

RESEARCH REVIEW
FACULTY OF ARCHAEOLOGY
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. Assessment of the Faculty	6
2.1 The Archaeology Faculty.....	6
2.2 Research quality.....	7
2.3 Relevance to society.....	8
2.4 Viability.....	9
2.5 PhD programme	10
2.6 Research integrity	11
2.7 Diversity.....	11
3. Summary and 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

This report contains the findings in September 2018 of a review committee concerning the quality of research of the Faculty of Archaeology of the Leiden University, as part of the national system of research quality assessment in the Netherlands established 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 committee considered written evidence for the quality of the research undertaken in the period 2012-2017, the quality of the research environment including for graduate students, and the sustainability of the Faculty in terms of its research strategy for the coming years. Its assessment of this documentation was greatly informed by a visit to the Faculty where the committee met a wide range of staff, post-doctoral researchers and graduate students. The committee would like to express its gratitude to all members of the Faculty for their openness and positive and reflective approach to the review. They made the exercise not just informative for committee members but also individually rewarding and indeed at times inspiring, reminding us all of the intellectual importance and societal relevance of our discipline. The committee would also like to thank most warmly its secretary Annemarie Venemans of De Onderzoekerij for her support before and during the review, and in the preparation of this report.

Professor Graeme Barker
Chairman



1. Introduction

1.1 Terms of reference for the assessment

The quality assessment of research of the Archaeology Faculty 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 was asked to assess the scientific quality and the relevance and utility to society of the research conducted by the Archaeology Faculty 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 the Archaeology Faculty.

1.2 The review committee

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

- Prof. Graeme Barker (chairman)
- Prof. Laurajane Smith
- Dr. Bruno Overlaet
- Prof. Thilo Rehren

Prof. Smith was not able to attend the site visit but sent in a preliminary assessment and commented on the report. 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 the Archaeology Faculty.

1.3 Procedures followed by the committee

Prior to the site visit, the committee received detailed documentation comprising:

- The self-assessment report of the Archaeology Faculty, including appendices;
- Informative document of the three departments of the Faculty;
- The Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) 2015–2021

The committee proceeded according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP). The assessment is based on the documentation provided by the Faculty and the interviews with the management, a selection of researchers of the Faculty, and PhD students. The interviews took place on 10 and 11 September 2018 (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 Faculty for factual corrections and comments. Subsequently, the text was finalised and presented to the Board of the Leiden University.



2. Assessment of the Faculty

According to the SEP scoring system, as explained in Appendix D, the committee has awarded the following scores to the Faculty:

Research quality:	2
Relevance to society:	2
Viability:	2

2.1 The Archaeology Faculty

The Archaeology Faculty is one of the seven faculties of the Leiden University. The Faculty is headed by a Board consisting of members of staff: the Dean, Executive Dean, Chair of Education, Chair of Research; and a student member.

In 2015 the Faculty organised itself in three departments:

- World Archaeology;
- Archaeological Sciences;
- Archaeological Heritage & Society.

Each department includes various research groups:

World Archaeology	Archaeological Sciences	Archaeological Heritage & Society
Human Origins	Bio-Archaeology	Archaeological Heritage Management
European Prehistory	Material Culture Studies	Heritage of Indigenous Peoples
Roman Provinces, Middle Ages and Modern Period	Digital Archaeology	Museum Studies
Archaeology of the Americas		
Archaeology of the Near East		
Classical & Mediterranean Archaeology		

The Faculty has recently (2017) defined five research themes as current cross-cutting research foci. The research themes are:

- Human Niche Construction;
- The Human Body;
- Urban Pasts: Managing Diversity and Inequality;
- Interaction and Identity;
- Crafting Societies in the Past and Present.

Currently, the Faculty consists of 145 staff members. These include 14 full professors, 28 lecturers, assistant and associate professors, 25 postdoctoral researchers, 32 employed PhD students, and 9 resident self-funded PhD researchers. Total research staff is approximately 105 members (72 fte).

The committee reflected at length on the organisational structures associated with research in Archaeology. The Faculty has the mix of humanities-based and science-based approaches that characterise well-founded research units in the discipline. The committee is strongly of the opinion that this mix is best served by the subject group remaining an independent Faculty at Leiden.



The three departments have a useful function in terms of the delivery of teaching programmes. In terms of research the committee finds this structure less obvious but was pleased to note that the departments do not appear to create boundaries hindering research collaborations or a cohesive research environment within the Faculty. The recent definition of the five cross-cutting research themes shared amongst the various research groups is a useful initiative in this respect.

The present number of research groups may be overambitious given the size of the core staff. The fragmentation is particularly evident in the department of World Archaeology. A revised grouping could help drive shared theoretical awareness, promote coherence in enquiry and method across wider ranges, and lead to more transferable insights and impacts beyond the chrono-geographic boundaries that define the World Archaeology research groups.

Research strategy and research area

The Faculty has the following mission statement: "The Faculty staff studies the evolution of humankind and the long-term development of human societies from a wide range of geographical and thematic perspectives, covering a large number of regions around the globe and tackling issues like social and behavioural complexity, growing social and economic inequality, the emergence of globalization and increased human impact on the environment. It contributes to the investigation of: human niche construction; the human body through the ages; urban pasts; and how societies are impacted by material culture. The Faculty becomes increasingly sensitive to the social and cultural environment in which it operates, meaning that it actively links scientific research to societal issues, current heritage practices and public debates about human origins and our deep past".

The research strategy of the institute is to consolidate its position as an institution where world-class researchers with global networks of peers, talented early career researchers and students engage in cutting-edge research and present their research results to the general public in outreach activities.

According to the committee, the self-evaluation report demonstrates that the Faculty has a considered and strategic research strategy that is continually being assessed and monitored. There is a considered self-reflection in the report and in the utility of the stated mission and goals, alongside a critical evaluation of the opportunities and resources available to the Faculty and its staff to reach achievable and realistic goals.

2.2 Research quality

The committee came to the conclusion that, when translating its opinion into the categories of the SEP 2015-2021, the overall quality of the research falling within its remit qualifies as 2 (the research unit conducts very good, internationally recognised research) with clear elements of 1. The committee's opinion is based on the following considerations.

The Faculty of Archaeology is internationally recognised as a centre of excellence in archaeology research and graduate training. It is clear that the Faculty is undertaking research of very high quality based on key indicators, such as quality and quantity of research publications, citation levels and project and individual grant capture. The research unit ranks impressively high in the QS by subject ranking for archaeology (#8 in 2018). The research quality is generally very good across all research groups and outstanding in some. There is good evidence of interdisciplinary collaboration within and between the research groups.

The Faculty has published between 63 and 92 refereed articles per year, with a steady increase in recent years of papers in high impact journals. The publication record demonstrates research of high quality in all of its research groups, and excellent research in several. Ten out of twenty "most cited" articles/books have a Leiden affiliated lead author, indicating the balanced position of individual research in international collaborations. There is also strength in depth, with high quality research well represented in terms of career stages, from senior staff to early career researchers. However, the committee is of the opinion that some of the research output is rather specialised and inward looking. The Faculty should



make efforts to ensure that as much of its research as possible culminates in publications that are of international significance and academic impact beyond their individual case study audiences.

The percentages of funding based on research grants (30.4 fte in 2017) and contract research (22.8 fte in 2017) both increased in the review period 2012–2017. The Faculty has had notable success for its size in awards of major personal grants (7 ERC, 2 VENI, 2 VIDI, 2 VICI). The prestigious prizes awarded to several staff are further recognition of the breadth of the research quality. Successful grant applications are shared by staff members to encourage further success. The committee appreciates this open collegiate culture.

The success of Faculty staff winning competitive research grants has put strains on teaching structures. Much of the teaching impacts appear to have fallen on the shoulders of post-docs, with potential impacts on their research productivity and career prospects. The committee recommends the Faculty to develop oversight mechanisms for monitoring post-doc workloads and to develop formal mentoring structures for post-docs by Faculty staff other than their PIs. The committee also noted that, as an alternative to appointing staff on fixed-term contracts to deliver teaching, the Faculty is exploring alternative measures such as providing support for PIs to enable them to continue with a defined teaching commitment alongside managing the grant.

During the site visit the committee had the opportunity to visit four laboratories of the Faculty. It was impressed by the facilities. However, the committee got the impression that some of the labs were rather teaching focused and believes that there is potential for them to become better integrated into the research endeavour. It applauds the plan to join all laboratory facilities within an integrated structure (the “Leiden Archaeological Laboratory”) as a mechanism not just to promote efficiencies in running costs but also to strengthen integrated bids for major research grants.

2.3 Relevance to society

The committee came to the conclusion that, as far as relevance to society is concerned, the Faculty’s research output generally qualifies as 2 in the SEP 2015–2021 categories (“the research unit makes a very good contribution to society”).

According to the self-evaluation report, the Faculty engages with a wide variety of (inter)national users from academic, governmental, and commercial organisations, and with printed and broadcast media. The committee noted that the Faculty clearly places much value on societal relevance, and is committed to further strengthening this aspect. Archaeological research benefits often from a heightened public interest and easily communicable activities; this is something which the Faculty seems to be actively encouraging and developing.

Several research products of significant public interest were highlighted in the report, such as the Trinil shell (the world’s oldest engraving), the reconstruction of pre-colonial Mesoamerican codices and the public engagement embedded in the NEXUS1492 ERC programme. The committee was impressed by these products, and by other initiatives such as in citizen science. In addition, the Department of Archaeological Heritage creates further possibilities for developing the societal relevance of the Faculty’s research more widely.

Based on the self-evaluation report and the interviews during the site visit it became clear that Archaeology collaborates with museums, professional archaeological and heritage organisations in Leiden as well as beyond. The committee believes that there remain significant opportunities to build on these local collaborations to promote Leiden *sensu largo* as a world centre of archaeological research that adds up to more than the sum of its parts. It was surprised that in its SWOT analysis the Faculty stated under Weaknesses that ‘Some of the fields of research are investigated elsewhere in Leiden, eg. archaeological research in the Humanities Faculty and the National Museum of Antiquities, heritage research in the Humanities and the Social Sciences Faculty, early hominin research at Naturalis, material culture studies at the Leiden Museum of Ethnology’ but under Opportunities that strengthening collaborations with such institutions represented significant potential for enhancing the Faculty’s research reach and impact (The Faculty acknowledged during the review that this juxtaposition was unintended). Given the desirability of involving external staff early in research grant applications and public



engagement activities, the committee wondered whether in some cases more formal contractual arrangements supporting collaboration with other Leiden institutions should be explored.

To further develop the societal impact, the Faculty described in the self-evaluation report the following near future strategy:

1. systematically exploring possibilities and opportunities for public outreach via high-quality public science media;
2. creating awareness of indigenous rights to archaeological and cultural heritage and ensuring public access to both heritage and the results of archaeological research;
3. stimulating citizen science;
4. paying specific attention to the deep history of current issues, such as globalization and its effects on cultures and economies, growing inequality, and increased human influence of the (natural) environment, using the benefit of hindsight and new knowledge of their long-term (archaeological) dimension.

While the committee applauds the description of a future strategy regarding public impact, this strategy needs further thought on how best to operationalise it, and to measure the effectiveness of specific actions, activities and/or results. This applies particularly to the fourth area of the strategy.

2.4 Viability

Whilst the previous two sections contained an assessment of the performance of the Faculty during the reference period, this section is more forward-looking. The committee came to the conclusion that, when translating its opinion into the categories of the SEP 2015-2021, the Faculty ranked as 2 for viability (the research unit is very well equipped for the future).

The self-evaluation report states that the Faculty wants to consolidate and develop its position as a leading centre for academic archaeology on a global scale. The committee believes that there is a great potential to achieve this ambition. Steady signs of quality improvement could be observed across the review period. Besides that, there are many positives for the Faculty's viability including its international research standing, the attractiveness of its teaching (both Bachelors and Masters) and PhD training programmes, the quality of its facilities, and the quality of its tenured academic staff including recent appointments and promotions.

The SWOT analysis was clear in identifying the strengths as well as the weaknesses. The Faculty is clearly aware of the challenges it is facing, and the constraints of the wider academic environment it is operating in.

The SWOT analysis points out the very successful achievement of the Faculty in obtaining large and prestigious peer-reviewed grants (ERC & NWO) which made a significant expansion of research staff and graduate student numbers possible. However, the Faculty notes the ever more competitive landscape for obtaining such grants. In addition, the committee learned that recently NWO has introduced an embedding guarantee for VIDI and VICI funding that includes a statement by the prospective institution that a successful candidate will either be appointed as a tenure track candidate or will be offered a permanent appointment on completion of the award. As the Faculty of Archaeology, like all other Archaeology departments in the Netherlands, is too small to offer permanent appointments like this (in effect mortgaging future retirements), this measure will lead to fewer NWO funding opportunities. The committee is pleased that the Faculty is well aware that it will face challenges in the maintenance of grant success and is thinking imaginatively about solutions, including involving cross-institutional collaborations.

However, the committee believes that the Faculty can take other positive steps to strengthen its viability going forwards. Like any other archaeology research unit it cannot cover all periods, areas, and approaches and should be honest about that. The committee suggests that the Faculty should identify its core strengths more explicitly and concentrate resources there. A sharper research profile is likely to strengthen the Faculty's international impact and its attractiveness for future hiring, funding and graduate recruitment.



Second, in the upcoming period several staff members will retire. It is important to develop a hiring strategy, and to do so in a transparent and consultative manner. This strategy should include: the areas and the breadth of openings; the balance between young and experienced researchers being sought; the development of existing talent; embedding of new Faculty members; and the mechanisms to identify the best talents on an international scale. This strategy should also take diversity into account (gender, migration background).

Decision-making currently appears to rest strongly with the Faculty Board, which is in effect a small senior management team, with input from the research and education committees and departmental heads. It will be critical to involve the tenured academic staff in the development of the Faculty's research and teaching strategy and the related recruitment choices, so that it is perceived as legitimate and broadly supported by the Faculty.

The Faculty's teaching programmes are attractive to a range of well qualified undergraduates, but providing that teaching and associated administration of course puts pressure on staff research time. It is important to develop promotion structures in which excellent performances in teaching and research are both rewarded appropriately. The committee was reassured to learn that the Faculty is actively addressing this issue.

2.5 PhD programme

The PhD Graduate School of Archaeology is responsible for the PhD programme. It plays a role in the selection of PhD students, the monitoring of progress, and in facilitating the participation of PhD candidates in research education activities.

The Faculty hosts different types of PhD students. The first category consists of internal funded PhD students with full employment status from a grant or scholarship. The second category are self-funded PhD students working in the Faculty supported by Graduate School facilities. External PhD students, such as professional archaeologists and retired people, form the third category; these students are self-funded and are based elsewhere.

At the start of the appointment of PhD students a tailor-made training and supervision plan (TSP) is drawn up, which contains details on the composition of the supervision team, an outline of the research project, and a list of training activities to be undertaken by the PhD candidate.

The committee concludes that the internal organisation of the PhD Graduate School of Archaeology is sound and constructive. Students are not only closely monitored and tutored, but also well integrated into the Faculty's research environment. The participation of the Faculty in the national Archon research school provides PhD students with a valuable national networking environment outside their own alma mater, as well as further resource opportunities which they exploit effectively.

The committee interviewed current internal funded PhD students in various stages of development of their PhD research about their supervision, research facilities and possible constraints on their research. The committee was pleased with the quality and enthusiasm of the students they met. The students the committee spoke with during the site visit were positive about the training opportunities provided. They appreciated the range of University and Faculty courses to which they had access.

The committee is of the opinion that, whilst not straightforward, the Faculty should explore measures to enable external PhD students to contribute to and derive support from the research environment. More structured participation in the graduate school will also contribute to the development of better awareness amongst the external students of the academic standards and customs in which the PhD is situated.

Currently, the mean duration of a successful PhD track is 5 - 6 years. The committee was pleased to note that a number of measures have been taken during the review period to improve these submission rates including:

- strict and careful selection of PhD researchers;
- the requirement (since 2015) to have at least two supervisors in a PhD project;
- the monitoring by both the supervision team and the graduate school.



The committee commended these initiatives, but recommends the Faculty keep monitoring completion rates and, if necessary, take further measures to increase the numbers of postgraduates completing their PhD in four years.

Of the PhD graduates from 2008–2016 (in total 79), 85% have gone on to employment in archaeology after finishing their dissertation, 75% of them in academic research and education. This is a very creditable record. All of the PhD students that the committee spoke with expressed the intention to pursue an academic career.

2.6 Research integrity

Faculty and staff of the Archaeology Faculty are subject to the Leiden University rules regarding academic integrity. The research staff must adhere to the “Code of conduct for academic practice” as formulated by the VSNU. In collaboration with the Leiden University Faculty of Humanities, the Faculty has developed an annual course/workshop in Academic Integrity & Ethics, with a focus on professional archaeological practice. In addition, Academic Integrity is an element in the curriculum of the courses offered to PhD students university-wide.

The Faculty has also decided that all relevant data resources of currently running projects should be archived and made available electronically, with or without access restrictions at the end. The Faculty organises annually an information meeting to address different aspects of data management, focusing on creating a data management plan, to investigate the possibilities of using a Leiden Virtual Research Environment and to familiarise staff with the national archaeological e-archive DANS.

The committee is pleased with the processes in place for ensuring research integrity. In its opinion, the ethical dimensions of science are clearly taken seriously within the Faculty. The integration of specific courses and informal advice opportunities on the subject in the student and staff career track is exemplary.

However, ethics, integrity and data management are becoming increasingly important in academia, especially in archaeology given the inherent destructive nature of excavation, so continued attention to this aspect is recommended at all levels of research practice. For the same reason open access publication is becoming essential in archaeology and should not be limited to cases where it is a prerequisite of the grant provider. It does come with a cost, however, that may have an impact on the publication output. Open access should therefore have some priority over the total number of publication outputs in the evaluation of any project and/or career plan. Access to relevant supporting data and resources (hosted by the Faculty) should be straightforward and systematically incorporated in printed and online scientific publications using permalinks.

2.7 Diversity

The Faculty has set up a diversity committee under the supervision of a diversity officer, which is comprised of members of staff, students and a board member. This committee works in close collaboration with the university’s Diversity Office.

Currently, among the full professors the ratio of men/women is 11:5. Among the tenured research staff (assistant and associate professor) it is 12:6. The committee noted that the Faculty of Archaeology has a very international composition.

The committee praises the Faculty’s ability to successfully attract and combine a diverse range of backgrounds at all levels, though given the fact that more women than men study archaeology, the committee recommends the Faculty to take further action to promote a more gender balanced environment.



3. Summary and recommendations

In summary, there is generally a very good level of research quality and societal relevance across all research groups, with notably outstanding work in several. Since the last evaluation the Faculty has produced a significant body of internationally – as well as nationally – recognised research, had an impressive record of competitive grant capture, and overseen consistent improvement in graduate student support and, linked to this, PhD completion rates. The committee invites the Faculty to consider the following suggestions:

- –Review the structure of the research groups so that the institutional structure best promotes staff career aspirations, strategic agency, capacity for national and international collaboration, grant capture and external visibility;
- Make efforts to ensure that its publications have the widest international impact beyond the individual case study audience;
- Improve the collaborations with museums, professional archaeological and heritage organisations in Leiden as well as beyond and consider more formal contractual arrangements;
- Develop a strategy for further strengthening the Faculty's national and international positioning and visibility, with a focus on areas of real strengths;
- Develop formal mentoring structures for its post-doctoral researchers and oversight mechanisms for monitoring their workloads, especially in regard to teaching;
- Develop a hiring strategy with respect to forthcoming retirements that is agreed and owned by the tenured academic staff;
- Take further measures to reduce PhD submission rates, including those of external students;
- Take further action to promote more gender balanced environments, teams and committees.



Appendix A – Curriculum Vitae

Prof. Graeme Barker (chair) is the Disney Professor of Archaeology Emeritus at the University of Cambridge, UK, and former Director of the McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research there, where he is now a Senior Research Fellow. After taking his BA and PhD at Cambridge he held positions at the University of Sheffield, the British School at Rome and the University of Leicester before returning to Cambridge in 2004. He was elected a Fellow of the British Academy in 1999 and awarded a CBE (Commander of the British Empire) for services to archaeology in 2014. He has published especially on multi-period landscape archaeology in semi-arid, arid and tropical ecologies, the origins of agriculture, and, currently, the ecological strategies underpinning the dispersal of modern humans out of Africa.

Dr. Bruno Overlaet is keeper of the Ancient Near Eastern, Iranian and Islamic Collections at the "Royal Museums of Art and History", Brussels, and has been visiting professor at Ghent University and Vesalius College, Vrije Universiteit Brussel. He was elected Associate Member of the "Royal Academy of Overseas Sciences" and awarded the "8th Farabi International Award" (Tehran 2017). He excavated in Siberia, Tadjikistan, Iran and in the U.A.E where he directs the Belgian excavations at Mleiha since 2009. His publications focus on the Iron Age, the Hellenistic and Partho-Sasanian periods in Iran and the Arabian coast of the Gulf. He is editor of the peer reviewed Journals "Iranica Antiqua" and "Arabian Archaeology and Epigraphy"

Prof. Thilo Rehren is A.G. Leventis Professor at the Cyprus Institute, and Director of the Science and Technology in Archaeology and Culture Research Center at Cyl. He has previously held the Chair in Archaeological Materials and Technologies at the UCL Institute of Archaeology (1999-2017), from where he was seconded as Head of Department to establish UCL Qatar as a Centre of Excellence in Archaeology, Museology and Conservation (2011-2016). His research interests cover most aspects of the primary production and distribution of metals and glass from their inception through to the early modern period, with particular emphasis on Europe, the Middle East, China and Africa.

Prof. Laurajane Smith is Head of the School of Archaeology and Anthropology and Director of the Centre of Heritage and Museum Studies, at the Australian National University. She is a Fellow of the Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia; founder of the Association of Critical Heritage Studies; editor of the International Journal of Heritage Studies and co-general editor (with William Logan) of the Routledge Series Key Issues in Cultural Heritage. Her publications include *Uses of Heritage* (2006), *Archaeological Theory and the Politics of Cultural Heritage* (2004), *Heritage, Communities and Archaeology* (2009).



Appendix B – Programme of the site visit

Monday 10 September

Time	Part	Collocutors
09.00 – 11.00	Site visit preparation	committee
11.00 – 12.00	Meeting with management	Prof. dr. Corinne L. Hofman (Dean 2012- September 2018); Prof. dr. Jan Kolen (Dean September 2018); Prof. dr. Ann Brysbaert (Director Research 2016-2018); Dr. Bleda Düring (Director Research 2018-); drs. Suzy Sirks-Bong (Executive Dean 2017-)
12.00 – 12.15	Feedback committee	committee
12.15 – 13.15	Lunch	committee
13.15 – 13.45	Meeting with graduate school board	Prof. dr. Miguel John Versluys (Director) and dr. Roswitha Manning (coordinator / policy officer)
13.45 – 14.15	Feedback committee	committee
14.15 – 15.15	Meeting with tenured staff members	Dr. Andrej Antczak (Head Dept of World Archaeology); Dr. Karsten Lambers (Head Dept of Archaeological Sciences); Dr. Mariana de Campos Francozo (Head Dept of Archaeological Heritage and Society); Dr. Roos van Oosten (Medieval Arch); Dr. Rachel Schats (Osteoarchaeology); Prof. dr. Wil Roebroeks (Human Origins); Prof. dr. Annelou van Gijn (Material Culture studies / chair Research Committee 2018-)
15.15 – 15.45	feedback committee and short break	committee
15.45 – 16.45	meeting with societal partners	Dr. Luc Amkreutz, curator Prehistory /Museum of Antiquities Leiden; Dr. Martin Berger, curator Americas /The National Museum of Ethnology, Leiden; Dr. Chrystel Brandenburgh, Senior Consultant Archaeology at the heritage agency of the Municipality of Leiden Drs. Cor de Graaf, adjunct Director Heritage dept Municipality Leiden, Drs. Tom Hamburg, Director of Archol.
16.45 – 17.45	feedback committee day 1	committee



Tuesday 11 September

Time	Part	Collectors
08.30 – 09.00	Preparatory meeting	committee
09.00 – 09.45	Tour by lab directors	
09.45 – 10.30	Meeting with PhD students	Catarina Guzzo Falci; Andy Sorensen; Natalia Donner; Weiya Li, Lennart Kruijjer
10.30 – 11.00	Feedback and short break	committee
11.00 – 11.30	Formulating questions for management	committee
11.30 – 12.15	Meeting with management	Prof. dr. Corinne L. Hofman (Dean 2012- September 2018); Prof. dr. Jan Kolen (Dean September 2018-); Prof. dr. Ann Brysbaert (Director Research 2016-2018); Dr. Bleda Düring (Director Research 2018-)
12.15 – 13.15	Lunch	committee
13.15 – 15.00	Feedback committee, writing conclusions	committee
15.00	Presentation first results	plenary



Appendix C – Tables

Table 1 Research staff in fte

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Scientific staff	14.2	17.3	20.2	20.6	21.5	21.2
Post-docs	13.1	17.6	23.6	22.6	21.8	22.3
PhD students	19.9	24.3	31.7	33.0	33.7	28.5
Total research staff	47.2	59.2	75.5	76.2	77.0	72.1
Support staff	15.1	16.0	20.8	21.3	20.3	20.3
Total staff	62.3	75.2	96.3	97.6	97.2	92.4

Table 2 Main categories of research output

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
1. Academic	209	217	236	264	176	189
a. Refereed articles	74	63	65	92	81	77
b. Non-refereed articles	24	6	16	27	13	10
c. Books	14	17	20	17	10	13
d. Book chapters	58	99	113	95	39	53
e. PhD theses	16	9	4	7	12	21
f. Conference Papers	23	23	18	26	21	15
2. Professional	27	29	57	29	23	44
a. Articles	6	13	11	12	7	14
b. Books	3	2	4	2	1	4
c. Book chapters	12	5	31	9	5	8
d. Conference papers	4	5	2	6	6	12
e. Report	2	4	9		4	5
f. Protocol						1
3. Popular	20	22	34	11	30	13
a. Books	3	3	1		2	1
b. Book chapters	1	2	12	6	6	3
c. Article in newspaper	2	4	5	1	12	3
d. Article in magazine	14	13	16	4	10	6
4. Other research output	136	134	268	72	56	76
Total	819	896	981	1009	1041	963



Table 3 Funding

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
<i>Funding in FTE</i>						
Direct funding	11.9	12.5	13.8	14.9	17.1	16.8
Research grants	25.0	26.1	27.8	30.1	31.6	30.4
Contract research	9.5	19.9	33.3	30.1	26.2	22.8
Other	0.8	0.8	0.6	1.1	2.0	2.2
Total funding	47.2	59.2	75.5	76.2	77.0	72.1
<i>Expenditure in M€</i>						
Personnel costs	2,960	3,745	4,755	4,838	5,050	4,989
Other costs	1,236	1,368	2,043	2,304	1,939	1,814
Total expenditure	4,196	5,113	6,798	7,142	6,989	6,803

Table 4 PhD candidates

Enrollment				Success rates									
Starting year	M	F	M+F	Graduated in year 5 or earlier		Graduated in year 6 or earlier		Graduated in year 7 or earlier		Total		Not yet finished	
				#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2009	1	5	6	1	17	2	33	3	50	3	50	3	50
2010	2	3	5	0	0	2	40	4	80	4	80	1	20
2011	1	3	4	0	0	3	75	3	75	3	75	1	25
2012	7	4	11	3	27	6	55	-	-	6	55	5	45
2013	9	12	21	1	5	-	-	-	-	1	5	20	95
Total	20	27	47	5	-	13	-	10	-	17	36	30	64



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

