

Assessment Report

Huygens ING – 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 Huygens ING	7
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 Mission of Huygens ING	7
2.3 Management and organisation	8
2.4 The KNAW Humanities Cluster	8
3 Assessment Huygens ING.....	10
3.1 Research Huygens ING	10
3.2 Huygens ING 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 Huygens ING	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 research institute Huygens ING, member of KNAW Humanities Cluster in Amsterdam, undertaken on March 18-20, 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 Huygens ING, additional documentation, and two days of meetings with the staff of the institute. This review report is both prospective and retrospective and has resulted in recommendations to Huygens ING 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 Huygens ING, staff and researchers, for their open and constructive participation in the review process.

We hope this report will mark the beginning of another successful period of very good research in Huygens ING and a significant contribution to the KNAW Humanities Cluster.

May 2018

Prof. Eduard Hovy
Chair

1. Introduction

1.1 The evaluation

All publicly funded university research in the Netherlands is evaluated at regular intervals in compliance with the national standard evaluation protocol (SEP 2015-2021), as agreed by the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU), the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) and the Netherlands Academy of Sciences (KNAW). The evaluation process, which is applied at the research unit or institute level, consists of a systematic external peer review conducted every six years.

The evaluation system aims to achieve three generic objectives:

- *improvement* in the quality of research through an assessment carried out according to international standards of quality and relevance;
- *improvement* in research management and leadership; and
- *accountability* to the higher management levels of the research organisations and to the funding agencies, government and society at large.

1.2 The assessment procedure

The evaluation procedures followed by the Review Committee were those set out in the NWO/VSNU/KNAW “Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021 for public research organisations”. This protocol entails two main characteristics:

- *Two levels of assessment*: The assessment takes place at two levels of the research organisation, i.e. the level of the graduate school and the level of research groups/institutes;
- *Three main criteria*: The research institutes are assessed on the three assessment criteria, i.e. research quality, relevance to society, and viability.

The review committee was requested to report its findings on the research institute in line with the three main criteria. With respect to the evaluation of Huygens ING the findings were expected to be reported in qualitative terms with a focus on policy and management questions. For the assessment of the research institute, the verdict needed to be cast in both qualitative and quantitative terms. In the text, the most important considerations of the committee had to be clarified, while the conclusion had to be summarized in a single term according to a four-point scale (annex 1). Checklists and excerpts of the standard evaluation protocol were provided as a tool for assisting in assessment. The four criteria should always be reviewed in relation to the institute’s mission, especially if this mission restricts the institute to operate only for / in a national scientific community.

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

- A self-assessment report detailing the operation, management, research activities, 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 groups.

The site visit was undertaken during the period of 18-20 March 2018 and consisted of a number of components, which can be summarised as follows (see annex 2 for the full programme and the names of participants):

- Start-off committee meeting on the evening of Sunday 18 March
- Meeting with the institute director and the director of operations of HuC
- Meeting with administrative staff (without directors)
- Meeting with senior scholars
- Meeting with younger scholars
- Meeting with data management and IT staff
- Meeting with management team (without directors)
- Meeting with chair Academic Advisory Board

The Peer Review Committee comprised of:

- Prof. E.H. (Eduard) Hovy, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh USA, chair
 - Prof. A. (Andreas) Fickers, Université du Luxembourg
 - Prof. J. (Julia) Flanders, Northeastern University, Boston USA
 - Prof. D. (Dániel) Margócsy, University of Cambridge UK
 - Prof. H. (Hans) Vandevoorde, Vrije Universiteit Brussel Belgium
- Dr. F.A.J. (Frans) van Steijn acted as independent secretary to the committee

1.2 Results of the assessment

This report summarises the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the international peer review of the research at Huygens ING. 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 included:

- Self-assessment with appendices
- Institute Working Programme 2012 – 2017 (in Dutch)
- Institute Working programme 2018 – 2023
- 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
- The Institute's website www.huygens.knaw.nl

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

The committee finds the information ample, honest and adequate.

2 Structure, organisation and mission of Huygens ING

2.1 Introduction

In 2011 Huygens ING originated from a merger of the Huygens Institute—a KNAW institute specialized in text editions of works of literature and the history of science—and the Instituut voor Nederlandse Geschiedenis (ING)—an NWO institute for historical source publications.

The Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands (Huygens ING) is now one of the sixteen research institutes of the KNAW and one of the three institutes of the KNAW Humanities Cluster (HuC). The HuC constitutes an intensive collaboration between Huygens ING, the IISH and the Meertens Institute. In October 2016 Huygens ING underwent another major change when the institute moved from The Hague to Amsterdam where it is housed together with the Meertens Institute in an historic 'Golden Age' building at one of this city's canals.

2.2 Mission of Huygens ING

Huygens ING's research is aimed primarily at Dutch language, history, history of science, and culture in its international context, and at developing and using new methods and techniques for the humanities. Huygens ING seeks to acquire new insights in the long-term development of the Netherlands with an eye on Europe and the world. It uses advanced digital tools that are designed, built and managed together with national and international partners.

Huygens ING is in the middle of evolving from an institute that concentrated on the (analogue) research of texts and sources and on producing scholarly editions, into an institute that is increasingly employing digital solutions for text and source editions, while also maintaining a focus on analytical research. At the top of the institute's new programme 2018–2023 are digital editions, digital source publications, and digital infrastructures, alongside important non-digital work. Huygens ING plays a leading role in Nederlab, an online research infrastructure for research into Dutch texts from ca. 800 AD to the present, and in CLARIAH, a distributed digital research infrastructure for the Arts and Humanities. As a KNAW research institute, Huygens ING is able to secure the durability of the digital infrastructure for humanities research in the Netherlands.

Huygens ING's research has since 2015 been characterized by five key areas:

1. *Governance of the Netherlands*, based on a rich depository of administrative sources with the core project 'Resolutions of the States General'.
2. *Debate culture*, focuses on development processes and the acceptance of knowledge with core projects 'Marginal Scholarship, Republic of Letters, Riddle of Literary Quality'.

3. *Innovative Editing*, where the institute experiments with innovations in editing with core projects 'Complete Works of W.F. Hermans, the works of Anne Frank and letters of Piet Mondriaan'.
4. *Impact of Circulation*, studying the effect of migration with core projects 'Republic of Letters, Migration to Australia, and Dutch East India reports home'.
5. *Infrastructure for digital Humanities*, building the digital infrastructure together with the two other KNAW HuC institutes, integrated with Nederlab and CLARIAH.

With respect to its outreach targets, Huygens ING has produced numerous works for audiences outside academia. The edition of the Van Gogh letters already has attracted a large attention and the dedicated website draws large numbers of visitors (330.000 in 2017).

2.3 Management and organisation

Huygens ING has five departments, three research departments (Literary Studies, History and History of Knowledge) and two supporting departments (IT and Digital Data Management). The director of Huygens ING chairs the management team (MT), consisting of the five department directors and the director of operations of the KNAW HuC. The present director holds this office since the fall of 2012 and the director of operations started in October 2016. Huygens ING has an annual budget of approx. € 8.2 million (2017), of which € 5.5 million is derived directly from the KNAW and € 2.7 million from grants and other external resources. From this budget 30.5 fte research staff are employed as well as 36.7 support staff (general, IT and data management). In 2016 and 2017 the institute's balance showed a deficit; the KNAW has fulfilled its promise to strengthen the financial reserves of HuC as a whole.

2.4 The KNAW Humanities Cluster

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

3 Assessment Huygens ING

3.1 Research Huygens ING

Principal	Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW)
Institute	Huygens ING
Director	Lex Heerma van Voss
Research input tenured staff 2017	26.2 fte (29 pers.)
Non-tenured research staff 2017	4.3 fte (5 pers.)

Assessment:

Research quality	2 (very good)
Relevance to society	3 (good)
Viability	2 (very good)

Research quality

Huygens ING has a long and very strong history and has produced excellent scholarly work. The institute is a national resource that merits preservation as it has a great opportunity to develop and initiate new styles of research. However, the committee feels that at this moment a clear understanding and formulation of the path forward is mainly missing. That would include strategies for research directions, the introduction of digital methods and tools, outreach to society, and its connections with the new HuC cluster.

Huygens ING's research is of very high quality and includes different classes of work. Some researchers are of international quality in textual editing (which is too often not recognized as a full-fledged research activity), and the committee recommends continuing and even strengthening international connections to burnish this international reputation and exchange ideas. Other researchers do very valuable work on preserving the cultural heritage of the Netherlands. Especially the researchers who focus on history of knowledge have made excellent progress in establishing an international presence. The committee recognizes their work with encouragement. Last, a group of researchers, partly overlapping with the previous ones, work on exploring digital methods to enhance research. This includes creating new digital data, data curation and editing, as well as designing and testing new tools and even methods. The committee considers this work outstanding.

While all this work is very good, the heterogeneity of the group hampers the formulation of a coherent strategy. It is important to retain an awareness of the history of science especially at an institution such as the KNAW.

The institute's digital approach explicitly recognizes a basic digitally-enhanced methodology: after digitizing the source material, this work enables researchers to add layers of interpretation as overlays of various kinds (single, multiple, independent, or connected). The projects have received international recognition; for example, the CollateX software (<https://collatex.net/about/>) is the most advanced package of this kind in their field(s) worldwide. The relationship and balance between domain researchers and IT specialists is an issue worthy of careful consideration. While the research agenda is driven by the domain researchers, there is important and appropriate collaborative design by IT specialists and by those in hybrid positions (i.e., those in the DH Lab and the Digital Data Management group). This is especially important because the development of digital infrastructure is a key part of the research agenda, making the involvement of those with appropriate IT expertise a strength. The committee applauds this model, the method of working, and the results. It is important to articulate this model explicitly and to systematize the institute's practical experiences.

It is becoming increasingly necessary to come up with more systematic and professionally recognized methods for evaluating the quality of research. Internal reflection is not enough. Increased publication should not be the only target. Given that there is already an increase, the committee recommends a partial focus on high-quality publications with strong visibility, as well as more proposals, public outreach, teaching, data management and curation, infrastructure quality, digitally-enhanced measures of coverage and consistency, and other methods. All of these are important. Working on all these targets should contribute to the strategic goals of the HuC, especially when the integration of the institutes grows.

The committee considers the research quality of Huygens ING to be very good.

Relevance to society

Huygens ING's strong focus on Dutch history and the role of history in national identity building creates a unique opportunity to draw interest from a wider public and from politics. But the outreach strategy seems more to take achievements as they come, rather than planning for them and dedicating resources. The fact that its digital products are available on Open Access is extremely helpful and important. The institute clearly has realized products—such as the Van Gogh letters and *1001 vrouwen*—that have a large impact on society. They indeed 'find their way to large audiences' as Huygens ING states in its self-assessment, but this process is not sufficiently analysed. The lack of a coherent strategic planning for outreach needs to be addressed. There is room for a better and more exciting website that provides opportunities for external involvement (such as examples and tools for easy access to resources), for

connections to the media (for example, daily messages about Dutch history), and for more emphasis on public appearances. These are all being done but not as well or as well planned as they could be. The committee notes that Huygens ING now has commissioned a fully revised website.

The committee considers the relevance to society of the research Huygens ING to be good.

Viability

The committee appreciates the multiple ways of doing research in Huygens ING, but the consequence is large heterogeneity in the organisation of topics, key areas, projects and methods. The quality of the work is also somewhat variable. The committee feels that Huygens ING should take the present opportunity to articulate clearer research foci for Dutch history and culture and organize that within an overarching narrative that explains how the different directions fit together. That would facilitate transverse cross-linkage (both within Huygens ING and especially to the two sister institutes), so that somewhat larger collaborations can be formed. The institute would then be able to better articulate a comprehensive original perspective on Dutch history and culture. The unique combination of materials and tools offered at Huygens ING could then better be exploited to make the international impact that its potential deserves.

On the digital side, there is an important need to articulate how software projects like Timbuktu and Pergamon are also research. In fact, to IT personnel/tool-builders, such 'infrastructuring' *does* count as research, while to domain researchers in other institutions this type of work is sometimes seen 'merely' as tools. One of Huygens ING's outstanding qualities is the deeply theorized co-construction of the research workspace, with professionals on both sides, and the products are of use to researchers worldwide. Therefore, designating much of the IT merely as 'support' is neither quite accurate nor ideal, and Huygens ING should strive to combat this view (especially since some of its IT staff is moving into the HuC).

The growing complexity caused by the HuC cluster requires a greater systematisation of the collaborative process of designing, building, and testing infrastructure and support. The committee strongly encourages the group to design a clear scheme showing workflows, templates, and roles that capture their experience in this digitisation/'infrastructuring'. That way they can better support all HuC researchers and the HuC Digital Humanities team. Such a scheme will also highlight some of the internationally unique qualities of the institute.

Within Huygens ING, when it comes to new hires, the committee recommends transparency and involvement across all levels to facilitate insights and suggestions of younger researchers based on their experiences and possibly different (and more digital) methodologies.

The committee recognizes the stressful times that Huygens ING has undergone recently. Therefore, the optimistic and positive attitude is commendable. The funding position is in good shape again, though a reduction in real-term funding is a little distressing. The new merger into the HuC is creating some stress, and the absence of a clearly articulated strategic vision adds to that. Further, the impending large number of retirements will have an additional impact, and it is important to obtain funding for personnel 'tiling', and to develop funding strategies and acquire support from the KNAW to maintain the level of research personnel. Given the right conditions, Huygens ING can make an outstanding contribution within the world of research in history and especially digitally enhanced research.

The committee considers the viability of Huygens ING to be very good.

3.2 Huygens ING in the HuC and digital humanities

Huygens ING clearly has recognized the challenges that the development of digital techniques and methods pose upon its research. The institute appears to embrace the opportunities the new Humanities Cluster offers in this respect for itself and its two sister-institutions. Whether the future continues to keep a separate, distinguished institute called the Huygens ING or an amalgamated institute for Dutch history, language and culture, famous for its digital approaches, the committee cannot foresee.

The HuC is expected to ensure the technical infrastructure for the continuation of the national facilities of Huygens ING.

3.3 PhD training and education programme

Huygens ING had in the years 2012 to 2016 an average of 3 PhD students on the premises but reports none for 2017. The eight Huygens ING research staff who hold a part-time professorship in one of the Dutch universities are supervising much more PhD students, but that is not apparent from the self-assessment report. Whether Huygens ING's 'own' PhD's receive the proper supervision and training is more the responsibility of the supervisors/professors themselves than the institute's. Nevertheless, Huygens ING claims to maintain close relations with all relevant research schools, in particular the Research School Political History and the NW Posthumus Research School for Social and Economic History. Indeed, the Huygens ING *Intervisie* (peer-to-peer learning) activity supports a constant flow of PhD students—most based in the universities—who come to

Huygens ING for shorter or longer visits. Students receive a small amount of funding for their visit, and while they are here they can (and do) interact with other researchers, attend meetings, etc. This activity works well and is a good model for the HuC in the future.

The committee believes Huygens ING can do more regarding education and training in general. The institute can play a distinctive role in educating the next (international) generation of history scholars in both text editing (analog and digital) as well as digitally enhanced methods.

It is important to strengthen connections to the universities. One way to do so is to establish revolving/temporary positions that can be occupied by researchers from universities for a few months at a time. Another is to strengthen the *Intervisie* programme to bring in all PhD students of the various research staff at Huygens ING who have PhD's at their universities as well.

3.4 Integrity

Huygens ING conforms to the KNAW and national policies to guard the propriety and integrity of research conduct. Integrity issues are frequently addressed in project meetings and between PhD students and their supervisors.

Huygens ING has developed a strong Research Data Management Policy that is based on the FAIR principles: Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Reusable. The committee advises Huygens ING to explicitly deal with the new EU directive on data protection that will have a huge impact on the future organisation of digital humanities.

There have apparently been no incidents and the committee found no indication of concern with respect to actual integrity issues.

3.5 Recommendations

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

1. After the move, and within the context of the HuC, Huygens ING should now avail itself of the opportunity to formulate a clearly articulated strategic vision which includes a sharper profile of its own regarding the field of Dutch Culture and History and adopting a strong role in relation to its HuC partners regarding new methods in Digital Humanities.
2. Articulate the Huygens ING model of doing research by domain researchers with co-development of digitally-enhanced methodology by IT specialists.

3. Develop systematic and professionally recognized models for evaluating the quality of research.
4. Develop a strategy and allocate corresponding resources for Huygens ING's outreach activities.
5. Articulate a focus for Dutch culture and history research and organize that within an overarching narrative.
6. Develop funding strategies, incl. personnel 'tiling', to maintain the level of researchers.
7. Adopt an explicit PhD policy—and more general an education policy—to educate the next (international) generation of scholars.
8. Seek various ways to strengthen the relations with the universities.

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:

Score	Meaning	Research quality	Relevance to society	Viability
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 Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands, chaired by prof. dr. Eduard Hovy.

The Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands (Huygens ING) studies Dutch literature, history, and history of science employing digital methods. Through fundamental, advanced and interdisciplinary research of source texts, Huygens ING produces new insights in the (long term) development of the Netherlands and Dutch literature, while keeping in sight relevant developments in and connections with other parts of Europe and the rest of the world. Huygens ING analyses issues ranging from the character of literature, the debate culture of the early Middle Ages to Dutch migration to Australia. The institute has an important infrastructural role for the Humanities in the Netherlands. Huygens ING was formed as an institute devoted to producing scholarly editions of texts. With the advance of digitisation, the forms in which access to source material is offered, have diversified. The institute has consequently acquired a broader role in building and sustaining a digital infrastructure for the Humanities. Among the large projects to give access to source materials that Huygens ING is working on are text editions like the complete works of W.F. Hermans, Erasmus and Piet Mondrian, the Golden Agents project on the creative industries of the Dutch Golden Age and the publication of Resolutions of the States General of the Dutch Republic. In addition, the institute develops digital techniques for interpreting and analyzing texts. Together with the Meertens Institute (for research and documentation of Dutch language and culture) and the International Institute of Social History, Huygens ING forms the KNAW Humanities Cluster.

Assessment

You are being asked to assess the quality and relevance to the scholarly community and society of the research conducted by the Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands 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. Please 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 editions, data sets, 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 Huygens ING is responding to this challenge;
2. the opportunities the KNAW Humanities Cluster offers for the quality, relevance and viability of the Huygens ING research groups.

In addition to the criteria and aspects 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 Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands 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 <https://www.huygens.knaw.nl/documentation-assessment-committee-huygens-ing-2018/> no less than four weeks prior to the site visit.

The documents will include at least the following:

- Self-assessment of Huygens ING 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 Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands will take place on 19 and 20 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 Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands.

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 Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands no more than 6 weeks after the site visit. The Huygens Institute for the History of the Netherlands 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 Huygens ING

Sunday March 18 2018

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

Monday March 19 2018

9:00-10.00 Session with institute director and HuC director of operations
Lex Heerma van Voss, Yildiz van den Akker

11.00-10.30 Session with administrative staff
Barbara Buis (Finance), Marjoleine Cornelissen (HR), Willy
Jongenburger (Facilities), Annejet Landman (secretariat), Thijs van
der Veen (communication)

10.45-12.00 Session with senior scholars
Marijke van Faassen (History), Ronald Haentjes Dekker (IR, R&D),
Ton van Kalmthout (History), Peter Kegel, (Literary Studies), Mariken
Teeuwen (History of Knowledge), Milja van Tielhof (History)

12.00-13.15 Session with younger scholars
Elli Bleeker (IR, R&D), Corina Koolen (Literary Studies), Marijn Koolen
(IT), Jelle van Lottum (History), Irene van Renswoude (History of
Knowledge)

14.45–15.45 Session with Data Management and IT
Marnix van Berchum (Digital Data Management), Peter Boot (Literary
Studies), Sebastiaan Derks (Digital Data Management), Gertjan
Filarski (IT), Charles van den Heuvel (History of Knowledge), Jauco
Noordzij (IT)

16.00-17.30 Session with management team (without the directors)
Karina van Dalen-Oskam (Literary Studies), Sebastiaan Derks (Digital
Data Management), Gertjan Filarski (IT), Marjolein 't Hart (History),
Charles van den Heuvel (History of Knowledge)

18.30 Dinner (committee only)

Tuesday March 20 2018

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| 9:00-11.15 | Session Committee only |
| 11.30-12.30 | Session with chair Academic Advisory Board
Wiep van Bunge |
| 14.00-15.00 | Feedback session with institute director
Lex Heerma van Voss |
| 15.00-16.00 | Informal summary of visit with entire institute |

Annex 4 Research data

a. Research staff on 31 December of (year)

	2012		2013		2014		2015		2016		2017	
Huygens ING												
	n	fte	n		n		n		n		n	
Scientific staff	34	29.9	36	31.6	32	28.1	31	28.1	31	29.9	29	26.2
Post-docs	6	3.9	6	3.3	5	2.0	5	2.2	5	3.7	5	4.3
PhD students	3	3.0	3	3.0	5	4.7	3	3.7	2	2.0	0	0
Total research staff	43	36.8	45	37.9	42	34.8	39	34.0	38	33.5	34	30.5
General support staff	35	25.3	31	24.3	32	25.7	19	15.0	16	12.3	5	4.3
IT and (from 2015) DDM staff	19	14.3	14	9.8	13	9.3	24	20.7	39	32.7	40	32.4
Total staff	97	83.0	90	80.5	87	79.2	82	77.8	93	88.0	79	76.4
Visiting fellows	10	6.6	16	8.5	18	9.4	17	8.1	18	9.5	16	9.2

b. Financing structure (x € 1000)

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Funding Huygens ING:						
Direct funding	5.051	5.070	5.020	5.212	5.239	5.521
Research grants	519	372	346	958	1.002	1.730
Contract research	1.084	1.769	1.326	630	548	783
Other	643	207	240	190	140	162
Total funding	7.297	7.418	6.932	6.990	6.929	8.196
<i>Expenditure</i>						
Personnel costs	5.744	6.064	5.849	5.825	6.112	6.060
Other costs	1.238	1.065	857	1.017	957	2.713
Total expenditure	6.982	7.129	6.706	6.842	7.069	8.773
Surplus/deficit	315	289	226	148	-140	-577

c. Research output

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Huygens ING						
Scholarly text editions	11	10	4	14	5	13
Scholarly data sets, database, software, website	4	10	5	3	21	9
Refereed articles	30	19	35	21	30	20
Non-refereed articles	9	6	6	2	4	2
Books	14	14	7	4	7	8
Book chapters	39	31	37	30	27	35
PhD theses	2	2	2	2	2	1
Conference papers	5	1	13	19	32	37
Professional publications	83	66	57	28	55	65
Publications aimed at the general public	40	48	19	27	29	106
Total publications	237	207	185	150	212	296

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. Andreas Fickers (1971) is director of the 3rd interdisciplinary centre at the University of Luxembourg C²DH, *Luxembourg Centre for Contemporary and Digital History*. As director of C²DH, he is member of the management team of Luxembourg University, consisting of the rector, the deans and three research centres.

Prof. Fickers received his PhD in 2002 at the RTWH Aachen. He was assistant professor at Utrecht University (2003–2007) in the history of television and associate professor at Maastricht University (2007-2013) in comparative history of the media.

Andreas Fickers directs and co-directs two graduate schools: the « Doctoral Training Unit in Digital History and Hermeneutics » and the tri-national school « L'histoire internationale par l'interdisciplinarité. Perspectives franco-allemandes et européennes au XXe siècle ».

Andreas Fickers represents Luxembourg and/or University of Luxembourg in European associations (DARIAH ; CLARIN (NL) and HERA).

In recent years, he has completed several research projects in the fields of the history of the media and the European history of technology and informatics. One recent (2016) project was funded by NWO, the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research, on the history of the *film de famille* (translation?).

One main activity was the writing of the last volume of the important serie « Making Europe » intitule, the book named « Communicating Europe : Technologies, Information, Events » and more books on the regional history of the German-speaking community of Belgium as part of a project funded by the Prime Minister entitled "Grenzerfahrungen"

Prof. Julia Flanders received an AB in History and Literature from Harvard University and a BA in English Literature from Cambridge University where she held a Marshall Scholarship. She received her PhD in English Literature from Brown University in 2005; her dissertation was titled "Digital Humanities and the Politics of Scholarly Work." She worked for 20 years at Brown University in a variety of roles focused on humanities computing and digital humanities, as part of the Scholarly Technology Group and at the Women Writers Project. In 2013 she joined Northeastern University where she is a professor of the practice in English and the director of the Digital Scholarship Group in the Northeastern University Library. She also directs the Women Writers Project and serves as editor in chief of *Digital Humanities Quarterly*, an open-access, peer-reviewed online journal of digital humanities. She has served as chair of the TEI Consortium and as President of the Association for Computers and the Humanities. She has also taught a wide range of workshops on text encoding and served as a consultant and advisor on numerous digital humanities projects. Her research interests focus on data modelling, textual scholarship, humanities data curation, and the politics of digital scholarly work.

Prof. Dániel Margócsy is a cultural historian of early modern science and medicine, his research focuses on the visual cultures of anatomy and natural history. He is currently university lecturer in science, technology, and medicine before 1800 at the Department of History and Philosophy of Science, University of Cambridge. He received his PhD from Harvard in 2009, and previously worked at Northwestern University and Hunter College – CUNY. He is the author of *Commercial Visions: Science, Trade and Visual Culture in the Dutch Golden Age* (Chicago, 2014), co-author of *The Fabrica of Andreas Vesalius: A Worldwide Census, Ownership, and Annotations* (Brill, 2018), and has also edited special issues on secrecy for the *British Journal for the History of Science* and on scientific networks for *Social Studies of Science*. He has published on the role of evidence in religion and natural history, on the history of the book in Hungary, on cabinets of curiosities in the Dutch Golden Age, and on the depictions of exotica in early modern prints in journals such as the *Journal of the History of Ideas*, the *Nederlands Kunsthistorisch Jaarboek*, *Print Quarterly* or the *Social History of Medicine*. He has been a fellow at the Cullman Center for Scholars and Writers at the New York Public Library, the Descartes Center in Utrecht, the Netherlands Institute for Advance Studies, and the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science in Berlin.

Prof. Hans Vandevoorde (1960) teaches Dutch literature at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB). He is one of the coordinators of the Centre for the Study of Experimental Literature (CEL/SEL), member of the Steering Committee of the ENAG (an international research community on European Neo-Avant-Garde) and with Bart Eeckhout (UA) chief editor of the *Cahier voor*

Literatuurwetenschap (CLW). A sabbatical leave was granted for the year 2014-2015 and he was appointed on the Breughel Chair at the UPenn 2016. Prof. Vandevoorde supervises an FWO-project on diaries in the second world war, a PhD on art and literature (VUB) and two FWO-fellowships (on the surrealist metaphor and on documentary literature in the literature of the sixties). He published several volumes and articles on nineteenth century, fin de siècle and interbellum literature & culture, and on post-war poetry. His main research interests are cultural history (cafés, world fairs, writers associations and generation study); literature (authorship, literary genres), the theory of biography and the rhetoric of pathos; comparative literature (relations between the Dutch speaking and the French speaking part of Belgium and between Germany and Belgium; and relation between arts & literature.

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.