

## Response of the academic advisory board to the IISH Assessment Report (2018)

In general, the academic advisory board (WeCo) approves of the review committee's assessment, particularly where research is judged to be excellent, while more work needs to be done on the societal impact of the IISH's activities. Taken as a whole, the assessments of the review committee are balanced and properly substantiated, and it is evident that the committee has obtained a clear picture of the institute within a short period. However, the academic advisory board would nevertheless like to draw attention to two points.

Firstly, the quality of the collections is judged to be 'very good', which implies that there is still room for improvement (so that in the future 'excellent' is a possibility). However, the text in question contains only compliments and other positive assessments, so that it is not clear why the collections were not assessed as 'excellent'. Moreover, little attention is devoted to the innovative character of the archiving of digital files, which has been the focus of much effort in the past few years.

The second point concerns the 'viability' of the institute. Here too, the same applies: the committee is full of praise for the new policy and its impact, and it is not really clear why the 'viability' is assessed as 'very good' rather than 'excellent'. What risks has the institute failed to see that could impact its 'viability'? Given the robust policy pursued in the past few years and the very promising cooperation within the Humanities Cluster, the 'viability' seems to have developed optimally. Both points concern nuances rather than real assessment differences, but the academic advisory board nevertheless finds it important to draw these points to your attention.