

Performance Review 2009-2013

**Leiden University Centre for the Study of Islam and Society
(LUCIS)**

Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities (QANU)
Catharijnesingel 56
PO Box 8035
3503 RA Utrecht
The Netherlands

Phone: +31 (0) 30 230 3100
Telefax: +31 (0) 30 230 3129
E-mail: info@qanu.nl
Internet: www.qanu.nl

Project number: Q 0505

© 2014 QANU

Text and numerical material from this publication may be reproduced in print, by photocopying or by any other means with the permission of QANU if the source is mentioned.

Report on the evaluation of the Leiden University Centre for the Study of Islam and Society (LUCIS)

Contents

Foreword by the Committee chair	5
1. The review Committee and the review procedures	7
2. Research review Leiden University Centre for the Study of Islam and Society (LUCIS)	9
Appendices	17
Appendix 1: Curricula vitae of the Committee members	19
Appendix 2: Explanation of the SEP scores	21
Appendix 3: Programme of the site visit	23

Foreword by the Committee chair

Preparing this review for the Leiden University Centre for the Study of Islam and Society (LUCIS) has been an interesting and challenging exercise. LUCIS is not a normal budget and personnel centre, nor is it formally one of the University's Research Priority Areas, although it closely resembles them in practice. The Committee has therefore had to know about the mainstream research activities located in the main participating institutes, specifically LIAS and LIRS – and this information was included in the LUCIS self-assessment report – but at the same time was not expected to focus on the institute activities as such in its review. The Committee has therefore constantly faced the challenge of distinguishing between essential contextual information and the core LUCIS information which was to be reviewed.

The Committee was greatly helped, first, by the excellent self-assessment report and, second, by the people who gave of their time to discuss their perspectives and to answer the Committee's questions. Their openness and readiness to respond constructively to sometimes quite probing questions from the Committee have been of major assistance, for which the Committee is most grateful.

The Committee is also most appreciative of the hospitality of Leiden University in providing the facilities for the site visit and of the friendly and efficient service offered to the Committee by its secretary Floor Meijer.

Prof. Jørgen S. Nielsen
Committee chair

1. The review Committee and the review procedures

Scope of the assessment

The Committee was asked to perform an assessment of the Leiden University Centre for the Study of Islam and Society (LUCIS). This assessment covers the period 2009-2013.

Although LUCIS is not a research institute in the strictest sense, the Committee nonetheless used the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 for Research Assessment in the Netherlands (SEP) as a framework for the review. In accordance with SEP, the Committee's tasks were to assess the quality of LUCIS on the basis of the information provided by the Centre and interviews with the management and members, and to advise on how it might be improved.

Composition of the Committee

The composition of the Committee was as follows:

- Prof. Jørgen S. Nielsen (chair), Hon. Professor of Islamic Studies, University of Copenhagen, Denmark;
- Prof. Ruud Peters, Professor emeritus, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands;
- Prof. Gabriel Martinez-Gros, Professor of the Medieval History of the Muslim World, Paris West University Nanterre La Défense, France.

Dr. Floor Meijer of QANU (Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities) was appointed secretary to the Committee. Short CVs of the Committee members can be found in Appendix 1.

Independence

All members of the Committee signed a statement of independence to safeguard that they would assess the quality of Leiden University Centre for the Study of Islam and Society (LUCIS) and its research programme in an unbiased and independent way.

Data provided to the Committee

The Committee has received detailed documentation consisting of the following parts:

- Self-evaluation report of LUCIS, with appendices.
- Copies of the annual reports, 2009-2013.

Procedures followed by the Committee

Prior to the first Committee meeting, all Committee members independently formulated a preliminary assessment of the programme. The final assessments are based on the documentation provided by Leiden University Centre for the Study of Islam and Society (LUCIS) and the interviews with the management and with the leaders and researchers of the programmes. The interviews took place on June 2 and 3, 2014 (see the schedule in Appendix 3) in Leiden.

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

scores and comments. The texts for the Committee report were drafted on the final day of the site visit and finalised via email exchanges. The final version was presented to the Leiden University Centre for the Study of Islam and Society for factual corrections and comments. After the committee had discussed the revisions suggested by the LUCIS, the report was finalised and sent to the University Board for formal acceptance.

The Committee used the rating system of the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 (SEP). The meaning of the scores is described in Appendix 2.

2. Review Leiden University Centre for the Study of Islam and Society (LUCIS)

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

1. Organisation, objectives, resources

The Leiden University Centre for the Study of Islam and Society (LUCIS) was established in 2009 as an interdisciplinary knowledge and networking centre that brings together academics from the Faculties of Humanities (Leiden Institute of Area Studies, LIAS; Leiden Institute for Religious Studies, LIRS), Law (Van Vollenhoven Institute of Law, VVI) and Social and Behavioural Sciences (Institute of Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology).

LUCIS is the expression of Leiden University's decision to continue its commitment to the study of Islam and Muslim societies after the International Institute for the Study of Islam in the Modern World (ISIM) was closed in 2009. Its aims are to provide excellent teaching and research on Islam and Muslim societies, to advance cooperation between Leiden scholars and to contribute significantly to public debates and policymaking. The Faculty of Humanities acts as the coordinating faculty and LIAS is its administrator.

The staff of LUCIS is limited to its director, executive secretary and office staff. During the review period, they held an average of 2.3 fte in total. The members of the steering Committee that advises on policy, initiates activities and supervises the budget are not on LUCIS's payroll. Neither are the approximately forty affiliated researchers, who are employed by their respective institutes (mostly LIAS and LIRS). Affiliation with LUCIS can either take the form of a membership (for Leiden academics whose research deals primarily with Islam and Muslim Societies) or a fellowship (for Leiden academics whose work does not primarily deal with Islam and Muslim Societies). In addition, LUCIS attracts visiting fellows and affiliated fellows from outside Leiden University. It has temporarily employed people to replace the director in his teaching duties and has made available additional funds for PhD candidates to assist in the organisation of LUCIS activities.

LUCIS is an active and committed participant in the national network of Islam research in the form of the Netherlands Interuniversity School for Islamic Studies (NISIS), with which it shares its director, executive secretary and office staff. Furthermore, it maintains connections with several national institutions with regional specialisations (e.g. African Studies Centre, the Turkey Institute and the Morocco Institute) and with international partners (e.g. Institute of Islamic Studies in Berlin, Institute of Arab and Islamic Studies in Exeter, Institut d'études de l'Islam et des sociétés du monde musulman in Paris).

LUCIS is primarily funded by Leiden University, whose central administration has awarded it an annual budget of €250.000 for the duration of five years (2009-2014). In this respect, LUCIS's position is not dissimilar to that of university-wide Research Priority Areas (RPAs), which have mostly been created to showcase and stimulate the university's self-declared research topics of exceptional strength. Over the review period, LUCIS's expenditure has grown. In the first two years of its existence there was considerable under-expenditure, as LUCIS was still setting up its activities. Total expenses in 2009 and 2010 amounted to €147.109 and €206.908 respectively. As of 2011 this initial under-spending has been

compensated by over-expenditure. Total expenses in 2011, 2012 and 2013 were €251.111, €292.882 and €268.346 respectively. The annual budget of LUCIS could be seen as ‘seed money’, as it is mostly spent on organising events, providing grants and fellowships, and staffing the LUCIS office.

The self-evaluation report mentions that, starting in 2012, LUCIS has explored several external fundraising possibilities. This has resulted in the Leiden Islam Programme 2014-2017, which aims at offering consultancy activities and tailor-made courses for which fees will be charged. However, revenues of this programme will not go to LUCIS but to LIAS, which administers the programme. The same goes for external grants (NWO, KNAW, EU) acquired by individual staff members. LUCIS itself merely provides the opportunity for interdisciplinary, cross-university cooperation – which is a recommendation if not condition for most funding agencies – and provides small grants to enable the preparation of research funding applications.

Assessment

The Committee considered the various dimensions of this heading within the limitations required by the character of LUCIS as an institution, recognising that, formally, the research work of faculty and PhD students is located in the related institutes. The question which repeats in this and subsequent sections is the role that LUCIS plays in terms of adding value: what, in other words, is possible with the existence of LUCIS, which otherwise would not be possible? Most obviously, the University funding of LUCIS provides a supplementary resource, which enables and facilitates initiatives towards research, often collaboratively across the boundaries of the various related institutes. It is clear to the Committee that the use of this budget for ‘seed money’ has enabled the preparation of research seminars and larger conferences, many international, which in turn have led on to more sustained research projects. Likewise, the allocation of smaller research grants has in a number of instances made possible the initial exploratory investigations which have subsequently led to research projects, some of which also include PhD positions. This approach makes the most effective use of the budget, which the University allocates to LUCIS, not simply supplementing the budgets of the institutes but making possible initiatives, which the institutes often are unable to undertake on their own.

The carefully considered mobilisation of the financial resources depends on the form in which LUCIS has been set up and the way in which it is led. It is important for the success of this entity that it is seen by all the participants as a value adding resource, and that it is run in such a way that all the participants have a sense of ownership: LUCIS has not been and must not become a competitor for resources. The current leadership – Director, Secretary, and Steering Committee – are to be commended for the leadership style, which has been adopted. From the start of the project in 2009 it has been careful to listen to the various interests represented among the LUCIS stakeholders. The approach has been non-hierarchical, facilitating and enabling rather than directive. A few of the persons the Committee met expressed a wish for clearer directions, but the Committee is of the opinion that the current ‘fuzzy’ organisation is most appropriate for the purpose for which LUCIS has been established, and that it is the one which earns the widest acceptance among the individual and institutional participants. The Committee is reassured that the change of Director currently underway will guarantee the continuity of this approach.

2. Quality, academic reputation and scholarly relevance

In order to assess LUCIS’s academic quality the Committee was asked to consider the quality and scholarly relevance of the activities it organised, as well as the quality and scholarly

relevance of the research output of its members. In doing so, it was invited to pay particular attention to (1) whether LUCIS succeeds in advancing cooperation of Leiden scholars in research and teaching and (2) whether LUCIS succeeds in building international networks and how these can be used as a good springboard for European grant applications in Horizon 2020.

In its self-evaluation report, LUCIS mentions that by organising conferences, lectures and symposia it seeks to promote the international visibility of Leiden research on Islam and Muslim societies and to further knowledge exchange between academics, which may result in joint applications for new research projects. In order to build its international network, LUCIS furthermore hosts delegations from foreign universities and governments, and invites distinguished researchers to visit Leiden as visiting fellows. Some of these initial informal networks have led to more formal cooperation. Two major international research projects have resulted, involving cooperation with institutions in Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States.

Cooperation among Leiden scholars is not only advanced by seeking out possibilities for joint research projects, but also by streamlining teaching activities on Islam and Muslim societies. To this effect, LUCIS has developed an educational portal that lists relevant courses of the Faculties of Humanities, Law and Social Sciences. Furthermore, it was involved in coordinating the short-lived bachelor's programme in Islam Studies, intended to educate so-called 'polder imams'. For reasons beyond the control of LUCIS and LIRS, the main teaching unit in this project, the programme was cancelled one year after it started.

The research output of LUCIS's members and fellows is, according to the self-evaluation report, of a multidisciplinary nature. The research areas in which its scholars work and publish vary from humanities subfields (such as religious studies, area studies, philology and history) to law and the social sciences. It is mentioned that, within the diversity of possible research topics, LUCIS concentrates on traditional strong points of Leiden, while at the same time encouraging new approaches. LUCIS's five informal research groups are centred on the following themes: (1) History of Islam, (2) History, theory, and methods of Islamic studies, (3) Developments in contemporary Muslim thinking, (4) Social and political developments in Muslim societies, (5) Sharia and national law.

Assessment

The Committee concludes that the researchers affiliated to LUCIS display a very good range of competences, with some outstanding internationally respected and renowned personalities. The quality of their publications is excellent and internationally leading. LUCIS has expanded its expertise to highly precise and qualified fields of knowledge, such as Muslim Law or the early stages of Islam in the Middle East as viewed through the extant Egyptian papyri. On the other hand, the departure of two of the four staff members listed in the research group 'Developments in contemporary Muslim thinking', have served to weaken a research area which might well be regarded as central to LUCIS's activities. For the purpose of teaching and research supervision there are sufficient other staff members with competences in this field, but LUCIS will need to consider how (or whether) it can sustain this research group. The Committee recognises that this is an area which is outside LUCIS's control.

It is clear that LUCIS's networking activities have enabled it to bring a significant number of international scholars to Leiden to work for shorter periods with the Centre's researchers, much to the benefit of all. Frequent round tables have been organised (six in 2010) for the staff of the institutes associated with LUCIS, especially the School of Middle Eastern Studies

and the Institute for Religious Studies. The international research projects that have developed out of such networking are of internationally significant importance and promise to produce interesting and noteworthy results. However, if LUCIS wishes to strengthen its position in research applications to the European Research Council and Horizon 2020 such networks will need to be more solidly founded in institutional networks, which are sustainable beyond the current well-working personal relationships.

It has been the consistent conviction of the LUCIS management – a conviction that the Committee commends and shares – that Islam in the West can hardly be understood without taking into account Islam elsewhere in the diversity of its aspects. Religion and Law, but also history, philology, politics and social trends. Islam is a historically and socially defined religion, a cultural area, and a civilisation as well as a religion. The broad interdisciplinary character of the institutions and researchers making up LUCIS today is therefore one of the strongest features of the Centre.

3. Productivity and productivity strategy

As a facilitating platform designed to bring together (but not employ) researchers, LUCIS understandably does not have an explicit productivity strategy, except for improving and increasing the productivity of individual researchers and PhD students by organising meetings and offering opportunities to exchange ideas. In order to get an idea of the Centre's productivity, the Committee has considered both the number of publications of its members, and the number and attendance of activities that LUCIS has organised.

Assessment

The Committee at first found the quantity of LUCIS publications difficult to assess, mostly because of the fact that the table given in the self-evaluation report does not distinguish between different categories of publications (books, peer-reviewed articles, non peer-reviewed articles), due to the way in which the university's publication data registration is currently set up. After going over the more detailed information in the annual reports of LUCIS, however, the Committee concluded that the productivity is excellent. The variations among individual researchers merely reflect their different career stages.

There is every reason to assume that the output of academic and other publications can be sustained. The LUCIS researchers have highly respectable track records in publications in international journals and have their areas of expertise in which they carry out research projects. The important point here is that the LUCIS structure has been a significant contribution not only to the amount of published research but to the innovative character of much of the interdisciplinary work.

LUCIS has, furthermore, been very successful in organising academic conferences, seminars and workshops, some of them in collaboration with institutions from abroad. These meetings have attracted a large international audience and contributed enormously to the international and national visibility of the Centre. The leadership of LUCIS has been careful to ensure that conferences and seminars have complemented similar activities undertaken separately by the participating institutes. The annual conferences are a particularly good example of an activity, which encourages exchange across the disciplines and geographical regions. Such events have often led to valuable publications and sparked further academic cooperation in directions that the institutes separately are unlikely to have inspired. Concern was expressed that some of the more specialised seminar topics have been less successful in terms of attracting large audiences. That is in the nature of specialised academic topics, and the Committee sees no reason for concern on that score.

4. Societal relevance

According to the self-evaluation report, LUCIS aims to contribute to the public debate about Islam and Muslim societies by making its scholarly research available to the general public. In order to do so LUCIS ‘seeks to provide scholarly knowledge in a sophisticated way, aimed at policy makers and high level journalists, rather than striving to produce sound bites for the popular media’. This is mostly done through the Leiden Islam Blog, but also via the LUCIS website and through public events, such as panel discussions that directly target non-scientific audiences. Over the review period, LUCIS has sought to complement scholarly knowledge with journalistic contributions, for example by granting a visiting fellowship to a former journalist. LUCIS’s communication network is described as a strength in the SWOT-analysis.

Assessment

While the Committee warns against overstressing societal relevance – which could easily stand in the way of the primary tasks of researchers, i.e. doing original research – it sees some room for expansion in this area. The LUCIS leadership is encouraged to develop a clearer strategy for developing its impact outside the academic environment with a view to achieving the most effective balance between investment and impact. With regard to the initiatives taken to engage the public and societal institutions generally, there was a divergence of views among those interviewed.

What LUCIS is best placed to do is to share its members’ expertise with opinion formers, policy makers, and those in the public and private sector who execute policy. By working in this direction LUCIS staff can focus on identifying strategic partners who have their own networks of potential audiences. In this light, according to the Committee there are four possible headings for activities focusing on societal relevance: (1) Popularising research results; (2) Reacting in public to current events; (3) Contributing to the public debate; (4) Acquiring contract research. LUCIS has experience in all four areas and has developed certain strategies based on these experiences.

In the view of the Committee, trying to directly reach and inform the broader public ought not to be a priority. If researchers are skilled in doing so, this is fine, but for the majority of researchers this is not the case. It should be mentioned that the Leiden Islam Blog appears to work well in terms of communicating with the public, especially as the media sometimes picks up blog entries. In the opinion of the Committee, LUCIS should, in collaboration with the communication staff of the university, maintain contacts with journalists interested in humanities research. Indeed, the Committee found that LUCIS has been working on this. It set up a network of journalists and invited one of the leading Dutch journalists with experience in the Middle East for a visiting fellowship. The Committee applauds these steps to improve contacts between LUCIS and the press. Such initiatives should be continued in the future.

With respect to the second area of activity: Reacting to current events is, in the Committee’s experience, difficult to plan, as it very much depends on the willingness of researchers to appear in public (radio, TV, press) and of them being known to journalists and programme makers. More than establishing and improving contacts with the press cannot be done. One way to do so is organising meetings for the general public, in which specialists speak on the topical events and cast light on their backgrounds. LUCIS already has some achievements in this respect and it is clear to the Committee that its members have the expertise and willingness to do so again if the circumstances arise, and in doing so LUCIS is fulfilling one of the tasks asked of it by the University.

The third area of activities is participation within the public debate. A number of meetings have been organised, but with varying success in terms of the size of the audience. It is clear that this form of communicating with non-academic sectors can produce very little return for significant investment of time, although on occasion events and short programmes have been arranged with a significant success in engaging policy and opinion makers. The Committee believes that some improvement could be made by organising more meetings not in Leiden but rather in The Hague (or Amsterdam), and by structurally collaborating with existing debate centres or other organisations. LUCIS could potentially benefit from the experience and larger reach of such partner organisations.

The final type of activity that the Committee wishes to address is contract research funded by private or public organisations. This offers a challenge. On the one hand LUCIS does not profit from such contracts, as the revenues will flow to the institutes rather than to LUCIS itself. On the other hand, the experience of the last five years has proven that trying to obtain contract research requires a disproportionate amount of members' time and effort. The Committee is of the view that expansion in this field would negatively affect the primary research activities of individual members.

5. Strategy for the future

The strategy for the future that is described in the self-evaluation report consists of several aspects. First of all, LUCIS aims to strengthen the involvement of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences by adding a representative of this faculty to the steering Committee. It is felt that the involvement of VVI and its focus on law is best continued in the current formal fashion. Furthermore, LUCIS wants to encourage joint grant applications in order to boost interdepartmental collaboration and improve success rates. Additionally, LUCIS intends to allocate more funds to support its members in writing grant proposals. In order to enhance knowledge dissemination, LUCIS will host the abovementioned Leiden Islam Programme 2014-2017. Finally, LUCIS aims to continue efforts to involve more students in its activities, for example by involving eminent visiting scholars in regular MA courses.

Assessment

At the core of the LUCIS's forward thinking is, in essence, more of the same. The five years being completed currently have been a time for experimentation and setting roots. This has been highly successful, also in clarifying where there are strong potentials and where LUCIS should perhaps be less ambitious. The Committee fully supports LUCIS's core focus on facilitating research and the dissemination of research results. LUCIS should be encouraged to strengthen its focus on encouraging collaborative research within the University, in the Netherlands, and internationally. Greater Faculty and University focus on supporting the design of international collaborative research project applications could be of major benefit here.

LUCIS has been given the task of disseminating its expertise beyond the academic world. This is a challenge to any academic institution, and LUCIS has experienced the vagaries of the field. Beyond the Islam Blog, the LUCIS steering committee have, in the Committee's view, reached the correct conclusion that communicating directly to the public is best left to others. In that LUCIS's main focus is Islam and society – a significant dimension of the historical tradition of Leiden University – it is able to raise the profile of an area, which is part of, but not a top priority of the participating institutes. It is thus well placed to identify institutional developments, which might weaken the field of Islam and society by default. Currently, the decline in staff numbers working in Islamic religious thought and the new organisational form of Religious Studies could be seen as a cause for concern. (The lack of undergraduate interest

in Islam as a major subject is rather surprising, given experience in some other European countries, but should have minimum impact on postgraduate and staff research with their rather different target groups.) LUCIS and the Faculty/University leadership could usefully give this some considered attention. On the other hand, closer cooperation with Social Sciences and Law is only to be encouraged.

The LUCIS leadership has been very careful to avoid nurturing competition between itself and its participating institutes, and the Director is to be commended for his insistence on an enabling and facilitating leadership. The Committee agrees that any attempt to be more directive, or to seek to enlarge LUCIS budget by developing independent income streams through its activities, is very likely to fatally damage the whole project. LUCIS is to be commended for ensuring that the change of Director currently underway will represent continuity in its leadership.

6. Conclusion

LUCIS has, in the view of the Committee, experienced a very successful first five years. This is due to the very strong research base present in the participating institutes (which is subject to assessment in each of the participating institutes, not here), the enthusiastic commitment of institutional and individual members of LUCIS, the facilitating and enabling character of the LUCIS leadership, and the support of the Faculty and the University. It is clear that the Director and Steering Committee have a realistic view of where they can take initiatives and where this is best left to the institutes. They are also aware of where adjustments of direction may be advisable.

But it is also clear that however much the LUCIS leadership and its stakeholders commit to the future development of this entity, and however successful LUCIS may be in the tasks allotted to it by the University and Faculty, its viability and continuity is absolutely dependent on the University deciding to continue its funding. It is the strongly held view of the Committee that in the five years of LUCIS's existence it has more than lived up to expectations. Its current levels of activity and the nature of its leadership and organisation are such that the University can be assured that its financial investment will continue to show an excellent return in research production and innovation, in public profile, and in academic recognition nationally and internationally.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Curricula vitae of the Committee members

Jørgen S. Nielsen (chair) was Professor of Islamic Studies, Faculty of Theology, University of Copenhagen until June 2013 and is now retired. He holds degrees in Arabic and Middle Eastern Studies from London and a PhD in Arab history from the American University of Beirut. He has previously held academic positions in Beirut, Birmingham (UK), and Damascus. Since 1978 his research focus has been Islam in Europe. Major recent publications include *Muslims in Western Europe* (Edinburgh University Press, 1992, 2nd ed. 1995, 3rd ed. 2004; Arabic translation, Beirut: Saqi Press, 2006); *Towards a European Islam?* (London: Macmillan, 1999); *Muslim networks and transnational communities in and across Europe*, ed. jointly with S. Allievi (Leiden: Brill, 2003); *Yearbook of Muslims in Europe*, chief editor (Leiden: Brill, from 2009); *Shari'a as Discourse: Legal Traditions and the Encounter with Europe*, ed. jointly with Lisbet Christoffersen (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2010); *Muslim Political Participation in Europe*, ed. Edinburgh University Press, 2013; *Everyday Lived Islam in Europe*, ed. jointly with Nathal Dessing, Nadia Jeldtoft and Linda Woodhead (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013).

Gabriel Martinez-Gros is presently professor of Mediaeval History of Islam at the University of Paris-Nanterre. An 'Agrégé d'Histoire' and a specialist of al-Andalus history, he has been successively assistant professor of Mediaeval History at the University of Rouen (1990-1995), then a full professor in the same University (1995-1999), in the University of Paris-Vincennes (1999-2008) and in the University of Paris-Nanterre as previously mentioned (2008-2014). He has been head of the History department in both the universities of Rouen (1993-1997) and in Paris-Nanterre (2010-2012). Between 1999 and 2002, he was associated with Lucette Valensi in creating the IISMM (Institut d'études de l'Islam et des Sociétés du Monde Musulman – Institute for Islam and Muslim Societies Studies), the main institution of the 'Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales – EHESS' involved in the field of the Islamic Studies. He has been since 2003 in charge of the doctoral sessions of the IISMM, in cooperation with the French Institutes network in the Islamic world. He has been appointed in 2012 member of the jury of the French 'Agrégation d'Histoire'.

Ruud Peters was professor by special appointment for the Law of Islam and the Middle East until 2011 and associate professor (UHD) for Islam Studies at the University of Amsterdam until his retirement in 2008. From 1982 to 1987 he was director of the Netherlands Institute in Cairo. He has degrees in Arabic from Leiden University and Law from the University of Amsterdam, where he also acquired his PhD. He has published books on jihad (*Islam and colonialism: the doctrine of jihad in modern history*. The Hague: Mouton, 1979) and on Islamic law (*Crime and Punishment in Islamic Law* (Cambridge: CUP, 2005), *Sharia criminal law in Nigeria* (Lagos: Spectrum Books, 2003), *Dispensing Justice in Islam* (ed. with Khalid Masud and David Powers) (Leiden: Brill, 2003) and the *Ashgate Research Companion to Islam Law* (ed. with Peri Bearman), (forthcoming summer 2014) and numerous articles in Islamic law.

Appendix 2: Explanation of the SEP scores

Excellent (5)	Research is world leading. Researchers are working at the forefront of their field internationally and their research has an important and substantial impact in the field.
Very Good (4)	Research is nationally leading. Research is internationally competitive and makes a significant contribution to the field.
Good (3)	Research is internationally visible. Work is competitive at the national level and makes a valuable contribution in the international field.
Satisfactory (2)	Research is nationally visible. Work adds to our understanding and is solid, but not exciting.
Unsatisfactory (1)	Work is neither solid nor exciting, flawed in the scientific and/or technical approach, repetitions of other work, etc.

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

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

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

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

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

Appendix 3: Programme of the site visit

Venue: Faculty Room Social Sciences/Faculty Room Sciences, Academiegebouw, Rapenburg 73

Monday, 2 June 2014

09.00-10.00	Meeting of the Committee
10.00-10.50	Meeting of the Committee with the Dean of the faculty of Humanities, prof. Wim van den Doel
10.50-11.05	short break
11.05-11.55	Meeting of the Committee with the LUCIS Steering Committee: prof. Léon Buskens, prof. Maurits Berger, prof. Petra Sijpesteijn and dr. Nico Kaptein
11.55-12.10	short break
12.10-13.00	Meeting of the Committee with the LUCIS directorate: prof. Léon Buskens and dr. Petra de Bruijn
13.00-14.00	lunch break
14.00-15.30	Meeting of the committee with members of LUCIS
15.30-16.00	break
16.00-16.50	Meeting of the Committee with the academic director of LIAS, (most of the Humanities' members of LUCIS are employed at LIAS)
18.00	diner

Tuesday, 3 June 2014

09.00-09.30	Meeting of the Committee with the academic director of LUCSOR
09.30-10.00	Final meeting of the Committee with the LUCIS directorate: prof. Léon Buskens and dr. Petra de Bruijn
10.00-12.30	Meeting of the Committee, if possible drafting of the report
12.30-12.45	short break
12.45-13.00	preliminary oral report of the results
13.00-14.00	lunch