. His fields of expertise include Greek Literature, Hellenistic and Roman poetry, and ancient literary criticism. Prof. Hunter chairs the Board of the Faculty of Classics at Cambridge University. He is a Fellow of the British Academy and of the Academy of Athens, and served as President of the Council of the Aristotle University in Thessaloniki, Greece. Prof. Hunter has edited several leading Classics journals and also served as Head of the School of Arts and Humanities in Cambridge.

Prof. Max Liljefors is Professor of Art History and Visual Studies, Lund University (Sweden).

His fields of expertise are: art and visual culture, visual historiography, bioart and medical visual cultures, performativity, aesthetics and spirituality.

Prof. Liljefors has extensive experience of interdisciplinary research about art and visual culture in collaboration with partners from biomedicine, ethnology, human ecology and law. He has been the principal investigator of a humanistic work package within the BAGADILICO research program (2008–2018) about Huntington's and Parkinson's diseases. He is currently the chair of the Swedish Research Council's reviewing committee for the aesthetic disciplines.

Prof. Remco Sleiderink is professor of Medieval Dutch literature at the University of Antwerp. He holds a PhD from Leiden University (2003). He is now professor of Medieval Dutch literature, coordinator of the Institute for the Study of Literature in the Low Countries (ISLN) and Chair of the Department of Literature at the University of Antwerp. From 2011 to 2017 he was campus dean of KU Leuven in Brussels, dealing with HR, budget and the organization of research and education. In his own research, he often focuses on the compositional contexts of Middle Dutch literature, with specific attention to the Duchy of Brabant and the dynamics between court and city. He is also highly invested in material philology, which provides an integrated approach to text and manuscript transmission. Other constant focuses in his research are literary analysis, intertextuality and multilingualism. He is member of the editorial board of *Spiegel der Letteren* (since 218) and has been editor-in-chief of *Queeste* (2003-2011). He is very much concerned with public outreach (e.g. exhibitions, social media, non-expert publications).

Prof. Katlijne Van der Stighelen studied art history at KU Leuven where she was appointed a Full Professor in 2003. She published books on Anna Maria van Schurman (1607-1678), Cornelis de Vos (1584/85-1651), Anthony van Dyck (1599-1641) and the tradition of Flemish portraiture. Furthermore, she published widely on aspects of Flemish art and women-artists in the 16th and 17th centuries. In the Fall of 2002 she was holder of the Rubens Chair at Berkeley, University of California. Together with Hans Vlieghe she is the editor of the series *Pictura Nova. Studies in 16th- and 17th-Century Flemish Painting and Drawing'* (Brepols Publishers Turnhout). Since 1996 not less than 21 monographs have been published. In 2018 she curated the first exhibition ever on 'Michaelina Wautier (1604-1689). Leading Lady of Baroque' organized by the Rubenshuis and the Mas in Antwerp. Currently she is preparing a volume on unidentified portraits by Peter Paul Rubens as part of the *Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard*, the largest catalogue raisonné that will ever be published on the oeuvre of an individual artist.

Dr. Frans van Steijn (secretary) studied physics (BSc) at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and philosophy (MA) at the University of Amsterdam. He received a PhD at the UvA on a thesis "The Universities in Society; a Study of part-time professors in the Netherlands"(1990). Since 1996 Frans was senior advisor at Vereniging van Universiteiten (VSNU) the Association of Universities in the Netherlands. He was Secretary to the Board and secretary to the Rector's Conference. His expert fields are quality assurance, research policy and research integrity.

In September 2014 he retired from VSNU and established an independent office for consultancy and project management, specialized in quality assurance in universities and research organisations.