

# **Assessment Report**

*International Institute of Social History – KNAW Humanities Cluster*

**Peer Review 2012 – 2017**

**May 2018**

## Table of contents

Preface .....	3
1. Introduction .....	4
1.1 The evaluation .....	4
1.2 The assessment procedure .....	4
1.2 Results of the assessment .....	5
1.3 Quality of the information .....	6
2 Structure, organisation and mission of the IISH .....	7
2.1 Introduction .....	7
2.2 Mission of the IISH .....	7
2.3 Management and organisation .....	8
2.4 The KNAW Humanities Cluster .....	9
3 Assessment research and collections of the IISH .....	10
3.1 Research and collections IISH .....	10
3.2 IISH in the HuC and digital humanities .....	14
3.3 PhD training and education programme .....	14
3.4 Integrity .....	15
3.5 Recommendations .....	15
Annex 1 Criteria and scores of national protocol SEP .....	16
Annex 2 Terms of Reference .....	18
Annex 3 Programme Site visit IISH .....	21
Annex 4 Research data .....	23
Annex 5 Curricula vitae of the Committee members .....	25

## **Preface**

This report embodies the findings and recommendations of an international peer review of the International Institute of Social History (IISH), member of KNAW Humanities Cluster in Amsterdam, undertaken on March 14–16 2018.

Our peer review committee was appointed by the Board of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Sciences (KNAW).

The assessment was based on a self-assessment report provided by the IISH, additional documentation, and two days of meetings with the staff of the Institute. This review report is both retrospective and prospective and produces recommendations to the IISH and the KNAW Board.

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 the IISH, 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 excellent research and outstanding collections in IISH and a significant contribution to the KNAW Humanities Cluster.

May 2018

Prof. Eduard Hovy  
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 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/institutes;
- *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. With respect to the evaluation of the IISH as a whole the findings should be reported in qualitative terms with a focus on policy and management questions. For the assessment of the research of the institute, the results 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 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 four criteria should always be reviewed in relation to the institute’s mission, especially if this mission restricts the institute to operate only for / in a national scientific community.

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

- A self-assessment report detailing the operation, management, research activities, collections and digital infrastructure, 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 students and council, academic staff, research managers and administrative staff about the work programmes, aims and strategy for the future of the research institute and its constitutive groups.

The site visit was undertaken during the period of 14-16 March 2018 and consisted of a number of components, which can be summarised as follows (see annex 2 for the full programme and the names of participants):

- Start-off committee meeting on the evening of Wednesday 14 March
- Meeting with the general director, director of research and director of collections and HuC director operations
- Meeting with researchers
- Meeting with collection staff
- Meeting with the Scientific Advisory Board and the Board of the IISH Foundation
- Meeting with administrative staff

The Peer Review Committee comprised of:

- Prof. E.H. (Eduard) Hovy, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh USA, chair
- Prof. G. (Gareth) Austin, Cambridge University
- Prof. N.L. (Nancy) Green, École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, Paris
- Prof. K.J.P.F.M. (Charles) Jeurgens, University of Amsterdam
- Dr. E.J.B. (Lily) Knibbeler, National Library, The Hague
  
- Dr. F.A.J. (Frans) van Steijn acted as independent secretary to the committee

## **1.2 Results of the assessment**

This report summarises the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the international peer review of the research at the ISSH. The review covered the period between 2012 and 2017. The written and oral information permitted a 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.

### **1.3 Quality of the information**

The information that was made available to the committee included:

- Self-assessment with appendices
- Programme of the site visit
- Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021 (SEP)
- Format for self-evaluation reports in the humanities
- QRiH manual for evaluation of humanities research according to the SEP
- Manual for research assessments of the Academy institutes
- Conclusions and recommendations from the previous assessment
- Response of the board of KNAW to the previous assessment report
- Collection Policy 2015 – 2020
- ‘Van archief/bibliotheek naar humanities research infrastructure’
- Rapport evaluatiecommissie IISG, Meertens en NIOD 2011

During and after the site visit, the committee received additional information, including: the weighted decision-making matrix for collection building; the memorandum ‘From Archive / Library to Humanities Research Infrastructure’ (vision for 2025); and all presentations given by the IISH director, HuC director of operations, researchers and collections staff.

This list of information is not exhaustive.

The committee finds the information provided fully adequate.

## **2 Structure, organisation and mission of the IISH**

### **2.1 Introduction**

The International Institute of Social History, established in 1935 and incorporated in the Royal Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) in 1980, performs research into the history of social movements, labour relations and the labour movement, and safeguards social history collections. The IISH has developed one of the largest and most important social history collections in the world and constitutes a global hub for labour history.

The IISH is one of the sixteen research institutes of the KNAW and one of the three institutes of the KNAW Humanities Cluster (HuC). The HuC constitutes an intensive collaboration between the IISH, the Meertens Institute and the Huygens ING.

The IISH is a hybrid organisation: besides its research activities it is a major heritage institution with an archival collection spanning over 50 km in shelf space and substantial data sets. Recently, the IISH has also started to collect digitally born archives.

### **2.2 Mission of the IISH**

As part of the Memory of the World, the IISH wishes to contribute to a vibrant civil society and a properly functioning democracy. The collections have intrinsic societal value and IISH seeks to maximize its social impact. Its research is aimed at informing public opinion and social debate. IISH's vision reads as:

"The IISH is a unique institute, serving science and society on a global scale. At an international level, we generate and offer reliable information and insights about the (long-term) origins, effects and consequences of social inequality. To promote this, we form an international hub for social historians worldwide. We offer and produce historical sources and data, facilitate social-history research and collaborate internationally in ground breaking research projects. Moreover, by preserving the heritage of often oppressed social movements, the Institute serves the quality of the world's memory. With our work we hope to contribute to a vibrant civil society and to the wellbeing of those who inhabit this planet, in the present and the future."

This vision has resulted in a strategy with five main elements:

(1) a transparent organisation, good management, and skilled employees; (2) the Global Labour History research programme; (3) more expertise in digital humanities and digital infrastructure; (4) a change towards acquiring digitally born archives; and (5) an intensified collaboration with the two other humanities institutes in the KNAW HuC. In 2017, this strategy was evaluated and updated, mainly with an increased emphasis on achieving societal impact and increasing

the Institute's recognition within the Netherlands as the world's most important location for social history collections.

IISH has now defined the theme of social inequality as the core of its research on labour and labour relations. The overarching research question is: 'How do shifts in labour relations influence social inequality?'

The research projects fall into three dimensions:

1. Global economic developments and their consequences for labour.  
Research projects focus on economic developments, commodity frontiers and commodity chains, and the history of slavery and other labour relations.
2. Individual and household strategies;  
Research projects focus on life course studies and migration.
3. Collective strategies.

The collection of the institute not only supports its own research but also other researchers throughout the world who work in a broader field than that of socio-economic labour history. IISH has become the national repository for virtually all social movements in the Netherlands and has been sought out by important international organisations such as Amnesty International and Greenpeace to safeguard their records. For the Netherlands, a certain level of completeness is achieved, especially when it comes to written material. Since this means that some material cannot be accommodated, IISH has developed and begun to formalise a Collections Policy Plan known informally as 'The Matrix' (more later). The IISH collections are accessible and searchable online. In 2018, a new website based on linked open data will offer even more extensive search functionalities.

### **2.3 Management and organisation**

The IISH is organisationally divided into a research and a collection department. The IISH board consists of four members: the general director, the director of research, the director of collections and digital infrastructure, and the director of operations of the HuC. The IISH has two supervisory boards: the Scientific Advisory Board for its research activities, and the board of the IISH Foundation for the collection activities. The IISH Foundation formally owns the collections. The IISH has an annual budget of approximately € 8.8 million (2017), of which € 5.9 million is derived directly from the KNAW and € 2.9 million from grants and other external sources. From this budget 19.3 fte research staff and 46.0 research/collection support staff are employed. An additional 7.0 fte are press museum staff. Since the start of the KNAW HuC a large number of administrative support staff have been transferred from the IISH to the HuC.

In 2012 the troublesome financial situation of the IISH—a structural annual shortfall of over € 800k—led to reorganisations and the abandonment of the



regional desks across the world. At that time, the present director of the IISH was appointed and shortly thereafter the present directors of research and collections. The balance between income and expenditure has now been restored. In 2017 the KNAW has approved IISH's ambitious collection policy plan to spend an additional € 2.6 million on attracting new expertise in digital collections.

## **2.4 The KNAW Humanities Cluster**

In 2016, the KNAW Humanities Cluster (HuC) was installed to form a strong organisation for humanities research, in which researchers, technicians, data, and collections specialists work closely together. The research focuses on history, culture and language and also new methods and techniques for research and collecting. The HuC combines the expertise and capacity in the areas of finance and control, human resources, facilities and support and communications of the three institutes: Meertens, IISH, and Huygens ING. This joint business office encompasses a staff of more than 36 fte, part of which (6 fte) is assigned to the KNAW Institutes NIOD and NIAS. The KNAW HuC is led by a management team of the three institute directors and the HuC director of operations.

The KNAW has allocated an additional € 15 million to the HuC, above the financing of the three constitutive institutes, to facilitate the move of Meertens and Huygens ING to the new Amsterdam location and for reorganisations and innovation. Part of the reorganisations consisted of transferring support and administrative staff from the three institutes into the offices of the HuC.

The KNAW HuC is also home to the new Digital Humanities Lab where three researchers carry out digital humanities projects that should support research across all three institutes, e.g., on computational models and structured databases. The mission is to facilitate the adoption of new, Humanities-oriented, digital techniques in the research of all three centres.

### 3 Assessment research and collections of the IISH

#### 3.1 Research and collections IISH

Principal	Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW)
Institute	International Institute of Social History (IISH)
Director	Henk Wals
Research input tenured staff 2017	9.5 fte (12 pers.)
Non-tenured research staff 2017	8.4 fte (15 pers.)

*Assessment:*

Research quality	<b>1 (excellent)</b>
Collections quality	<b>2 (very good)</b>
Relevance to society (research)	<b>2 (very good)</b>
Relevance to society (collections)	<b>2 (very good)</b>
Viability (institute)	<b>2 (very good)</b>

#### **Research quality**

The committee recognizes IISH's historic and socio-economic research as a key global player in the domain of labour history. The IISH has presented to the committee an overview of the research projects, whose diversity (geographic, temporal, and thematic) and depth are very impressive. Academic leadership and research impact, as well as the scale of output, are excellent. IISH's publications are predominantly in peer reviewed journals and there are many other scientific activities.

The structure of the research groups in three dimensions of 'inequality' seems to be a strong configuration. One of the great strengths of the group is their serious, wide-ranging, and deep internationally recognized investigations. The committee recognizes the decision to focus on inequality—specifically inequality stemming from labour relations—which is a significant yet relevant move that fits logically in the tradition of the institute.

One part of IISH's methodology is to create typologies of characteristics (of socio-economic phenomena like shifts of labour relations and social inequality), and then to interpret data in terms of them. This enables the IISH to do large-scale—even bold—comparisons across quite disparate areas. This kind of work is one of IISH's major distinguishing features that helps research at the IISH stand out internationally.

IISH's research leadership has done very well in continuing the evolution of the institute's research agenda. Under the leadership of the present research

director, the Institute has built in a clear-sighted and energetic way on the reputation it developed during the tenure of his predecessor, when IISH pioneered the concept of 'Global Labour History' and proposed a new conceptual framework for implementing it, moving away from the traditional focus of labour historians on male proletarians towards a genuinely global analysis of all forms of commodified labour, proletarian and otherwise, female and male. The new focus on inequality stemming from labour relations takes this approach further, while adapting it to the recent growth of concern about inequality in both society and the academy.

The committee assesses the overall quality of the IISH research to be excellent.

### **Collections quality**

The committee has witnessed an extremely interesting overview of the collection activities of the IISH. This is clearly a coherent, close-knit, and very well-run activity. Compared to many archives the IISH has a relatively small collections staff and therefore cannot accept all offers. Since there is no legal mandate requiring sources to come to the IISH, the Institute has to be more agile than its large government counterparts. IISH's very strong international presence clearly shows the Institute's success.

The content of the collections is highly significant, exemplified by the original Marx holdings and the unique Anti-Apartheid collection. IISH has received global acclaim for several international collections. Compared to the previous evaluation in 2011, IISH has made excellent progress in collections and concomitant international visibility. The quality and accessibility of the holdings deserve commendation.

The committee assesses the overall quality of the IISH collections to be very good.

### **Relevance to society (research)**

The IISH wishes to 'contribute to a vibrant civil society and hence to a properly functioning democracy' through its research and outreach activities.

Regarding research, the thematic relevance is extremely high: inequality, globalisation, labour relations and migration are topics at the forefront of political and social debate. Through a wide range of contributions, IISH participates in these debates, not only by publishing research results in non-academic media, but also through popular books, lectures for a wider audience, media performances and events organized by the IISH. The committee acknowledges that the number of outreach activities from research is impressive. However, while progress is apparent, outreach still falls on the shoulders of too few people. IISH expresses the need for enhanced social impact in its strategy document, in

particular through directing its research programme more at pressing societal issues, but the committee encourages IISH to elaborate and clarify this intention further, especially to a national audience.

The committee considers the relevance to society of the research of the IISH to be very good.

### **Relevance to society (collections)**

With respect to the collections, the material is extremely relevant to society. During the review period, IISH's collections have become much more accessible via an increasing number of digital platforms, including public platforms like 'Europeana'. Notable is IISH's popular public website 'Vijfeeuwenmigratie'. The institute's easy-access policies and welcoming attitude stand to its good stead. But the committee feels that more can be done. Many opportunities exist for greater online, proactive, dynamic outreach; what IISH now achieves with social media and involvement in other platforms is not as far as the institute could go. The committee understands that a new website is in the making and IISH has just started working full-time on social media, but unfortunately the committee was not yet able to see the results. In sum, the committee feels that a (multi-channel) communication strategy both for the research programme and, more importantly, for the heritage role of the Institute is a necessary step towards reaching the formulated aims of gaining greater recognition and more societal impact. With such outreach in place, the committee is confident that the interest from society in IISH's collections has potential to grow in the coming years.

The committee considers the relevance to society of the collection of the IISH to be very good.

### **Viability**

Since the previous external evaluation in 2011, great strides have been made. IISH has made important adjustments to its strategy—a new vision and research agenda, digital humanities and digitisation, improved accessibility of the collections and facilities for sustainable access to born-digital archives—all of which contribute to a sustainable strategy and sustainable institutional framework. Much attention is given to 'rejuvenate' the institute. IISH's recent request for 2,6M euro for 'personnel tiling' to train new staff before older personnel retire was a wise move. It is very important to make sure these new colleagues have expertise in the new media, digital techniques, and dynamic outreach to society via social media. Diversity of the staff in terms of age, gender and nationality requires attention; it is IISH's intention to do so.

After a troublesome period, IISH's financial situation is now stable. The IISH recognizes potential threats of national budget cuts and limited access to

research grants but seems to anticipate these in a sensible way. The committee congratulates the management team, especially in the face of the recent and imminent organisational changes. Morale is high and it is clear that there is enthusiasm and eagerness to continue with the work. The Institute—members of the research, collection, and administrative support teams alike—appears to be a happy working environment.

Importantly, the KNAW can do more to support proposal-writing activities.

In the last years IISH has created new facilities to keep and use digital collections and has made a shift towards born-digital records and digitizing analogue records. This move is important and has helped IISH to strengthen its position in the network of curating institutions on a national and international level. However, this move has also brought with it two major challenges: (1) It has increased the already enormous amount of material potentially available for inclusion (even if within Asia, Europe, and Africa). IISH's six major providers constitute by far the most of its holdings. For the rest, within the enormous amount of material, a large amount of material cannot be accepted. (2) The need to devote time and effort not only to collection and management, but also to developing and using to best effect new digital technologies, increases the risk of losing focus regarding a coherent vision for addressing the future. The IISH must continue to strive for a balance among the demands of management, collection/inclusion, and technology development.

In order to address these challenges, IISH has developed a procedure/policy ('the Matrix') that attempts to ensure coherence and consistency of acquisition decisions across time. Formalising and modulating principles stated during the review such as "content before form", "we don't wait, we collect and record all our decisions", this Matrix provides a weighted structure in which different potential collections can be compared. We applaud the concept behind this structure and recommend that more attention be paid to it, starting with self-reflection about the relative import of its various parts. (We note in particular that there is only one rubric addressing 'the digital', that it considers only whether the proposed material can be searched digitally, and that its weight constitutes only 1/15<sup>th</sup> of the total decision. Given the position of IISH within the HuC and its stated goals of supporting the development of novel technologies to support research, it may be time to reconsider this rubric in particular.) The Matrix is highly important and influential; it is what will determine over the long run whether IISH continues to make best use of unexpected opportunities and stays ahead of other similar collections in content, relevance, and procedures/methods.

The committee considers the viability of the IISH to be very good.

### **3.2 IISH in the HuC and digital humanities**

The IISH clearly has recognized the challenges that the development of digital techniques and methods pose upon its research and collections. IISH appears to embrace the opportunities the new Humanities Cluster offers in this respect for itself and its two sister institutions.

The HuC is expected to ensure the technical infrastructure for the continuation of the national facilities of the IISH. The Institute is widely known and highly valued among socio-economic historians and is a very strong brand worldwide. While acknowledging the need for the KNAW to demonstrate a strong presence of its national research and collections in the field of the humanities, the committee's strong recommendation is that a distinct identity of 'IISH' be maintained. An independent 'brand' is indispensable for IISH's type of collection building, as well as for the reputation of its internationally-recognized research group. However, as all three sister institutes recognize that digitisation is part of the future of humanities research, and that the HuC can very usefully help coordinate the development and use of tools and methods that will stand everyone in good stead in the long run, the IISH should visibly, energetically, and publicly indicate its participation and central role in the cluster in this respect.

### **3.3 PhD training and education programme**

During the assessment period, the IISH employed 12 PhD students, five of whom now have completed their theses. The IISH has no policy to appoint a specific number of PhD students but makes the choice between hiring PhDs or post-docs dependent on the nature of the research projects they will be working on. In 2017, the IISH housed 5 PhD students and 10 post-docs. The supervision of the PhDs is primarily in the hands of the six IISH-researchers who have a part-time appointment as professor in one of the Dutch universities; together they supervised 22 PhD students in 2017. The majority of IISH graduates appear to have accomplished very successful careers in universities or education institutions in the Netherlands and abroad.

The IISH-based PhDs all receive additional training from the N.W. Posthumus Institute, the national economic and social history graduate school. The committee has not been able—and was not asked—to assess the quality of the training provided by the Posthumus Institute.

The committee feels that the number of in-house PhD students is just about enough to generate good opportunities for learning from each other. IISH is advised to set a minimum—or an optimum—number of PhDs to be working in the Institute.

### **3.4 Integrity**

The IISH conforms to the KNAW and national policies to guard the integrity of its research. It must be noted that the self-assessment report mentions rather obsolete documents, where in the Netherlands these last years severe discussions have taken place on research integrity—and breaches thereof—resulting in updates of the national policy.

There have apparently been no incidents and the committee found no indication of concern with respect to actual integrity issues. The IISH obeys its own Research Data Management Policy that requires full verifiability of the research and proper quality and openness of the data collections, data input, data storage and data processing.

### **3.5 Recommendations**

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

1. Define and implement a more clearly articulated strategy and transparent guidelines for the present and future collections.
2. Elaborate and clarify the Institute's intention to enhance the societal impact of its research.
3. Explore even more opportunities for greater online, proactive, and dynamic outreach for the collections.
4. Seek, together with the KNAW and the HuC, more support for proposal-writing activities.
5. Continue to strive for a more diverse staff.
6. Take full advantage of the opportunities the HuC offers but cherish the strong international brand of 'IISH'.
7. Adopt a policy with regard to an optimum number of PhD students in the institute.

## **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 scientific knowledge. The committee also assesses the scale of the institute's research results (scientific 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 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
- (scientific) 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:*

<b>Score</b>	<b>Meaning</b>	<b>Research quality</b>	<b>Relevance to society</b>	<b>Viability</b>
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**

*The board of KNAW hereby issues the following Terms of Reference to the assessment committee of the International Institute of Social History chaired by prof. dr. Eduard Hovy.*

*The International Institute of Social History (IISH) examines how work and labour relations have developed globally over time. It collects and analyses data on social and economic trends from 1500 onwards. Its aim is to study how inequality arises within and between societies. As an independent institution, the IISH preserves the vulnerable historical heritage of people who were not in power and who have struggled for emancipation. It is the only institution to fulfil this mission on a global scale and is one of the world's leading research institutes on social history. Together with the Meertens Institute (for research and documentation of Dutch language and culture) and the Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands, the IISH forms the KNAW Humanities Cluster.*

### **Assessment**

You are being asked to assess the quality and relevance to society of the research conducted by the International Institute of Social History 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 SEP assessment criteria below:

- a. research quality;
- b. relevance to society;
- c. viability.

For a description of these criteria, see Section 2 of the SEP. Be sure to take into account current international trends and developments in science and society in your analysis.

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

We ask you to pay special attention to the following aspects in your assessment:

1. the importance, use and maintenance of the collection of the International Institute of Social History;
2. the development of digitisation in the Humanities and the way the International Institute of Social History is responding to this challenge;
3. the opportunities the KNAW Humanities Cluster offers for the quality, relevance and viability of the International Institute of Social History research group and the collection department.

In addition to the criteria described above, the board of the KNAW has formulated three general questions to the assessment committee:

1. What is the institute's added value in the national context and what is its international position?
2. How does the institute stimulate and facilitate knowledge utilisation and open access?
3. How does the institute's structure, size and financial policy contribute to its mission?

We would furthermore like your report to provide a qualitative assessment of the International Institute of Social History 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 reflect on the following three aspects in your report as well:

- a. PhD programmes;
- b. research integrity;
- c. diversity.

### **Documentation**

The necessary documentation will be available on the secure website <http://socialhistory.org/en/content/documentation-evaluation-committee> no less than four weeks prior to the site visit. The documents will include at least the following:

- Self-assessment with appendices
- Programme of the site visit
- Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021 (SEP)
- Format for self-evaluation reports in the humanities
- QRiH manual for evaluation of humanities research according to the SEP
- Manual for research assessments of the Academy institutes
- Conclusions and recommendations from previous assessment
- Response of the board of KNAW to the previous assessment report

### **Site visit**

The site visit at the International Institute of Social History will take place on 15 and 16 March 2018. The provisional programme for the site visit is enclosed with this letter.

### **Statement of impartiality**

Before embarking on your assessment work, you have been asked to sign a statement of impartiality. In this statement, you declare that you have no direct relationship or connection with the International Institute of Social History.

**Assessment report**

We ask you to report your findings in an assessment report drawn up in accordance with the SEP guidelines and format. You should send the draft report to the IISH no more than 6 weeks after the site visit. The International Institute of Social History will check the report for factual inaccuracies within one week after receiving the draft report; if such inaccuracies are detected, you will see that they are corrected within one week after notification. You will then send (the corrected version of) the assessment report to the KNAW board.

## **Annex 3 Programme Site visit IISH**

### **Wednesday March 14, 2018**

18.30 Dinner and preparation of the site visit  
(Committee Only)

### **Thursday March 16, 2018**

9:00-11.00 Short presentations by the directors on general policy, research and collections/discussion  
Henk Wals, general director, Afelonne Doek, director of collections, Leo Lucassen, director of research, Yildiz van den Akker, director of operations HuC

11.00-12.00 Tour of the institute  
Henk Wals, Afelonne Doek, Leo Lucassen

13.00-15.30 Researchers (presentations and discussion)  
Marcel van der Linden, Dennie Oude Nijhuis, Eva van der Heijden, Kees Mandemakers, Rombert Stapel, Zhanna Popova, Matthias van Rossum, Tamira Combrink, Ulbe Bosma, Karin Hofmeester, Bas van Leeuwen, Filipa Ribeiro da Silva, Gijs Kessler, Aad Blok, Richard Zijdeman, Henk Wals, Afelonne Doek, Leo Lucassen

16.00-17.00 Scientific Advisory Board and IISH Foundation  
Jan Luiten van Zanden, chair SAB; Maria Heijne MA, member of the SAB; Jan Lucassen, chair of the IISH Foundation; Marens Engelhard, member of the IISH Foundation

17.00-17.30 Feedback with director  
Henk Wals

### **Friday March 16, 2018**

9:00-10:00 Meeting with administrative staff  
Machteld Maris, Marjoleine Cornelissen, Barbara Buijs, Willy Jongenburger

10.00-12.00 Collection staff members (presentations and discussion)  
Marien van der Heijden, Huub Sanders, Richard Zijdeman, Robert Gilisse, Eric de Ruijter, Marja Musson, Anne Oechtering, Thijs van Leeuwen, Monique van der Pal, Kier Schuringa, Leila Musson, Henk Wals, Afelonne Doek, Leo Lucassen, Yildiz van den Akker

- 13.00-15.00      Committee meeting
- 15.00-16.00      Feedback session with team of directors  
Henk Wals, Afelonne Doek, Leo Lucassen, Yildiz van den Akker
- 16.00-17.30      Summary of the visit for entire institute

## Annex 4 Research data

### a. Composition of the IISH staff (fte) on 31 December of (year)

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
<b>IISH</b>						
Researchers and post-docs	10.5	8.6	12.3	13.5	14.5	15.1
PhD students	5.0	5.0	2.8	3.8	3.2	4.2
<b>Total research staff</b>	15.5	13.6	15.1	17.3	17.7	19.3
Research/collection support staff	51.0	44.0	40.0	39.0	40.0	46.0
Administrative support staff	26.0	21.0	27.0	21.0	12.0	7.0
<b>Total staff</b>	92.5	78.6	82.1	77.3	69.7	72.3

### b. Research capacity on 31 December of (year)

	2012		2013		2014		2015		2016		2017	
<b>IISH</b>	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte	n	fte
Researchers	12	9.6	12	9.0	12	8.7	14	10.7	12	9.5	12	9.5
Post-docs	2	1.8	2	1.6	6	3.6	6	3.4	10	5.6	10	5.0
PhD's	5	3.3	6	4.3	8	5.9	6	4.1	5	3.4	5	3.4
Fellows	8	1.6	11	2.2	13	2.6	13	2.6	14	2.8	13	2.6
Guests	4	0.8	3	0.6	2	0.4	1	0.2	1	0.2	1	0.2
Other scientific staff	22	2.7	23	2.8	20	2.5	19	1.9	18	1.8	15	1.5
<b>Total research staff</b>	53	19.8	57	20.5	61	23.7	59	22.9	60	23.3	56	22.2

### c. Financing structure (x € 1000)

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
<i>Funding:</i>						
Direct funding	4.916	5.206	5.137	5.209	5.808	5.874
Research grants and contracts	3.188	1.420	2.065	1.845	2.272	2.558
Other	323	707	528	624	392	335
<b>Total funding</b>	8.427	7.333	7.730	7.678	8.472	8.767
<i>Expenditure</i>						
Personnel costs	6.161	5.738	4.943	5.255	5.527	5.424
Other costs	2.722	2.485	2.772	2.103	2.805	3.445

<b>Total expenditure</b>	8.883	8.223	7.715	7.358	8.332	8.869
--------------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

d. Numbers of publications/products

<b>IISH</b>	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	total
Contr journal non-refereed	10	4	7	2	5	4	32
Contr journal refereed	34	24	49	38	36	39	220
Contr. Book/film/review	3	3	4	3	8	7	28
Contr journal (editorships)	1		8	1	1	6	17
Contr books/reports/chapters non-refereed	55	30	5	10	5	10	115
Contr books/reports/chapters refereed	7	4	43	11	32	28	125
Entry encyclopedia/dictionary		2		1	2		5
Conference proceedings non-refereed	1	2					3
Conference proceedings refereed	1	2	4		2		9
Conf. papers non-refereed	5		1		2	1	9
Conf. papers refereed			2		2	5	9
Books non-refereed	15	6	5	1		3	30
Books refereed	1	5	6	7	10	6	35
Reports			2			2	4
Online papers			2				2
Web articles		1	1	1			3
Non-textual products	3	7	8	3	10	5	36
PhD theses	1		2	1		2	6
<b>Total publications</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>688</b>



## **Annex 5 Curricula vitae of the Committee members**

**Prof. Eduard Hovy** (chair) is Research Professor at the Language Technologies Institute of Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh USA. He holds a PhD from Yale University and honorary doctorates from the University of Antwerp and the UNED Distance Education University in Madrid. His research focuses on various topics around the computational semantics of human language (such as text analysis, event detection and coreference, text summarisation and generation, question answering, discourse processing, ontologies, text mining, text annotation, and machine translation evaluation), aspects of social media (such as event detection and tracking, sentiment and opinion analysis, and author profile creation), analysis of the semantics of non-textual information such as tables, and aspects of digital government. Prof. Hovy is Co-Director for Research of the Command, Control, and Interoperability Center for Advanced Data Analysis (CCICADA), a center of excellence funded by the Department of Homeland Security. He is also a Regular High-Level Visiting Scientist in the International Guest Academic Talents (IGAT) Program for the Development of University Disciplines in China (111 Program), China (Jan 2008 - Dec 2019).

**Prof. Gareth Austin** is professor of economic history at Cambridge University, focussing on African, comparative and global economic history. After teaching at a community-financed secondary school in Kenya, he took a BA at Cambridge and PhD at Birmingham. His past employers include the University of Ghana, the London School of Economics, and the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva. He served as general editor of the *Journal of African History* and was one of the proposers of the *Journal of Global History*. His publications include *Labour, Land and Capital in Ghana: From Slavery to Free Labour in Asante, 1807-1956* (2005); *Labour-Intensive Industrialisation in Global History* (ed. with K. Sugihara, 2013); and (ed.), *Economic Development and Environmental History in the Anthropocene: Perspectives on Asia and Africa* (2017). His work has appeared in many journals, including *Business History Review*, *Economic History Review*, the *Journal of African History* and the *Journal of International Development*.

**Prof. Nancy L. Green** is a professor of history, Directrice d'études at the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales (EHESS) in Paris. Her social science research specializes in immigration and transnationalism. She received a PhD (with honours) at the University of Chicago in 1980 and a thèse d'état (with honors) at the University of Paris 7 in 1996. Nancy Green has held visiting professorships at a range of US universities, among which Yale, UCLA, NYU, UC-Irvine and at Addis Abeba University. She has published numerous books, including *Repenser les migrations* and *A Century of Transnationalism* (ed. with Roger Waldinger). In 2003 she was honoured as Chevalier in the Ordre des

Palme des Académiques. From 2012-2017 she was mediatrice (ombudswoman) at EHESS.

**Prof. Charles Jeurgens** (1960) is professor of archival science at University of Amsterdam (since 2016) and strategic advisor for the Dutch National Archives (since 2012). He studied social and economic history at Leiden University (1979-1985) and archival studies at the Dutch School for Archival Studies in The Hague (1991-1993). He received his PhD in history from Leiden University in 1991. He worked several years as editor of archival sources in the Institute of Netherlands History (current Huygens ING) in The Hague and he was municipal archivist and director of the city archives of Schiedam (1994-1999) and the city of Dordrecht (1999-2009). From 2009 till 2012 he was head of the developing section on appraisal and selection of the Dutch National Archives. In 2014 he was acting State Archivist of the Netherlands. Between 2004 and 2016 he was part-time professor of archival studies at Leiden University. He has been visiting professor in Taiwan (Hualien) and Australia (Perth) and is frequently teaching archival studies at Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia (Jakarta) and National Archives of Surinam (Paramaribo).

His special research interests include innovation of information and archives management, appraisal and selection of digital records, colonial archives, (post)-colonial heritage.

**Dr. Lily Knibbeler** is director of the Koninklijke Bibliotheek in The Hague, the National Library of the Netherlands. She works on realizing the National Library of the Future, which stimulates, empowered by the force of the written word, readers of all ages and abilities to develop their intelligence, skills, and creativity. As it's General Director, Knibbeler leads over three hundred people working on this ambition on a daily basis and she continues to expand and strengthen the networks of libraries and other parties contributing to this future.

Knibbeler was trained as an historian, receiving her PhD at the University of Leiden with the thesis 'Saving the city. Ambiguities in ancient Greek crisis management'. After that, she worked as a teaching fellow at the University of Groningen, as a research fellow at University College London, and as a member of staff at the 'Prins Bernhard Cultuurfonds', before joining the KB in 2008. At the KB, she held several management positions before being appointed as General Director in 2015.

**Dr. Frans van Steijn** (secretary) (Amsterdam, 1949) 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. In that capacity Frans van Steijn assisted the review committees of the National Experimental Plant Sciences Graduate School, the Leiden University Teacher Training Institute, Tilburg Law School, and the Institutional Audit of Utrecht University.