

# **Assessment Report**

*Meertens Institute – 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 Meertens Institute .....	7
2.1 Introduction .....	7
2.2 Mission of the Meertens Institute .....	7
2.3 Management and organisation .....	8
2.4 The KNAW Humanities Cluster .....	8
3 Assessment of the research of the Meertens Institute .....	10
3.1 Research Meertens Institute .....	10
3.2 Meertens in the HuC and digital humanities .....	13
3.3 PhD training and education programme .....	13
3.4 Integrity .....	14
3.5 Recommendations.....	14
Annex 1 Criteria and scores of national protocol SEP.....	16
Annex 2 Terms of Reference .....	18
Annex 3 Programme Site visit Meertens Institute .....	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 Meertens Institute, member of KNAW Humanities Cluster in Amsterdam, undertaken on March 11-13, 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 Meertens Institute, additional documentation, and two days of meetings with the staff and students of the institute. This review report is both prospective and retrospective and contains several recommendations to the Meertens Institute 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 Meertens Institute, staff and researchers, for their open and constructive participation in the review process.

We hope this report to be the beginning of another successful period of very good research in Meertens Institute and a smooth integration with significant contributions 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, which should always be reviewed in relation to the institute's mission, especially if this mission restricts the institute to operate only for/within a national scientific community.

With respect to the evaluation of the Meertens Institute the findings should be reported in qualitative terms with a focus on policy and management questions, and for the assessment the verdict should be cast in both qualitative and quantitative terms. In the text, the most important considerations of the committee should be clarified, while the conclusion should be summarized in a single term according to a four-point scale (annex 1). Checklists and excerpts of the standard evaluation protocol were provided as a tool for assisting in assessment.

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

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

The site visit took place during the period of 11–13 March 2018 and comprised 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 Sunday 11 March
- Meetings with institute director and HuC director of operations
- Meeting with administrative staff (excl. director and director of operations)
- Meeting with researchers in ethnology
- Meeting with researchers in variationist linguistics
- Meeting with PhD students and Postdocs
- Meeting with technical support group
- Meeting with management team (excl. director and HuC director of operations)
- Meeting with Scientific Advisory Board

The Peer Review Committee consisted of:

- Prof. E. H. (Eduard) Hovy, Carnegie Mellon University Pittsburgh USA, chair
- Prof. A. (Angela) Ralli, University of Patras, Greece
- Prof. T. (Tine) Damsholt, University of Copenhagen, Denmark
- Prof. W. (Walter) Daelemans, University of Antwerp, Belgium
- Dr. O. (Oskar) Verkaaik, University of Amsterdam, Netherlands
- Dr. F.A.J. (Frans) van Steijn acted as independent secretary to the committee

Due to an unfortunate illness, Dr. Verkaaik was not able to attend the site visit; he has afterwards advised the committee on this report.

## **1.2 Results of the assessment**

This report summarises the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the international peer review of the research at Meertens Institute. The review covered the period between 2012 and 2017. The written and oral information permitted good understanding of the research institute. The assessment was rated and weighed according to the rationale explained in annex 1. The

conclusions, as given in chapter 3 of this report, follow the structure and criteria which are formulated in the Terms of Reference, annex 2.

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

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

- Self-assessment with appendices
- Research Program Meertens Institute 'The Netherlands in the World' 2018-2023
- Research Program Meertens Institute 'Crossing Boundaries' 2013-2018
- 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
- Rapport evaluatiecommissie IISG Meertens en NIOD 2011
- Information from the website: [www.meertens.nl](http://www.meertens.nl)

During and after the site visit, the committee received additional written information and a presentation by the director of operations of the Humanities Cluster.

The committee finds the information ample, honest and adequate.

## **2 Structure, organisation and mission of the Meertens Institute**

### **2.1 Introduction**

The Meertens Institute, established in 1926 and incorporated as a research institute of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) in 1952, is one of the sixteen institutes of the KNAW and one of the three institutes of the KNAW Humanities Cluster (HuC). The HuC constitutes an intensive collaboration of the Meertens Institute with the International Institute for Social History (IISH) and the Huygens ING.

The institute positions itself as a unique Dutch entity to research the 'Dutch case' of language and culture and preserve the largest (partly digitized) collection of everyday Dutch language and culture. The institute's research areas and expertise are ethnology and variationist linguistics. To fulfil its central role, the institute co-operates closely with the national policy and archive institutions such as Nederlandse Taalunie (standard Dutch language), Nationaal Archief (Netherlands National Archives), the Royal Library, and several heritage organisations. The institute also works closely with academic groups in the Dutch universities, a.o. through the special chairs that are held by nine Meertens researchers at six Dutch universities.

### **2.2 Mission of the Meertens Institute**

The Meertens Institute documents and studies language and culture in the Netherlands as well as Dutch language and culture throughout the world. Research focusses on the phenomena that shape everyday life in society. The Meertens Institute studies the 'Dutch case' from a comparative and international perspective. It seeks to contribute to the social debate by clarifying and providing nuance to the role of language and culture in social processes. The ambition of the Meertens Institute is to give research a clearer voice in the social debate and to use the Dutch research data and conclusions to obtain a leading position in the scientific debate.

During the period now reviewed, the institute recognized four relevant developments it aims to address with its research, collections and outreach activities: 1. Intensified social discussions on identities, heritage, and cultural and linguistic diversity in the Netherlands and the world; 2. The emergence of digital humanities; 3. The government's science policy, directing science into economic and socially 'interesting' topics; 4. The KNAW policy to lead its institutes towards closer co-operation. This recognition has led to a five-point formulation of the mission of the Meertens institute:

1. To study culture and language in the Netherlands in a globalizing world; to operate on the forefront of international research in ethnology and variationist linguistics;
2. To play a leading role in societal and academic debates;
3. To connect its long-term research to the creation of extensive, well-documented collections;
4. To be innovative with respect to methods and techniques, especially in digital humanities;
5. And to take on long-term commitments and projects.

These missions are expanded in the institute's recent research program 'The Netherlands in the World' (2018), in which the actual and future projects are presented in the two areas, variationist linguistics and ethnology, and in the interconnected multidisciplinary areas of research and methodology: language culture and digital humanities.

### **2.3 Management and organisation**

The Meertens Institute is accountable to the KNAW board. Its management has a bi-annual meeting with this board. The institute has a Scientific Advisory Board which advises both the director of the institute and the KNAW.

The institute's management consists of a director, who is supported by a management team, comprising the leaders of the research units (Ethnology, Linguistics and Technological Development), and the director of operations (HuC). The present director has held his function since January 2017, and the director of operations since October 2016.

The institute receives a yearly lump sum financing through the KNAW of about €3.2 million. The budget of € 4.8 million is completed with € 1.4 million of research grants and some € 0.2 million from contracts and other resources. The research performed at the Meertens Institute is organised in themes. The research themes change every five years. All researchers at the Meertens Institute perform research related to one or more themes. Together the researchers form the Research Council.

### **2.4 The KNAW Humanities Cluster**

In 2016, the KNAW Humanities Cluster (HuC) was established by the KNAW to form a strong centralised organisation for gathering research in humanities, in which researchers, technicians, data and collections specialists could work closely together. The research is about history, culture and language and also about new methods and techniques for research and collecting material.

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 currently led by a management team of the three institute directors and a director of operations. The KNAW has allocated an additional € 15 million to the HuC, above the financing of the three constituting 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 of the new Digital Humanities Lab, where three researchers carry out digital humanities projects within the three institutes, e.g. on computational models and structured databases.

### 3 Assessment of the research of the Meertens Institute

#### 3.1 Research Meertens Institute

Principal	Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW)
Institute	Meertens Institute
Director	Prof.dr. Antal van den Bosch
Research input tenured staff 2017	10.9 fte (14 pers.)
Non-tenured research staff 2017	4.5 fte (5 pers.)

*Assessment:*

Research quality	<b>2 (very good)</b>
Relevance to society	<b>2 (very good)</b>
Viability	<b>2 (very good)</b>

#### **Research quality**

The Meertens institute stands at the forefront in digital humanities research and development of new technologies and infrastructure. Heritage, religion, immaterial and oral culture are strong research fields in ethnology. Meertens is also leading the way for variationist linguistics and makes significant contributions to the development of this domain.

In general, Meertens's work is excellent, and in some cases even world-leading. Publications are of high quality and international visibility is high. The discussions held with the committee were thoughtful, reflecting an awareness of the challenges posed by recent changes in research directions and the potential of working more closely across the two principal research groups of ethnology and linguistics. Shared themes such as language culture and Dutch identity(-ties) in everyday life and in an international context are interesting; the committee encourages addressing them with new approaches and a fresh look, to keep Meertens in step with recently-evolved and increasingly digitalized research methodologies and to ensure that its great potential and deep strengths continue to be relevant and recognized.

However, the rather small size of the research groups makes it difficult to fully live up to Meertens's mandate to represent all of Dutch ethnology and language. This dilemma is underlined by the fact that Meertens is the only institute in the Netherlands for ethnology and the most influential in dialectology. Despite the small size, the impact of its scientific groups is noteworthy. Moreover, the adaptation of new technologies in humanities is helping to disseminate research results in the international community.

The relative lack of mid-level experienced researchers posed a problem for everyone. While the younger people at Meertens all do work of high quality, they still need more help with proposals and project initiation than KNAW currently

provides. The present help from the University of Amsterdam based office of IXA (Innovation Exchange Amsterdam) is certainly welcome but is insufficient in that it lacks deep domain expertise. Having at hand someone in mid-career who combines a command of one or more of the relevant study areas with a thorough working knowledge of the techniques employed by the younger, more digitized, generation, can make a significant addition in the current culture. Thus, regarding personnel, both the small size of the research group and the absence of mid-level researchers argue for allocating some additional funding for hiring, especially mid-career people. After the site-visit, the committee has learned that such steps are in the making.

Finally, writing proposals is an inextricable part of research. Past CATCH projects and the current HERILIGION project are good examples of the impact of funding and of international research collaboration. The relatively small number of new proposals that have been submitted at this time is a little surprising and curtails the research environment in terms of students, visitors, and dynamism. Given that 2018 is the year of Cultural Heritage in the EU, the committee would expect several proposals under submission or being planned; in addition to the HERA programme, there are several other opportunities for language-oriented proposals, for example ERC.

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

### **Relevance to society**

The Meertens institute has consciously chosen to play a public role and to translate and communicate research findings to a larger audience. Studying 'the Dutch case' is highly relevant in the societal debates about identities, diversity, migration and globalisation. The institute has a strong impact, reflecting this natural importance of its subject matter to the public at large. This is reflected in the following:

- digitisation of resources and making them publicly available via the technology group,
- 3 million website hits (of which 1 million were name searches), which is a surprising number for a country the size of Holland,
- participating in and commenting on public debates, such as on *Zwarte Piet*,
- working with museums to reach out to high school students,
- the large number of short-term volunteers/visitors,
- participating in international consortia such as SIEF, CLARIN and EUDAT.

However, the committee feels that more can be done. It is, for instance, possible to hold workshops for high school and undergraduate students at Meertens to demonstrate the fun and interest of research and to engage these 'digital natives' in documenting their language cultures (e.g., how they interact with each other on social media). While various universities do conduct such outreach

at present, Meertens represents neutral territory between the various relevant universities and can harness their individual outreach efforts for the good of all. Other improvements may be achieved by hosting international visitors or establishing part-time positions for faculty members from universities throughout the country.

The committee considers the relevance to society of the Meertens Institute to be very good.

### **Viability**

Meertens is undergoing a significant change; its administrative and technical support branches are moving away. The committee found some concern within these groups regarding their increased distance to the research staff and the need to support additional groups. Confidence that things will go well might be justified, but it is advised to avoid unnecessary fracture lines and misunderstanding (there is a cost to centralisation, one that can be mitigated by dedicated people whose job it is to create and foster dynamic, friendly, and evolving connections).

With regard to personal privacy, data integrity, and overall technical support, the committee found adequate preparation and measures.

An important concern is the absence of a clear vision/model for exactly how 'digital humanities' work, tools, and methods can be used in a wide variety of projects and topics. Now is a good time to establish two or three flagship cross-disciplinary and digitally-based projects that illustrate (even to colleagues) various ways of fusing old and new paradigms. This involves careful thought not only about data, tools, perspectives, and methods, but also about evaluation/validation and presentation/publication. Meertens, in its new configuration as part of a cluster, is in a wonderful position to provide a smorgasbord of options, from purely qualitative to purely quantitative, to help people define and broaden their projects and knowledge. And, of course, to stand as an international inspirational beacon and model for this type of work including experiments with combining qualitative and quantitative methods and data in new ways. The committee found that in this respect Meertens already has made significant contributions.

Meertens has a very strong brand and a good impact. Its unique role in the country is not to be denied, and the institute must be kept strong as a recognisable entity, even within a future larger grouping. But few people cannot do everything; the committee recommends funding for at least one more research position, one more technical support person, more PhD students and hosting international visitors as short-time researchers. The committee recently learned that the KNAW has allocated funds for additional researchers and that the hiring procedure has already started.

To exploit its unique combination of expertise, its diversity of methods and theories, the committee recommends more proposals joint across fields, and a stronger awareness of the increasing capabilities of digital tools and methods.

The committee considers the viability of the Meertens Institute to be very good.

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

The Meertens Institute has recognized the challenge that the development of digital techniques and methods pose upon its research and collections. Meertens appears to embrace the opportunities the new Humanities Cluster offers in this respect for itself and its two sister institutions IISH and Huygens ING. Meertens's new director seems to carefully lead the institute in the direction of applying new digital methods—where appropriate—and joint research projects between the two main research groups and with the two other humanities institutes. The recent changes Meertens underwent, including moving to new accommodation in the centre of Amsterdam, together with Huygens ING, and transferring of support staff into the HuC, are faced with admirable energy and ambition. Meertens's collections and data structures constitute a valuable access portal for national and international researchers of Dutch language and culture from inside and outside academia. The HuC is expected to ensure the technical infrastructure for the continuation of the national facilities of the Meertens Institute. The committee advises to not lightly abandon the strong brand of 'Meertens', but also acknowledges the need for the KNAW to demonstrate a strong presence of its national research and collections institutes in the field of the humanities.

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

During the review period some 3-6 PhD students worked at Meertens yearly, but the institute employs at present only few PhD students who carry out their projects under the supervision of Meertens-based university professors. Through this personal link with one or more of the Dutch universities, Meertens's PhD students participate in a graduate school of a university. The committee was, therefore, not able to assess the merits of the graduate school(s) that are responsible for the educations of Meertens's PhDs.

Meertens conforms to the national obligation to organize a go/no-go assessment of the PhD student after their first year and further on yearly assessments of their progress. A training plan specifies which graduate school courses and additional custom training the student must attend.

The committee feels there are (far) too few PhD students at present. Meertens's current procedures regarding external funding for students are not adequate. Either internal funding should be devoted to fund some PhD projects, or researchers with proven proposal-writing skills should be hired to bring in more funding, or preferably both. Obtaining funding for students will enable Meertens

to offer positions to PhD students working on their degrees. PhD students and postdocs are the lifeblood of an institute like Meertens; they, more than anyone, ensure renewal and vitality.

The committee feels that Meertens lacks a plan or goal for employing more PhDs within its walls. It seems to be the concern/initiative of the researchers holding a special chair to have PhD students in the institute—or not—rather than that of the institute’s leadership. The committee strongly recommends remedying this omission.

### **3.4 Integrity**

Meertens conforms to the KNAW and national policies to guard proper and integer research conduct. 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. Meertens’s objects of study have become highly politicized; therefore, the institute should more thoroughly and explicitly monitor the dangers this poses on research integrity in the long run.

### **3.5 Recommendations**

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

- Continue to reinforce the Institute with experienced mid-level researchers.
- Continue to work on flagship cross-disciplinary and digitally-based projects that illustrate various ways of fusing old and new (digital) research paradigms.
- Adopt a more active policy of writing and submitting research proposals to the relevant granting funds.
- Establish a policy for employing more PhD students within the institute.
- Begin to seek funding for at least one more research position and one more technical support person.
- Try to attract, in cooperation with the universities, high school and undergraduate students to Meertens to bring them in contact with the interesting research topics it deals with.

- Host (more) international visiting fellows and establish part-time positions for faculty members from universities throughout the country.

## **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 Meertens Institute chaired by prof. dr. Eduard Hovy.*

*The Meertens Institute studies diversity in language and culture in the Netherlands, focusing on factors that play a role in determining social identities in Dutch society. Its main research fields are the ethnological study of the function, meaning and coherence of cultural expressions, and the structural, dialectological and sociolinguistic study of language variation. In addition to research, the Meertens Institute concerns itself with documentation and providing information to third parties in the field of Dutch language and culture. Together with the Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands and the International Institute of Social History, the Meertens Institute forms the KNAW Humanities Cluster.*

### **Assessment**

You are being asked to assess the quality and relevance to society of the research conducted by the Meertens Institute 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 development of digitisation in the Humanities and the way the Meertens Institute is responding to this challenge;
2. the direction that has been set in motion by the new director of the Meertens Institute;
3. the opportunities the KNAW Humanities Cluster offers for the quality, relevance and viability of the Meertens Institute research groups.

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 Meertens Institute 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://www12.meertens.knaw.nl/documenten/> 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 Meertens Institute will take place on 12 and 13 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 Meertens Institute.

### **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 Meertens Institute no more than 6 weeks after the site visit. The Meertens Institute 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 Meertens Institute**

### **Sunday March 11, 2018**

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

### **Monday March 12, 2018**

9:00-10:00 Session 1a Meeting with institute director and HuC director of operations  
Antal van den Bosch, Yildiz van den Akker

10.00-10.30 Session 1b Meeting with administrative staff  
Marjoleine Cornelissen, Lidy Jansen, Willy Jongenburger, Erik Links, Simone Wolff, Douwe Zeldenrust

10.45-12.00 Session 2a Ethnology  
Sophie Elpers, Ernst van den Hemel, Folgert Karsdorp, Peter van Kranenburg, Peter Jan Margry, Theo Meder, Irene Stengs

12.00-13.15 Session 2b Variationist linguistics  
Hans Broekhuis, Leonie Cornips, Mirella De Sisto, Frans Hinskens, Marjo van Koppen, Jolien Makkinga, Marc van Oostendorp, Gertjan Postma, Nicoline van der Sijs, Ton van der Wouden

14.45-15.45 Session 2c PhD students and Post-doctoral researchers  
Mirella De Sisto, Sophie Elpers, Ernst van den Hemel, Folgert Karsdorp, Peter van Kranenburg, Jolien Makkinga

16.00-16.30 Session 1c Technical support  
Daan Broeder, Hennie Brugman, Jan Pieter Kunst, Menzo Windhouwer

16.30-17.30 Session 1d Management team (excluding institute director and HuC director of operations)  
Daan Broeder, Theo Meder, Marc van Oostendorp, Irene Stengs

18.30 Dinner (Committee only)

### **Tuesday March 13, 2018**

9:00-11.15 Session 3a (Committee only)

- 11.30-12.30      Session 3b: Scientific Advisory Board (delegation)  
Joep Leerssen, John Nerbonne
- 14.00-15.00      Session 1e  
Feedback session with institute director  
Antal van den Bosch
- 15.00-16.00      Informal summary of the visit with entire institute

## Annex 4 Research data

a. Composition of the Meertens Institute (fte) on 31 December of (year)

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
<b>Meertens Institute</b>						
Scientific staff	14.0	14.8	14.3	15.1	11.9	10.9
Post-docs	3.0	4.8	4.8	5.1	3.3	2.5
PhD students	3.0	5.0	5.8	5.8	4.8	2.0
<b>Total research staff</b>	20.0	24.6	24.1	26.0	20.0	15.4
Support staff	24.6	23.9	22.8	24.4	19.4	16.2
Visiting fellows						0.2
<b>Total staff</b>	44.6	48.5	46.9	50.4	39.4	31.8

b. Financing structure (x € 1000)

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
<i>Funding:</i>						
Direct funding	2864	2863	2834	2870	3213	3217
Research grants	1476	738	1061	1789	1181	1382
Contract research	434	552	410	171	235	124
Other	113	226	210	188	124	117
<b>Total funding</b>	4887	4464	4504	5018	4753	4795
<i>Expenditure</i>						
Personnel costs	4468	3839	4161	4283	3572	3442
Other costs	374	589	540	683	1078	1301
<b>Total expenditure</b>	4842	4428	4701	4966	4650	4743

c. Numbers of publications

<b>Meertens Institute</b>	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Refereed articles	37	21	26	16	29	31
Conference papers	17	11	9	9	8	8
Non-refereed papers	5	4	8	4	2	7
Books	5	2	2	2	2	5
Book chapters	24	40	14	21	14	21
PhD theses	1	1	2		1	1

Scholarly text editions			17	19	26	19
Professional publ.		1	9	7	6	7
Publ. for general public	65	70	75	79	65	62
<b>Total publications</b>	154	150	162	157	153	161



## **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. Tine Damsholt** is professor (with special obligations) at the SAXO Institute, section of European Ethnology, University of Copenhagen (UCPH). Her primary field of research is political culture i.e. political rituals, nationalism and patriotic discourses in early modern Denmark-Norway and contemporary Western countries based on cultural history and ethnographic fieldwork. Further she has been involved in (and is also managing) several qualitative research projects on user perspectives, practices, innovation, and everyday life in contemporary Denmark primarily within the fields of university education, meals and shopping but also sustainability and tourism. Subjectivity, materiality, body and gender are recurrent themes in her research and publications. Theories of culture, cultural analysis, cultural history, qualitative methods, and ethnographic fieldwork are equal fields of interest in her research as well as teaching.

**Prof. Walter Daelemans** is professor of Computational Linguistics at the University of Antwerp where he directs the CLiPS computational linguistics research group. His research interests are in machine learning of natural language, for example in the development of Memory-Based Language Processing (CUP, 2005); computational psycholinguistics, especially exemplar based alternatives to mental rules as representations explaining language acquisition and processing; computational stylometry, with a focus on authorship attribution and author profiling from text; and language technology applications, for example biomedical information extraction and cybersecurity systems for social networks.

**Prof. Angela Ralli** is Professor of General Linguistics at the Department of Philology (Linguistics Division) of the University of Patras, director of the Laboratory of Modern Greek Dialects and ordinary member of the Academia Europaea. Her main expertise area is theoretical morphology, particularly Greek morphology and its dialectal variation, and recently, she has developed a special interest in language-contact issues. She is member of the editorial board of international journals, member of the evaluation committee and organizer of international conferences, has directed/directs 21 research projects on morphology, language variation and language contact issues, and has been awarded the Canadian Faculty Enrichment Award (1999), the Stanley J. Seeger Research Fellowship (Princeton University, 2012), and the VLAC Research Fellowship of the Belgian Royal Academy (2008, 2009 and 2014). Angela Ralli is particularly active in the field of preserving language heritage. In this framework, she has conducted research expeditions to South Italy and Turkey (Pontus, Cappadocia, Cunda (former Moschonisi) and Aivali (today's Ayvalik)) and has documented linguistic systems which are on the way to extinction.

**Dr. Oskar Verkaaik** is associate professor at the Department of Anthropology of the University of Amsterdam. He is Programme Director Research Master Social Sciences, University of Amsterdam. He teaches courses on the history of anthropological theory; nationalism, democracy and populism; the anthropology of architecture; and ethnographic research methods. He has worked on a number of research projects including: religion and ethnicity in political culture and everyday life in Pakistan; grassroots resistance against the geo-political use of 'tribal culture' in the Pakistan-Afghan border region; secular nationalism and citizenship rituals in the Netherlands; and the politics and aesthetics of new religious buildings, particularly mosques and synagogues in the Netherlands and Germany. He has recently started a new research project on endangered cow species in the Netherlands in the context of national heritage debates, biodiversity, and EU regulation of agriculture. Oskar Verkaaik is member of the Board of Participants of NewConnective, an organisation that promotes diversity and inclusion at Amsterdam institutions of higher learning.

**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.