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FOREWORD COMMITTEE CHAIR

In the Dutch research landscape the NIOD has a special place, thanks to its unique collection and its mixture of functions. The committee that was charged by the KNAW to review the NIOD’s research performance over the period 2012-2017 therefore faced a difficult but interesting and rewarding task. With relatively few organisations with a similar structure and function, the committee needed to assess the NIOD’s performance in terms of the accepted academic standards for the kind of historical research that is carried out at the NIOD but also in terms of the intrinsic qualities of its distinctive features.

In performing that task the committee could draw on the wide range of expertise that its members represent. It was greatly helped by the documentation that the NIOD had prepared in advance as well as by supplementary data that it provided on request of the committee. Of great help also was the open atmosphere in which the committee was able to interact with various segments of the NIOD team, academic and support staff, the management and the scientific leadership. This allowed the committee to form a clear and substantiated picture of the research performance of the NIOD in the period under review, to identify challenges and opportunities, and to formulate a number of recommendations for the next period.

On behalf of the committee, I would like to thank the NIOD staff for its openness and its willingness to engage in this process.

Martin Stokhof
Professor of Philosophy of Language at the University of Amsterdam
Chair of the review committee

May 2018
1. THE COMMITTEE AND THE REVIEW PROCEDURES

Assignment to the committee
The Board of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, KNAW) asked the review committee to perform a review of research at one of its institutes, the NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies. The research review concerns the period 2012-2017.

In accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021 (SEP) for research reviews in the Netherlands, the committee’s assignment was to assess the quality and relevance to society of the research conducted by the NIOD as well as its strategic targets and the extent to which it is equipped to achieve them. The committee was asked to score these aspects on a four-point scale, ranging from world leading/excellent (1) to unsatisfactory (4). The meaning of the scores is explained in appendix 2. Also part of the review was a qualitative assessment of the institute’s PhD programme, and its research integrity and diversity policies and practices.

In addition, the Academy Board asked the committee in the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the review to pay special attention to the following aspects in its assessment:
1. The development of digitisation in the Humanities and the way NIOD is responding to this challenge;
2. The direction that has been set in motion by the new director of NIOD;
3. The opportunities that further collaboration with the other KNAW Humanities institutes offers for the quality, relevance and viability of NIOD.

The board also 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 utilization and open access?
3. How does the institute’s structure, size and financial policy contribute to its mission?

While the previous research review, which took place in 2012, covered both the research conducted within the institute and its collections, the current committee was asked to focus solely on NIOD’s research efforts.

Composition of the committee
The committee consisted of:
- Prof. dr. Martin Stokhof (chair), Professor of Philosophy of Language at the University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands;
- Prof. dr. ir. Thea Hilhorst, Professor of Humanitarian Aid and Reconstruction at the International Institute of Social Studies (ISS) of the Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands;
- Prof. dr. Pieter Lagrou, Professor of History at the Université Libre de Bruxelles, Belgium;
- Prof. dr. Mary Fulbrook, Professor of German History and Dean of the Faculty of Social and Historical Sciences at University College London, United Kingdom;
- Prof. dr. Stephan Parmentier, Professor of Criminology and Human Rights at the Leuven Institute of Criminology Law (LINC), Faculty of Law, KU Leuven, Belgium.

Dr. Floor Meijer was appointed as independent secretary to the committee. A short curriculum vitae of each of the committee members is included in appendix 1.

All members of the committee signed a statement of independence to ensure that they would judge without bias, personal preference or personal interest, and that their judgment is made without undue influence from persons or parties committed to the institute under review, or from
other stakeholders.

**Documentation provided to the committee**
The committee has received the self-evaluation report of NIOD (in Dutch and English), including the information required by SEP. The following additional documents were provided:

- Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021;
- Terms of reference SEP assessment NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies;
- Conclusions and Recommendations Previous Assessment (2012);
- Response of the Board of KNAW regarding the Previous Assessment Report;
- QRIH 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;
- Strategische Agenda NIOD 2017-2021 - 7 maart 2017;
- NIOD Managementrapportage 2017 Q4;
- Verkennende respons analyse van 10 NIOD publicaties 2018;
- Decolonisation Programme Fact Sheet.

Upon its request, the committee also received information on expenditures per department in relation to the lump sum, staff categories (in FTE), teaching load of staff members and staff diversity.

**Comments on the documentation**
The documentation provided the committee with sufficient factual information. The committee noted that the self-evaluation report followed the SEP-protocol rather strictly and could have been more informative on a number of issues, such as the way in which the current research projects are designed, the quality indicators and other benchmarks that the institute applies, and key publications and other output for the research projects. The committee would also have liked to see an English-language version of the Strategische Agenda (Strategic Agenda) available at the start of the process.

**Procedures followed by the committee**
The committee used the criteria and categories of the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021 (SEP) and also considered the guidelines for research evaluation in the humanities as laid out in the Quality and Relevance in the Humanities (QRIH) manual. Prior to the site visit, the committee members were asked to read the documentation and formulate preliminary assessments and questions for the interviews. On the evening before the start of the site visit, the committee held a closed meeting to discuss its preliminary findings, prepare for the interviews and agree upon procedural matters.

The site visit to NIOD took place on 5 and 6 April 2018. The schedule is included in appendix 2. During the site visit, the committee met with NIOD’s management and representatives of the underlying three research programmes. The committee also spoke with PhD students, staff members of the collections and services department, the academic advisory board and the organisational council. In between interviews the committee discussed the various findings. During the final day of the site visit, a closed session was held for the review committee to come to its final qualitative and quantitative assessment. To conclude the visit, the committee chair orally presented the main preliminary conclusions to NIOD’s staff and management.

After the site visit, chair and secretary drafted a first version of the review report, which was circulated to the committee for all members to comment on. The draft report was then presented to the NIOD for factual corrections and comments. In close consultation with the chair and other
committee members, these comments were used in drafting the final report. The final report was presented to the NIOD and the Board of the KNAW.

In this report, the committee presents its qualitative and quantitative assessment of NIOD, based on the preparatory documents and the information provided during the interviews. It starts with a description of the institute and its strategies, which is followed by assessments of the SEP criteria. The additional aspects and questions proposed by the Academy are addressed in the relevant sections of the report. To conclude the report, the committee makes some recommendations to the NIOD.
2. DESCRIPTION OF NIOD INSTITUTE FOR WAR, HOLOCAUST AND GENOCIDE STUDIES

Profile and mission
NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies was founded in 1945, directly after the end of the Second World War in the Netherlands. The institute, which was then known as the State Institute for War Documentation (RvO, later RIOD), was given the tasks of collecting materials and conducting research on the Netherlands and Dutch East Indies during the Second World War. With time, NIOD’s focus broadened, both in geographical and temporal terms. Starting from the 1990s, research into the Dutch experience in the Second World War was increasingly placed in an international comparative perspective. The chronological focus was stretched to also include the aftermath of WWII. In addition, the institute began studying more recent wars in which there was Dutch involvement, establishing a reputation in this field with the government commissioned investigation (1996-2002) into the Dutch role in the fall of the enclave Srebrenica in Bosnia. Around the same time, organisational changes occurred. In 1999, the institute became part of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) under a new name: Netherlands Institute for War Documentation (NIOD). More recently, in 2010, NIOD merged with the Centre for Holocaust and Genocide Studies to become NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies, thereby further broadening its geographical, temporal and disciplinary scope.

The present day NIOD characterises itself as a centre of expertise on the history of war, mass violence, and genocide. Under this heading, the institute unites various activities – research, collection management and services – which feed into one another and target multiple audiences: the academic community, professionals and the general public. These activities contribute to NIOD’s overall mission, which is described as follows:

NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies is active in the world – the world in which we live, and the world of scholarship. By studying the recent history of war, mass political violence and genocide – including their long-term effects on society – from a variety of different perspectives, the institute helps foster an understanding of that world, both now and in the recent past. NIOD also makes it possible for its own and external researchers to study relevant sources and other materials in its own and other collections, increasingly and as much as possible by digital means.

Organisation
NIOD’s profile is reflected in its organisational structure, which consists of two departments: (1) Research and (2) Collections & Services. Both departments are assisted by General Affairs, which is responsible for operational management. Together, the heads of the two departments and the head of Operational Management form the management team that assists the general director. An Academic Advisory Board provides solicited and unsolicited advice to the management team. Like other KNAW institutes, NIOD is able to make use of the Academy’s centralised facilities in e.g. legal affairs, IT and personnel. Responsibility for NIOD’s finances was recently outsourced to the back office of the KNAW’s Humanities Cluster (HuC).

While NIOD enjoys a relatively large measure of freedom, its operations and general policymaking are subject to supervision by the Academy. In 2012, a serious conflict between the Academy’s management and NIOD arose when the Academy developed plans to drastically reorganise its seven humanities institutes in order to improve efficiency. Part of the plan was to merge the collections of these institutes and house them at a single location, separate from the institutes. Within NIOD, the impending physical separation of collections and research was seen as a serious threat to the institute’s continued existence, giving rise to the idea of withdrawing from the Academy altogether. The ensuing conflict raged on for a number of years and only subsided when
a new Academy Board entered office. As of 2015, relations between NIOD and the Academy have normalised. The plan to separate research and collections is now off the table.

Since the current director took office in late 2016, organisational changes have been made in order to deal with ongoing challenges and to prepare NIOD for the future. These changes, and the vision behind them, are laid out in the Strategic Plan 2017-2021. To improve coherence and synergy within and across departments, so-called core teams were created in 2017. Each department now encompasses three core teams. For the Research department these core teams coincide with three research programmes: (1) War & Society, (2) Genocide Studies and (3) Societal Research. Within the Collections & Services department, core teams have been set up around (1) the Knowledge Resource Centre, (2) Thematic Infrastructures and (3) Collections & Library.

The new research organisation is intended to inspire and encourage a structural conversation between researchers rather than to provide a rigid demarcation of the research areas. While the programmes War & Society and Genocide Studies each operate in their own distinctive domains, there is overlap in terms of central topics and conceptual frameworks. The Societal Research programme is different from the other two programmes in the sense that its research is commissioned and funded by public, semi-public and private institutions and organisations who come to NIOD with a specific question. In terms of thematic focus, the programme is aligned with the other two programmes, most notably with the War & Society programme. In its research efforts, NIOD aims to connect with universities and other potential partners from the academic community. A substantial number of NIOD researchers have secondary appointments at three Dutch universities (University of Amsterdam, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Leiden University).

NIOD is the only KNAW Institute to offer a teaching programme. The one-year, English-taught master’s programme in Holocaust and Genocide Studies is a collaboration between the History Department of the University of Amsterdam and NIOD.

The new core teams in the Collections & Services department reflect the various activities that this department is involved in, ranging from collection management to providing information and assistance to professional researchers and members of the public who wish to consult its collections, or related collections outside of NIOD. A relatively new activity is NIOD’s involvement in setting up thematic (digital) infrastructures on the Second World War. NIOD is currently the leading partner of (1) the Network of Dutch War Collections (Netwerk Oorlogsbronnen, NOB), which brings together the material of 400 Dutch institutions with collections on the Second World War; and (2) the European Holocaust Research Infrastructure (EHRI), which focuses on the accessibility of collections on the persecution of European Jews, Roma and Sinti. Both projects have the ambition to continue to grow in coming years, the NOB as the national infrastructure for digital WW II collections and EHRI as a permanent European research infrastructure (ERIC).

Human and financial resources

In the reporting period, NIOD employed an average of 73 staff members (56 FTE), of which 29 research staff (23 FTE) and 44 other staff members (33 FTE). On average, a little over half (55%) of NIOD’s funding is provided by the KNAW in the form of a lump sum. The rest of the annual budget (45%) is generated externally, mostly from third stream funding (contract research, 35%). Second stream funding (competitive grants) accounts for 6% of the average annual budget.

In the reporting period, NIOD was faced with financial difficulties. These were first of all caused by a period of insufficient financial and HR management, up to 2016. In the long term, the growing claim that the Department of Collections & Services is making on the lump sum budget (1.4 M€ = 25% of the 2017 budget) causes an increasing dependence on additional external funding sources. Also, the imbalance between lump sum (fixed)/temporary funds and tenured/temporary staff puts a heavy pressure upon the institute to acquire new grants and funds. In 2016, structural changes had to be made in order to attain greater financial stability.
3. ASSESSMENT OF NIOD INSTITUTE FOR WAR, HOLOCAUST AND GENOCIDE STUDIES

Quality

Research focus

NIOD’s three research programmes – War & Society, Genocide Studies and Societal Research – largely reflect historical developments within the institute. The research of the War & Society programme is part of a long NIOD tradition in the sense that it incorporates the institute’s research concerning the Netherlands during the Second World War. Other research lines within this programme deal with more recent wars in which The Netherlands was involved and with the decolonisation period. The Genocide Studies programme represents the research of the Netherlands Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies which was incorporated into NIOD in 2010. It focuses on genocide and mass violence in the 20th and 21st century, which it studies from a comparative and multidisciplinary perspective. The Societal Research programme reflects NIOD’s long-established core task of taking up research questions in its remit that are put forward by society at large. These questions can theoretically span the full width of the fields that NIOD is active in, but in practice research commissions on the history of the Second World War – the field that NIOD is best known for – are most common.

In the view of the committee, the research focus and ambitions of the programmes differ. On the whole, the Genocide programme seems more focused and ambitious than the War & Society programme. The interviews highlighted that the Genocide programme aims to influence world-wide research agendas. Its researchers are used to thinking in terms of concepts and theories rather than in terms of individual events, and generally appear to operate as a group. For the War & Society programme, a co-ordinated conceptual-theoretical approach seems to be relatively new territory. It was repeatedly mentioned in the interviews that this programme – until very recently – was rather loosely cemented and that individual researchers used to work on their own projects without spending much energy on common theory building. The committee appreciates that the new course that was initiated by NIOD’s management in 2017 intends to change that, particularly by the creation of core teams that act as a forum for programme development.

The decision to house societal research in a separate programme was, at first, not completely self-evident to the committee. In this respect, the interviews offered substantial clarification. The committee came to understand that this programme acts in close cooperation with the NIOD’s knowledge centre and includes researchers who are specialists in the field of Public History. While the programme’s primary goals are to address topics that are brought up by society and to disseminate the resulting historical knowledge to a broad audience, it is also firmly linked to academia. The programme adopts scientific research methods and aims to generate outcomes that are also relevant to the academic community. The committee was pleased to learn that the group’s research projects are usually the result of a careful balancing of societal and academic interests. This is exemplified by an upcoming project (2018) commissioned by the Rotterdam city council regarding municipal policies towards Jewish war victims, which includes a PhD project that is co-funded by the University of Amsterdam. A suggestion that the committee would like to offer is to convey the distinct character of this programme, with its integration of societal and academic perspectives, more clearly by changing its title to ‘Public History’.

Output

In its assessment of the scientific quality of the research, the committee has taken the indicators that were chosen by NIOD itself as its starting point. The institute has followed the SEP and QRIH academic output categories: (1) books, source publications, exhibition catalogues (authorised), (2)
journal articles and reviews (authorised), (3) book chapters (authorised) and (4) editorships of edited volumes and theme issues (authorised).

NIOD researchers use a variety of channels for the communication of their results, but the institute considers so-called ‘hybrid’ publications to be characteristic for its publication culture: the majority of its publications intend to combine academic value with societal relevance. Many of the publications in the above-mentioned categories are primarily meant for peers but are also considered interesting for professionals and/or a more general audience. The impact and scientific value of such hybrid publications – and of large segments of humanities research in general – are hard to measure with classical bibliometric indicators. In view of that, NIOD has put forward the results of a response analysis which considers the impact of ten of its most prominent publications. This analysis concludes that these are equally popular with peers, professionals and interested members of the general public. The committee is of the opinion that with respect to hybrid publications this is a good way to assess their impact. For academic publications the usual standards of the historical sciences apply.

With respect to publications in general, the committee notes that there appears to be no general policy with regard to publication venues, publications languages and other issues that influence the impact of NIOD’s output. The committee recognises that the formulation of such a policy is complicated: the importance of reaching out to the Dutch general public and the maintaining of Dutch as an academic language are aims that need to be balanced with that of increasing the impact, potentially also of hybrid publications, by publishing for an international, English-language readership. However, in order to maximise the impact of various types of publications a systematic policy seems both needed and possible. The committee recommends that the institute formulates such a policy and implements it on an institute-wide scale.

Prior to the site visit, the committee examined a shortlist of five publications that NIOD considers to be its key publications for the reporting period, as well as a more extensive list of monographs and edited volumes produced by NIOD staff. No exhaustive list of all the research outputs during the review period was available. Though not required by the SEP, the committee would have appreciated it if such an overview would have been available. Based on the lists that were provided – and the committee members’ general familiarity with NIOD’s academic publications – the committee concludes that the quality of the output ranges between good and excellent. The work that is being done is visible to academic communities, nationally and, where the publications are in English, internationally. Much of it has a clear impact.

The committee notes that there is some uneveness in the international visibility of NIOD’s research. While some research is clearly internationally leading because of its capacity to position work on local and national topics in terms of international debates, other projects, which are often equally original and methodologically rigorous, cater mostly to a national audience. Overall, the committee sees a good potential for more of the NIOD research to become agenda-setting. For that, the current attempts to define a more focused, strategic approach need to be intensified. Strengthening, calibrating and, where needed, extending existing systems for providing internal feedback on non-peer reviewed outputs, and for developing competitive grant proposals in major funding schemes (NWO, ERC, …) would support such efforts.

NIOD’s academic output does not just consist of publications. Other outputs provide further quality indicators and show that the institute has a visible role and good reputation in national and international research networks. For example, the role that NIOD researchers play in the Dutch War Collections Network and in the European Holocaust Research Infrastructure network provide evidence for that. The integration of collection and research that is characteristic for NIOD leads to cross-fertilisation between the two and positively contributes to the output of NIOD. Especially
the experimental digital data mining project TRIADO could in the near future prove to be a pioneering innovation in both archival management and digital history.

Academic reputation
Both NIOD as a whole and its individual staff members enjoy a very good academic reputation in the fields of war and genocide research. The committee notes that NIOD is well embedded in national, European, and global scholarly networks and is therefore well-placed to connect researchers in similar research fields. To this end, the institute organises and hosts an average of ten seminars, workshops and high-profile conferences a year. Individual members of staff are frequently invited to hold lectures or (co-)supervise PhD candidates employed at universities.

The value of the institute’s collections and services is clearly recognised by scholars world-wide. NIOD attracts a steady stream of visitors and fellows who conduct (part of their) research at the institute and are generally very satisfied with the facilities and with the guidance provided by its staff. According to the committee, the latter aspect is something that the institute could further capitalise on. The institute would do well to develop more systematic policies regarding the use of its services and facilities. The committee was, for example, surprised to learn that the institute does not keep systematic records of the purpose of research visits. Neither does it make visitors sign a statement specifying that NIOD should be mentioned in publications that result from their visits.

The committee notes that NIOD has not provided an international benchmark as part of the documentation for the review. The self-evaluation report argues that NIOD should be considered unique because of its triple role as a research institute, collections manager and expertise centre. The committee is not fully satisfied with this explanation and believes that a benchmark analysis would have been a useful and instructive exercise for the institute. Institutes that the committee believes to bear some resemblance to NIOD’s position are the International Institute for Social History (IISH), a fellow Academy institute, the Institut für Zeitgeschichte in Munich (IIZ), the Zentrum für Zeitgeschichtliche Forschung in Potsdam (ZZF), the Institut d’Histoire du Temps Présent (IHTP) in Paris, and the Centre d’Etudes Guerres et Sociétés Contemporaines/Studiecentrum Oorlog en Hedendaagse Maatschappij (CEGESOMA) in Brussels. The IHTP and CEGESOMA followed the same trajectory as NIOD, from institutional independence to insertion in a wider research environment, through their absorption into the CNRS/Paris 8 and the State Archives respectively. An assessment of the link between institutional independence, collection management, research and international intellectual leadership in these four comparable institutions could prove highly instructive for the future strategy of the NIOD. Apart from that, it would also be possible, and recommendable, to benchmark at least part of NIOD’s research against relevant academic research programmes in history.

Productivity
In the reporting period, NIOD’s research staff produced a total of 37 scientific books, critical source publications and exhibition catalogues (an average of 1.6 per research FTE), 73 peer reviewed journal articles and reviews (an average of 3.2 per research FTE) and 63 book chapters (an average of 2.8 per research FTE). Furthermore, scientific staff gave a total of 437 invited lectures (an average of 19 per research FTE) and organised 63 conferences, workshops and seminars (an average of 2.8 per research FTE). Six internal NIOD PhD candidates defended their dissertations and NIOD staff (co-)supervised another nine external PhD candidates who completed their work in the reporting period.

The committee judges the productivity over the entire period to be satisfactory according to standards that are usual in the field. The committee did note that productivity has fallen after 2013. For many of the chosen indicators, the annual average productivity per scientific FTE was (more
than) halved. One possible explanation might be that this was a result of the ongoing conflict with the Academy, which reportedly took up a lot of the staff’s time and energy. Another explanation could be linked to the recent retirement of several prominent and highly productive NIOD researchers, which raises the issue of the generational renewal of the research staff.

**Research strategy and targets**

The committee established that NIOD has limited experience with setting long-term strategic targets; the Strategic Agenda for 2017-2021 was the first of its kind since many years. Before 2017, the institute’s course was set out in a succession of annual plans. While the committee commends the new management for outlining its ambitions for the institute, it concludes that these are rather broadly defined. The document does not include overall quantitative targets in terms of funding, staff size or publications, nor does it identify specific strategies for realising the envisioned ambitions. As the management explained during the site visit, its first priority after taking office was to create a solid organisational structure and financial foundation. As a second step it aims to translate its ambitions into quantitative targets. The committee firmly underscores the necessity of this next step. In the current, highly competitive research climate, failing to set concrete targets may result in the institute coming across as inward looking or even complacent. The committee recommends that adequate strategies and procedures for realising these targets are developed.

There appear to be no institute-wide standards for measuring individual performance in terms of compliance with targets regarding publications, grant applications, and the like. Targets only seem to relate to those projects that have predetermined deadlines and deliverables. The committee recommends that the institute develop clear and institute-wide standards for the assessment of individual performance that are in line with the actual research time of individual researchers, and that it apply these in a systematic periodic assessment procedure.

**External funding**

Success in acquisition of external funding, especially funding from competitive sources, is generally regarded as another indicator of scientific quality of research. The committee noted that NIOD researchers are very successful in the acquisition of so-called ‘third stream’ funding, in the form of contract research. This is a good achievement. However, since this type of research is often directly linked to the expertise and reputation of the NIOD, it is difficult to use as a comparative quality indicator.

NIOD researchers are less successful when it comes to obtaining so-called ‘second stream’ funding in individual grant schemes (NWO’s Vernieuwingsimpuls, ERC PI-centric Grants) and grant schemes that fund collaborative research projects (NWO, Horizon2020). A noteworthy exception to the latter is EHRI, which is a major collaborative Horizon2020 project (8M€). The committee noted that in recent years there was a sharp drop in income from second stream funding. Whereas research grants made up 12% of the total annual budget in 2012, in the following years the average share of grants was just 5%. In the interviews the drop was attributed to the conflict, which distracted researchers from writing proposals, but also to the absence of a proper support system for grant application and the fact that dedicated time for writing proposals is not made available to research staff. A final factor that was mentioned is the growing competition for grants in the face of diminishing funding for the Humanities. Although it recognises that these are relevant factors, the committee is still of the opinion that performance on this indicator is below par, especially in view of the fact that, unlike researchers working at the universities, NIOD researchers do not have substantial teaching loads.

The committee feels that NIOD can and should be more ambitious when it comes to attracting second stream, competitive funding, in order to realise its ambitions. This type of funding increases opportunities for academically motivated research, it acts as a benchmark of academic quality, both for the institute itself as well as for third parties, and it allows the institute to extend its
PhD programme. Developing long-term planning in the research programmes and appointing principle investigators for clearly identified research areas, setting up adequate support systems and formulating targets should be priorities in the coming years.

Relevance to society
In line with its prominent position and function within society, NIOD attaches special value to conducting a wide spectrum of activities that are relevant for non-academic target audiences. Its long tradition of societal research, its high visibility and its position of moral authority all contribute to the fact that NIOD has a virtual monopoly on dealing with the national public in its research fields. These facts are perhaps too self-evident to the institute, and could have been made more explicit in the way in which it presented itself to the committee. They also merit more self-reflection since some of them (the status of a monopoly, the role of a moral authority) create a special responsibility with regard to the way the institute operates in its relationships with academic and non-academic communities.

The expertise provided on a daily basis by the Knowledge Research Center, relaying requests to the entire staff of the NIOD and the moral authority the Institute continues to perform a crucial critical function of fact finding and the establishment of individual track records. Its role here could be positively compared to the 'Gauck Commission' (Bundesbeauftragte für die Unterlagen des Staatssicherheitsdienstes des Ehemaligen Deutsche Demokratische Republik) in Germany or IPN (Instytut Pamięci Narodowej) in Poland, institutions who admittedly deal with more recent archives, but also dispose of an incommensurably larger staff. The NIOD upholds a quite unique model in the public management of a controversial past, however difficult it might seem to quantify this role.

Relevance to society is not limited to the NIOD’s role as a centre of expertise. In all three programmes, the committee found noteworthy examples of highly relevant societal work, not only at the national level but, increasingly, also internationally. The committee considers the societal relevance of its research as one of NIOD’s distinguishing features.

Output
NIOD itself has identified two main categories of products intended for societal target groups. The first category comprises products for professional users such as media, museums and sister institutions. Part of this category are digital infrastructures and databases for professional users, websites for professional visitors, and lectures and master classes for a professional audience. The second category consists of popular products aimed at the general public, most notably books, source publications and exhibition catalogues for a general readership, articles in general magazines and journals and lectures and master classes for a general audience.

Productivity in terms of societal output is substantial. During the reporting period, NIOD has published 23 books for a general readership (an average of one per research FTE), 124 articles for popular magazines (an average of 5.4 per research FTE) and 192 lectures and master classes for professional and general audiences (an average of 8.4 per research FTE). The committee further notes that NIOD displays a constant presence in the media, with an average of two references in Dutch newspapers every day.

Impact
The results that NIOD achieves with its societal output are impressive. The work produced is not just of very good quality, but also has a clear impact on society. NIOD’s output is generally well received in the professional and in the public domain. Publications are widely read by professional audiences and by members of the general public, and often generate quite a bit of media attention.

Quantitatively, the number of people that visit the institute, attend lectures, master classes and exhibitions, as well as the traffic generated by the NIOD website appear to be as can be expected.
However, in view of lack of data for some indicators and because of the absence of comparative institutes, these data can only be taken at face value.

As the committee established, in terms of societal impact there is no strict dividing line between products of the Societal Research programme and the other two programmes, where the work is more academically oriented. As demonstrated by the response analysis, the products of NIOD’s more fundamental research also reach multiple audiences, thereby underlining the hybrid nature of much of NIOD’s work. The ten publications considered in the analysis were cited on 601 separate websites, altogether representing a very broad spectrum of society.

A good indicator of the fact that NIOD’s work meets an existing need, is the large number of commissioned projects undertaken in cooperation with societal partners and funded by societal partners. The committee was informed that there is a lot of demand for new research projects. The Societal Research programme finds that it has to be selective in the projects that it takes up, not just to safeguard quality but also because it has insufficient capacity to take up all projects that present themselves. Plans to develop a European network of institutes with expertise in commissioned projects, with the CEGESOMA in Brussels and other comparable institutes, deserve further exploration.

The committee notes that NIOD describes its activities on societal impact in a way in which the public solely acts as a recipient of knowledge. In practice, however, NIOD is developing a more dynamic relation with the public. The committee was particularly struck by examples of projects in which NIOD works in cooperation with Dutch civil society, which is very interested in personal stories and local narratives regarding the Second World War. The institute is currently conducting a crowdsourced pilot project (part of NOB), in which volunteers from the general public transcribe the registry of Kamp Vught. If this project proves successful, NIOD plans to apply the same formula to its extensive collection of war diaries. The committee believes that such projects are a very useful way to tap into knowledge that exists within the general public, and it recommends NIOD to further develop and explicate its vision on how to engage the public. This is a domain of methodological innovation that merits space in the stories that NIOD tells about itself on its website, should be documented and lends itself to reflective academic publications.

The committee regards the performance of the NIOD in terms of societal relevance at this point as excellent, and it is pleased to note that the institute will continue with exciting new projects, such as the new project ‘Decolonisation, Violence and War. Indonesia 1945-1950’ in cooperation with the Royal Netherlands Institute of Southeast Asian and Caribbean Studies (Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land en Volkenkunde, KITLV) and the Netherlands Institute of Military History (NIMH).

**Viability**

Over the reporting period, NIOD has clearly faced its share of organisational and financial difficulties, all of which have affected its viability. The protracted conflict with the Academy and the internal managerial troubles have eaten away at the institute’s operational processes, its productivity, its ability to compete for competitive grants and – more generally – at the morale of its staff members. The financial situation is precarious because of the imbalance between structural and temporary funds, and the growing claim that collections & services are making on the budget. According to the Strategic Agenda 2017-2021, the current financial situation leaves little room for realising NIOD’s ambitions in terms of improving its (digital) infrastructure and expanding its research capacity.

In the opinion of the committee, NIOD is facing some serious challenges that need to be addressed. The academic quality and societal impact of NIOD’s research is beyond question, but the institute will need better planning, more careful and explicit strategies, and more efficient ways of organising its resources in order to safeguard its continued viability. It is the committee’s
impression that over the reporting period, NIOD may have leaned too much on reputation and – for some years – has neglected its responsibility to renew itself and adjust to ongoing changes in the external environment (such as developments at national and international funding organisations, rapid technological changes, organisational developments in the Academy, and so on). Judged by humanities standards, NIOD is a medium-sized institute. In order to realise its stated ambitions, both academic and with regard to societal impact, it can and should expand, by further collaborations with academic partners, by strengthening its position in national and international networks, and by growing its own research capacity.

According to the committee, what the institute needs to do at this juncture is to develop precise ambitions and to carefully map out a road that leads to the intended destination. Part of that process should be to assess current policies and to aim for further professionalisation of procedures. Of particular importance are measures to increase the success in attracting competitive external funding, and the development of HRM-policies that allow the institute to be more flexible and to accommodate growth. It is a positive sign that NIOD’s current management team is well aware of these necessities. Since taking office it has made it a priority to bring about much needed change. The SWOT analysis also testifies to that. It not only signals things that need to improve but it also identifies potential ways and opportunities for doing so.

**Organisational change**

During the site visit, the restructuring of the organisation that took place in 2017, right at the end of the reporting period, was extensively discussed. The committee established that within NIOD there is wide support for the changes that have been set in motion. These seem to have created positive energy and a clean break from the troubled start of the reporting period. Representatives of the three programmes informed the committee that in their experience the new core teams are an effective way of creating more focus and synergy. The new structure makes it possible to work more specifically on a shared agenda that overarches the separate themes by identifying relevant research subjects (such as mass violence, transitional justice and new approaches to resistance). Moreover, it enables joint efforts towards methodological innovation in the field of digital humanities and new forms of cooperation at the interface between research and collection management (NOB, EHRI), and at the interface between the institute and engaged members of the public. While it is early days, the committee has heard positive examples of cross-fertilisation and interaction between departments. A prominent example is the new Decolonisation project, which involves NIOD staff of different departments and programmes. If successful, the newly developed direction should contribute towards the overall goal of enhancing the institute’s visibility and, therefore, towards establishing new partnerships and new funding opportunities.

The committee appreciates that under the new director NIOD is undergoing further professionalisation. From the documentation and interviews it is clear that attempts at formalising common practices and setting new policies are currently underway. Also, the management is taking its first steps in quantifying its ambitions, by asking the core teams to set goals in terms of funding applications and publications. The new director has a clear vision of the direction in which he thinks NIOD should be moving and he sets out that vision in an open and direct way that invites feedback from all NIOD employees. The changes that he, and the management team, aim to bring about are profound, and sometimes they meet with resistance. However, proponents and opponents alike are of the opinion that the process is transparent and fair and that all involved have the opportunity to express their views and to contribute to the changes. The new director also represents NIOD externally, and he does so in a way that the people in the institute appreciate and feel comfortable with.

All in all, the committee feels that these recent developments are cause for optimism.
Strategy for the future

In the documentation and interviews it was emphasised that NIOD’s so-called ‘special formula’ of combining academic and socially relevant research with a visible role as a national expertise centre and archive for the Second World War should be central to its strategy for the future. To retain its unique position in Dutch and international scholarship, NIOD will continue to pursue scholarly innovation and to focus even more on international debate and cooperation; it will also continue to improve its position as a societal network and expand its digital infrastructure. The latter is thought necessary not only to ensure that NIOD remains a national centre of expertise but also to furnish the EHRI and NOB with a stable environment in which to operate.

An issue that the committee has discussed extensively during the course of the review, both internally as well as with the representatives of the various groups with which it has spoken, is whether NIOD has added value as a separate institute that combines the roles of a collection manager, knowledge centre and research organisation. After reviewing the documentation and speaking to NIOD representatives, the committee believes that the answer to that question is affirmative. In transferring NIOD’s extensive collections to an external cultural heritage institution, such as the National Archive, a defining part of its identity would inevitably be lost. The strength of the institute, and the key to its successful continued existence, lies precisely in the strong connection between research, collections and public services. The very deep knowledge of its own and of related collections that exists within the institute clearly sets NIOD apart from other collection managers, where knowledge of the content of the collection is more superficial and services to the research community and general public are not as well-developed. The large portion of income that NIOD draws from contract research could be seen as indicative of the recognition of this added value within society at large. The intricate ties between research, collection and services also give NIOD a very special position, nationally and internationally. NIOD’s observation that it would have a slim chance of survival as an independent research institute without its own collection, is in the opinion of the committee, most likely correct. The committee does feel that the institute should build a stronger case for itself, by making more explicit when and how academic research, societal research and the collection are crucially interdependent, and by highlighting and substantiating the role of the expertise center in providing service for and seeking collaboration with professionals and the general public.

The unique nature of NIOD is definitely an asset, but sometimes also a liability. It makes the institute uniquely valuable, but also creates challenges, for example when it comes to providing an adequate internal support structure that is necessary to compete for second stream funding, or for growing its PhD programme. As the recent past indicates, the biggest risk seems to be a lack of reflection internally on the opportunities and the challenges it creates, and a subsequent neglect of communicating this with the external environment. The committee is confident that these challenges can be met, but notes that this will require constant awareness and care.

One of the biggest long-term challenges in connection with the way in which research, collection and services are related presently, concerns the fact that the collection by and large remains tied to a specific period and a specific geographical area, viz., the Kingdom of the Netherlands in the Second World War. Already, the institute is engaged in research that is not thus localised in space and time, and that therefore is much less, and sometimes not at all, tied to the collection and, thereby, to its traditional societal impact. This development will only continue in the future, and although the interest of the general public in what was once the core business of the institute presumably will remain a factor in the immediate future, it will change in the longer term. That requires further adjustment of the course of the institute, and the committee thinks it is essential that the process of “thinking the future” should get underway already now.
Digitisation
A particular aspect that was hampered by the recent troubles, was NIOD’s effort to innovate its collection management and update its digital infrastructure. During the site visit it was mentioned that the institute missed its cue for digitisation and is now falling behind other Academy institutes. In the coming years, NIOD hopes to work in close cooperation with these other institutes in order to establish an all-encompassing digital Search & Research Environment (SRE) that integrates information, tools and access portals for various target groups. This will require a substantial extension of entries into NIOD’s material, including in the form of indexes on persons, geography and themes.

The committee appreciates the awareness of the current situation with regard to digitisation, of the need to make up for lost time and to do so in close co-operation with the other institutes in the Academy. The committee shares the NIOD’s assessment that there are definite benefits here, not just for digitisation in the strict sense, but also for new methodologies that can foster new forms of research.

PhD programme
Hosting and supervising PhD candidates is not a core activity for NIOD, but it is seen as a valuable way of forging connections with universities and other research institutes, and of bringing in fresh ideas and new approaches. All of NIOD’s PhD candidates are associated with a university, where the eventual defence of the PhD takes place. The criterion for being counted as a NIOD PhD candidate, is that one or more of the institute’s staff members (who hold professorships at Dutch universities) are involved in (co-)supervision. Agreements concerning supervision are made with the university in question, in accordance with the prevailing guidelines.

PhD candidates fall into one of two main categories: either they are internal candidates, appointed to a specific NIOD research project and (co-)financed by the institute, or they are external candidates who work on projects related to NIOD’s area of expertise but who are not (co)financed by the institute. The latter category includes both PhD candidates who hold employment at a university and candidates who are entirely self-funded. The committee notes that the number of internal candidates is very limited: at the time of the site visit there were just three PhD candidates who work on NIOD-projects, with a fourth candidate expected to start work in the near future. The number of external candidates is somewhat larger, but still modest.

From the documentation and interviews, the committee concludes that the institute does not run a PhD programme in the normal sense of the word, since the training of PhD candidates mainly takes place outside the institute. The Graduate Schools of the universities that PhD candidates are associated with provide them with training in so-called ‘transferable skills’, while national research schools offer content-related teaching. Exact arrangements vary per PhD candidate and are (usually) laid out in a training and supervision plan that is drawn up at the beginning of the PhD project in accordance with the regulations at the university where the PhD candidate will defend. Depending on their research topic, NIOD PhD candidates are enrolled in national research schools such as the research school for Political History, the N.W. Posthumus Institute and the Huizenga Institute for Cultural History. Preparing students for the (academic) job market is mostly done via individual coaching at NIOD. The PhD candidates whom the committee spoke with are generally satisfied with the help of staff members in building their networks and identifying opportunities. While most PhD candidates indicated that they would like to pursue an academic career, they clearly recognise the difficulties involved.

PhD candidates with whom the committee spoke, mentioned that the PhD community is tight-knit and well integrated in the institute as a whole. In their experience, individual PhD candidates are
much more visible at NIOD than they are at a university, where numbers tend to be much higher and PhD candidates can feel rather anonymous and isolated. Since staff members and PhD candidates share office space, there is frequent formal and informal interaction, which seems to be highly appreciated by both sides. PhD candidates are generally satisfied with the supervision by NIOD staff. They appreciate the common practice of involving two different supervisors, who often offer complementary perspectives and insights. PhD candidates also mentioned that an added benefit of being part of a specialised (research) institute is that there is generally more relevant expertise around than would be the case at a broadly oriented university research department. PhD candidates are welcome to participate in regular research meetings and monthly koffie-lezingen (coffee lectures), where staff members (including PhD candidates) present their ongoing research. Employed PhD candidates typically have access to funding for research trips and conferences, but the exact arrangements vary, depending on the type of appointment and the associated funding.

During the site visit, the management indicated that it would like to further increase the number of PhD candidates, which it sees as helpful in securing the influx of new energy and in talent development. Both the MA programme and the PhD programme feed into a talent pool from which future staff members can be recruited. Although the committee is of the opinion that recruitment of future staff should look at the widest possible pool of candidates, not just those who are trained ‘in house’, it supports the ambition to grow the PhD programme. It does, however, wish to point out that in order to successfully sustain an increased PhD population, the institute would have to professionalise its PhD programme. As it stands, support structures for PhD candidates and supervision practices seem rather informal, based on personal agreements rather than on fixed procedures. The committee would also expect the institute to define a clear policy on how it wants its PhD candidates to interact at the university level, specifying which additional contribution NIOD could make to their training. Further, there should be a clear policy (case-based) in the case of project-related PhD candidates about responsibilities and deliverables for the project in relation to the production of a PhD, even where this largely coincides. A welcome first step that was mentioned during the interviews is that the Academy is currently working on streamlining (training) procedures and conditions for all PhDs working at Academy institutes.

A particular issue that NIOD put forward in the self-evaluation, is the current lack of financial compensation for (co-)delivering PhDs. The committee notes that since NIOD researchers who are involved in supervision usually also have a part-time position at a university, the attribution of supervision time to a position is complex. It agrees that the Academy and NWO would do well to make binding agreements with the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU) concerning this matter.

Diversity
With respect to the diversity of its staff, NIOD scores higher on some indicators than on others. In terms of gender and age, the institute seems to be doing quite well. Throughout the reporting period, women have outnumbered men by a small margin and there is an (almost) even number of men and women at all salary scales. Age distribution is no particular concern either. Since 2012, the age distribution has improved as younger staff have moved into positions vacated by retirees.

In terms of ethnic and national background, NIOD’s staff is (much) less representative for the population as a whole. According to the self-evaluation report this has to do both with the limited staff turnover and with the deeply culturally and historically determined themes that the institute has traditionally studied. Moving into new research themes and fields – e.g. by further expanding the Genocide programme – is thought to present a good opportunity for widening the ethnic and cultural diversity of the staff, as well as attracting researchers from different disciplinary backgrounds.
While the committee sympathises with this approach, it believes that success will partly rely on whether NIOD succeeds in developing the proper policy framework. From the interviews during the site visit the committee concluded that individual staff members have sound ideas with respect to diversity, but as yet these have not been translated into concrete strategies or targets that can be taken into account when recruiting new staff members or when acquiring new books for the library. The committee was pleased to learn that the institute hopes to shortly develop and implement a diversity charter. A specific suggestion that the committee would like to offer is to measure the academic advisory board against the yardstick of diversity and – if necessary – appoint additional members.

Research integrity
Research integrity and proper data management are important topics for NIOD, since its researchers tend to work with personal information of a sensitive nature. The committee was informed that NIOD adheres to the Netherlands Code of Conduct for Academic Practice as proposed by the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU) and to the Academy's protocols on this subject. Both documents offer guidelines on what is considered an ethical attitude for academic staff and on the proper handling and storage of information and data.

In 2012, NIOD implemented a data policy plan, which offers researchers guidance on privacy issues and further details the Academy's open access and digital preservation policy for research data. According to the policy plan NIOD researchers are required to store their research data permanently in digital form and with due observance of the Dutch Personal Data Protection Act (Wet Bescherming Persoonsgegevens, WBP). Researchers are obliged to include a data section in any new research plans, in which they must indicate what research data they will be producing and how they intend to deal with them. To put the policy into practice, the institute created the function of NIOD data steward and set up a Research Data and Archives working group. While the institute admits that compliance with the data policy plan was not self-evident from the start, it believes that good progress has been made during the reporting period. In the 2012-2017 period, six datasets were stored permanently in DANS-EASY, the main Dutch online repository for research data in the social sciences and the humanities. The data policy plan will be revised in 2018 to adequately respond to new developments. A particular concern that was voiced in the documentation and interviews has to with the implications that new EU legislation on data protection will have on the pursuit of scientific and scholarly research. The committee also noted that NIOD is currently preparing a risk assessment with the help of a specialised lawyer employed by the Academy.

The committee is satisfied with the level of awareness of the many facets of dealing with research data of the kind that NIOD researchers deal with, and it thinks that the institute handles these matters with due care. The committee notes that no research integrity issues were reported in the 2012-2017 period. NIOD credits its open, egalitarian research culture, in which researchers frequently discuss potentially sensitive issues amongst themselves. Although there was no standing ethics committee at NIOD in the reporting period, ethics committees were appointed in relevant cases. A step that is currently under consideration is the establishment of a joint ethics committee for all of the humanities institutes within the Academy. The committee would welcome this initiative and notes that there seems to be wide-spread support for such an undertaking within NIOD.
4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion
In reviewing the different categories defined by the SEP, as well as the associated authorised and reasoned performance indicators as defined by NIOD, the committee concludes that the institute on the whole conducts internationally recognised research of a very high academic quality. With its research activities the institute, furthermore, makes an outstanding contribution to society. Given the developments in the recent past and the ongoing changes in the external environment viability of the institute is good.

The committee believes that the following scores fairly summarise NIOD’s standing and achievement:

Research quality: very good
Relevance to society: excellent
Viability: good

Research quality is very good overall, although there are some variations in quality and international impact. Some of the publications arising from the Genocide programme stand out. The War and Society programme has the potential to be internationally agenda-setting but requires further strategic thinking and direction in coordinating efforts. NIOD has a strong tradition of organising societal research and public history using academically rigorous methodology and procedures, but the institute could make this more explicit.

Relevance to society is excellent: the societal impact of the Societal Research programme is substantial, and the institute functions as a core knowledge centre, at both a national and an international level. Societal research of NIOD is commendable for its collaboration with societal partners and promising ways in which this research draws on enthusiastic collaboration from the larger public.

Viability is good: due to developments in the environment the institute has gone through a difficult period, but the course set out by the new director and the management team is clear and has the support of the staff. Future viability must be a key concern in thinking about the strategy for the future.

Recommendations
The committee would like to offer the following recommendations:
- Develop targets at institute, programme and individual level with regard to key performance indicators such as number and kind of publications (including questions around which languages are most appropriate for what kinds of publication and target readership), publication venues, grant applications, contract research, outreach activities, division of time over research, outreach and other matters, and so on;
- Develop procedures for internal feedback on, in particular, non-peer reviewed research outputs, grant applications, and develop a support framework that makes it possible for individual researchers and research groups to meet their targets;
- Enhance a system of annual performance appraisal and career planning of individual researchers;
- Develop a cohesive, future-oriented mission that makes the unique features of the institute visible, that identifies ways to capitalise on them, and that reflects pro-actively on the changes that are necessitated by internal and external developments;
- On the basis of that mission, develop a growth strategy that strengthens the earning capacity of the institute in competitive external research funding to make it more resilient in the future;
- As part of that mission, develop a long-term vision on the future role of the NIOD as a knowledge centre in connection with its collection;
- As part of that mission, further develop the role of the societal research programme with its links to both academic research and non-academic impact along the lines of ‘public history’; consider reflecting this in the name of the programme;
- Develop procedures for supervision and training in a PhD programme in conjunction with the regulations imposed by the universities with which NIOD co-operates;
- Develop and implement diversity policies and make additional appointment(s) to the academic advisory board in order to promote diversity at all levels of the organisation.
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### APPENDIX 2: SEP ASSESSMENT SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Research quality</th>
<th>Relevance to society</th>
<th>Viability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>World leading/excellent</td>
<td>The unit has been shown to be one of the most influential research groups in the world in its particular field.</td>
<td>The unit makes an outstanding contribution to society</td>
<td>The unit is excellently equipped for the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>The unit conducts very good, internationally recognised research</td>
<td>The unit makes a very good contribution to society</td>
<td>The unit is very well equipped for the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>The unit conducts good research</td>
<td>The unit makes a good contribution to society</td>
<td>The unit makes responsible strategic decisions and is therefore well equipped for the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>The unit does not achieve satisfactory results in its field</td>
<td>The unit does not make a satisfactory contribution to society</td>
<td>The unit is not adequately equipped for the future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

### Program site visit NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies

**Herengracht 380**  
1016 CJ Amsterdam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wednesday 4 April 2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>Dinner at restaurant Haesje Claes, Spuistraat 273-275</td>
<td>Committee only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday 5 April 2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9:00 – 10:15 | Introductions and presentations on general policy of NIOD by the members of the Management Team, followed by questions and discussion. | Committee  
Frank van Vree, general director  
Piet van Wijk, head of collections  
Peter Romijn, head of research  
Marjolein Schenkel, managing director |
| 10:15 – 10:30 | "Site visit": city palace Herengracht 380, with coffee | Committee  
Anne-Use Bobeldijk  
Milan van Lange  
Ingrid de Zwarte |
| 10:40 – 11:25 | PhD-students | Committee  
Anne-Use Bobeldijk  
Milan van Lange  
Ingrid de Zwarte |
| 11:35-12:20 | War & Society | Committee  
Ismee Tames  
Peter Keppy  
Milan van Lange |
| 12:20 – 13:20 | Lunch | Committee only |
| 13:20 – 14:05 | Genocide Studies | Committee  
Thijs Bouwknegt  
Karel Berkhoff  
Uğur Üngör |
| 14:15 – 15:00 | Presentations EHRI and NOB | Committee  
Petra Drenth  
Eliske Rotteveel  
Martijn Eickhoff  
Peter Romijn  
Lizzy Jongma |
| 15:00-15:30 | Coffee, Tea, Refreshment |                                                                                                 |
| 15:30 – 16:10 | Research Program DGOI | Mariëtte Wolf  
Peter Romijn  
Stephanie Welvaart  
Anne van Mourik |
| 16:20 – 17:05 | Societal Research | Committee  
Jeroen Kemperman  
Kees Ribbens  
Erik Somers |
| 17:15 – 17:45 | Closing meeting | Committee  
Frank van Vree stand by |
<p>| 18:00    | Dinner at restaurant d’Vijf Vlieghen, Spuistraat 294-302 | Committee only |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00-10:00</td>
<td>Meeting with staff “Collections &amp; Services”</td>
<td>Committee Hubert Berkhout, Karolien Verbrugge, Marjo Bakker, René Pottkamp, Piet van Wijk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:10 – 11:10</td>
<td>Academic Advisory Board</td>
<td>Committee Charles Jeurgens, Bruno de Wever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 – 12:10</td>
<td>Staff Council (OC)</td>
<td>Committee Martijn Eickhoff, Ralf Futselaar, Femke Jacobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10 – 13:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 – 15:00</td>
<td>Commission meeting</td>
<td>Committee only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00 – 16:00</td>
<td>Feedback session with Management Team</td>
<td>Committee Frank van Vree, Piet van Wijk, Peter Romijn, Marjolein Schenkel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00 – 17:00</td>
<td>Summary of the visit for entire NIOD staff, followed by drinks.</td>
<td>Committee, all staff members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 4: QUANTITATIVE DATA

#### Results of quantitative indicators NIOD 2012-2017 (Table D3b SEP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1 Scientific/scholarly books, critical source publications and exhibition catalogues (authorized)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2 Journal articles and reviews (authorized)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3 Book chapters (authorized)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4 Editorship of an edited volume or special issue (authorized)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Scientific/scholarly books, critical source publications and exhibition catalogues</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Journal articles and reviews</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Book chapters (authorized)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Editorship of an edited volume or special issue (authorized)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6 Commissioned reports (reasoned)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.7 Organising Conferences [and workshops/seminars]</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1 Invited Lectures</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2.1 Books, source publications and exhibition catalogues for a general readership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2.2 Articles in general magazines and journals</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2.4 en 2.4.3.1 Lectures and master classes for a professional resp. general audience</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of finished PhD’s by NIOD Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of finished PhD’s of non-employees under NIOD supervision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE D3A NIOD STAFF IN FTE AND HEADCOUNT 2012-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research unit</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientific staff</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-docs</td>
<td>np</td>
<td>np</td>
<td>np</td>
<td>np</td>
<td>np</td>
<td>np</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD students</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total research staff</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting fellows</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other staff</td>
<td>35.57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total staff</td>
<td>58.95</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>51.27</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>54.77</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABEL D3D

Finished PhD's

3 2 3

Current projects

21 26 26

TABEL D3C NIOD BUDGET AND FUNDING 2012-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundtype</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct funding [1]</td>
<td>2.905</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2.908</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research grants [2]</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract research [3]</td>
<td>1.468</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1.792</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other [4]</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total funding</td>
<td>5.199</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5.750</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-57</td>
<td>-76</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>-381</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Direct funding (basfinanciering / lump-sum budget)
(2) Research grants obtained in national scientific competition (e.g. grants from NWO and the Royal Academy)
(3) Research contracts for specific research projects obtained from external organisations, such as industry, government ministries, European organisations and charitable organisations
(4) Funds that do not fit into the other categories