

Research review
Groningen Institute of Archaeology (GIA)

Report on the research review of the Groningen Institute of Archaeology (GIA)

Contents

1. Foreword committee chair	3
2. The review committee and the procedures.....	4
3. Research review of GIA (general part).....	6
3.1 Introduction	6
3.2 Research quality, societal relevance and viability	8
3.3 Additional questions regarding GIA's preparation for the future.....	11
3.4 PhD training.....	12
3.5 Research integrity	14
4. Research review of the research groups.....	15
4.1 Arctic and Antarctic Studies (AAS)	15
4.2 Bio-archaeology (BA).....	15
4.3 Classical and Mediterranean Archaeology (CMA)	16
4.4 Greek Archaeology (GA).....	17
4.5 Prehistoric and Protohistoric Archaeology of NW Europe (PP)	18
5. Recommendations	19
Appendices.....	20
Appendix 1: Explanation of the SEP criteria and categories	20
Appendix 2: Curricula vitae of the committee members.....	21
Appendix 3: Programme of the site visit.....	23
Appendix 4: Quantitative data.....	25

1. Foreword committee chair

It gives me great pleasure to present this report on the 2016 research review of the Groningen Institute of Archaeology (GIA) at the University of Groningen that concerns the half decade 2010-2015. Quality assurance and regular monitoring of both research and education are of crucial importance to academic governance in order to guarantee continuity, sustain quality and gauge the need for investments. In academia, peer review is the instrument *par excellence* for doing so, whether it concerns academic publishing or teaching and research evaluations. The research review was accordingly carried out by an independent Peer Review Committee that was specifically appointed for that occasion, in keeping with Dutch national regulations (appendix 1). The review itself included both a documentary and an interview phase.

The importance that is attached to exercises as the research review reported on here, is underscored by the care taken and the efforts made by Groningen University and its Institute of Archaeology to prepare the review and to provide a wide-ranging and up-to-date set of documentation, as well as their active collaboration during two intensive days of meetings in Groningen on November 7 and 8, 2016. It is also evident from the composition of the Peer Review Committee that was constituted by a group of carefully selected international scholars. As described in more detail on the following pages, and especially in Appendix 2, the Review Committee was made up of five scholars specialized in fields, regions and topics of particular relevance for the Groningen Institute of Archaeology. Four committee members are based at universities outside the Netherlands, while the fifth is based at a Dutch government agency.

The review process began in early October 2016, when the documentation and publications were made available to the Review Committee. The committee subsequently convened in Groningen on November 6, ahead of the two-day visit. The meetings with faculty and staff of Groningen University and the Institute of Archaeology were concluded with a brief presentation of the key findings and recommendations. The present report was finally drafted between late November and December 2016, and a preliminary version was submitted for feedback to the Groningen Institute of Archaeology in early January.

As chair of the Peer Review Committee, it has been my privilege not only to preside over the proceedings of the two-day visit to Groningen University, but also to take the lead in preparing the meetings, and especially in drafting the report – all of this in close collaboration with and expertly supported by Erik van der Spek of Hendrikx Van der Spek consultancy.

On behalf of my fellow committee members, I would finally like to thank both the faculty and staff of the Groningen Institute of Archaeology, and of the Faculty of Arts, for the wide-ranging, informative and interesting discussions, as well as of course for the extensive prompt and forward-looking support to ensure the smooth and steady progress of the proceedings.

Peter van Dommelen,



(Providence, RI, January 29, 2017)

2. The review committee and the procedures

Scope of the review

The review committee was asked to perform a review of the Groningen Institute of Archaeology (GIA). This institute, according to the website, engages in fundamental archaeological research in Northwest Europe, the Mediterranean and the Polar Regions. GIA stimulates and integrates fundamental research on past human societies and their environments, from Palaeolithic hunter-gatherers to complex urban societies. The Institute facilitates research and fieldwork through its laboratories, drawing facilities, documentation, GIS, and technical support.

In accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021 (SEP) for research reviews in the Netherlands, the committee's tasks were to assess the research quality of GIA on the basis of the information provided by GIA and the Graduate School for the Humanities and interviews with the management of the coordinating institute, directorate, board, senior and junior members, and to advise on how its work might be improved.

Composition of the committee

The committee was composed of the following members:

- Prof. Peter van Dommelen (chair), Joukowsky Family professor of Archaeology and professor of Anthropology, Brown University, USA
- Prof. Johannes Müller, professor of Prehistoric Archaeology, Kiel University, Germany, and director of the Institute of Pre- and Protohistoric Archaeology, Kiel, Germany
- Prof. Paul Lane, professor of Global Archaeology, Uppsala University, Sweden
- Dr Naomi Sykes, associate professor in Zooarchaeology, University of Nottingham, UK
- Prof. Jos Bazelmans, head of the Department of Archaeology of the Dutch Cultural Heritage Agency and professor Archeologische Monumentenzorg, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam

The Curricula Vitae of the committee members are included in Appendix 2.

Drs Erik van der Spek of Hendrikx Van der Spek was appointed as secretary to the committee.

Independence

All members of the committee signed a statement of independence to confirm that they would assess the research quality of GIA in an unbiased and independent way. Any existing personal or professional relationships between committee members and the research unit(s) under review were reported and discussed in the first committee meeting. The committee concluded that there were no unacceptable relations or dependencies and that there was no specific risk in terms of bias or undue influence.

Data provided to the committee

The committee had received the self-evaluation report of GIA, including a number of appendices such as an assessment report of the Graduate School of the Humanities, a report of the previous research review of GIA and a midterm review. The committee members were given online access to key publications of the five research groups within GIA.

In addition, the committee received the following documents:

- Terms of Reference
- SEP 2015-2021.

Procedures followed by the committee

Prior to the first committee meeting, all committee members independently formulated a preliminary assessment of GIA based on the written information that was provided.

The site visit took place on 7-8 November 2016 (see the schedule in Appendix 3) in Groningen. Preceding the interviews with management and representatives of GIA, the committee was briefed by the secretary about research reviews according to SEP. The committee discussed the preliminary assessments and decided upon a number of comments and questions. It also agreed upon procedural matters and aspects of the review.

After the interviews the committee held a final committee meeting in which it discussed its findings and formulated its assessment. This assessment was based on the documentation provided by the research school and the information gathered during the interviews. To conclude the site visit, the chair presented the committee's findings to representatives of GIA. The committee would like to thank the GIA staff for their thorough preparation and smooth organization of the site visit.

After the site visit, the committee's findings were set out in a report. The draft report was presented to GIA for factual corrections and comments, which were discussed by the committee. The final report was sent to GIA, the coordinating Faculty and the Board of the University of Groningen.

3. Research review of GIA

3.1 Introduction

The Groningen Institute of Archaeology (GIA) is based in the Faculty of Arts at the University of Groningen. GIA is responsible for all archaeological research within the university, including the training of PhDs within the framework provided by the Humanities Graduate School. GIA is based in three separate buildings: the core facilities, including the faunal reference collections, are housed in Poststraat 6, whereas the botanical and material laboratories are located at Broerstraat 9. The Arctic and Antarctic Research Group, one of five research groups within GIA, is housed at the Arctic Centre at Aweg 30, which has a broader multi-disciplinary base.

Archaeological research is conducted in five research groups, each headed by a group leader:

- Arctic and Antarctic Studies (AAS) led by Prof. Peter Jordan
- Bio-archaeology (BA) led by Prof. René Cappers
- Classical and Mediterranean Archaeology (CMA) led by Prof. Peter Attema
- Greek Archaeology (GA) led by Prof. Sofia Voutsaki
- Prehistoric and Protohistoric Archaeology of NW Europe (PP) led by Prof. Daan Raemaekers.

Mission

GIA's Mission, as stated in the self-evaluation report, is to:

- conduct innovative, ethically-informed research that has high visibility and impact;
- provide a supportive environment in which researchers perform at their full potential;
- effectively disseminate research results to diverse audiences in appropriate formats.

To fulfill this mission GIA organizes its research to focus critical mass on:

- understanding specific periods and processes of transition within well-defined geographical regions, specifically the Mediterranean (Italy, Greece, Near East), NW Europe and the Circumpolar North;
- applying an integrated field- and laboratory-based approach to research, underpinned by engagement with diverse theoretical perspectives, and a commitment to methodological innovation.

GIA's vision

GIA believes that archaeology can make a unique academic contribution; it is the only discipline tasked with studying the development of human cultural diversity over extended time periods, as well as interactions between past societies and the wider environment. To properly fulfil this ambition, GIA believes that archaeology needs to operate beyond its own disciplinary framework, incorporating theory, methods and approaches from across the humanities, natural- and social sciences. GIA also feels that it has a duty to communicate the results and importance of its work to fellow researchers and wider society.

Developments in the assessment period

The staffing has increased between 2010 and 2015 by 3,2 FTE (from 60 to 63 total staff). The research staff has increased by 4,3 FTE; this is mostly due to the increase in postdocs (from 13 to 15) and PhD students (from 18 to 20). Strategic new appointments have been made in several research groups, for instance Prof. Peter Jordan (Arctic and Antarctic Studies), Dr Canan Cakirlar (Bio-archaeology) and Dr Lidewijde de Jong (Greek Archaeology). Prof. Sofia Voutsaki was promoted to Chair in 2011, thereby creating a new research group in Greek Archaeology.

Several changes have been made and measures have been taken in response to the outcomes of the previous research assessment in 2009. Quite some effort has been put into increasing the PhD-numbers and completion rates. In research, the focus has been shifted to larger 'flagship' projects and publications in top journals, thereby also increasing the visibility of GIA. In funding, a shift is perceptible towards competitive

grants and commercial contracts, whereas European funding (such as Horizon 2020 projects) is also becoming more important.

Strengths and weaknesses as perceived by the institute

According to the self-evaluation, GIA has developed a successful niche profile with five strong research groups, each embedded in strong national and international networks. The academic staff have contracts that allow them to spend 60% of their time on research. GIA research is directly supported by the faculty. The combination of the niche research profile, good faculty support and wider institutional embedding means that GIA staff can apply for competitive research funding from a position of strength; GIA has a good track-record in supporting research through external funding.

On the downside, the self-evaluation mentions the dispersal of staff across three locations; the institute has grown more or less organically. Two of the three buildings are old and at full capacity; the laboratory infrastructure needs upgrading. Not only GIA's buildings are aging, but so is its staff; a significant cohort will retire within a decade.

Targets

In the self-evaluation, GIA has presented its strategy 2016-2026 in ten points. In this strategy, the current five research groups form the starting point: each of these research groups will need to implement reinforcing measures to produce high-quality output, secure research income and train PhDs. However, the interaction between the research groups also needs to be strengthened to create stronger internal synergies. Other targets include attracting top talent, improve the PhD training and completion rate and strengthen public outreach.

View of the assessment committee

The assessment committee has discussed GIA's mission and vision, the results of the SWOT-analysis and the targets with several groups of representatives within GIA. The committee believes that GIA's vision is itself commendable, but has also noted that the translation of this vision into strategic measures may be improved. For instance, the vision includes the statement that "archaeology needs to operate beyond its own disciplinary framework, incorporating theory, methods and approaches from across the humanities, natural- and social sciences." This statement implies the need to develop into a contemporary, state-of-the-art science-based institute. However, the ambitions in this field remain unclear and the views of the researchers the committee has spoken to seem to differ on this point.

In general, the committee believes that GIA could profit greatly from regular discussions about strategy and targets, especially in view of the intention, as stated above, to strengthen interaction between the research groups. The committee notes that with three sites and five research groups, coherence and interaction cannot be taken for granted. GIA organizes annual GIA and PhD research days and the faculty organizes research meetings four times a year, but these meetings are hardly sufficient to develop a coherent and ambitious strategic vision across research groups; in the view of the committee, more regular (for instance monthly) meetings and seminars are needed. The committee has noted that the Arctic and Antarctic research group has a strategic meeting every month: the committee suggests that such a regular strategic meeting would be beneficial for GIA as a whole as well.

When discussing the long term vision and the coherence and interaction within the institute, the organizational division between the five research groups inevitably comes to mind. An institute with 63 staff members divided across five research groups is bound to encounter issues with critical mass. Since two thirds of the staff consist of postdocs and PhDs, the numbers of core staff in each research group are small in both relative and absolute terms. Add to this the age of several key staff members, and the problem of critical mass becomes readily evident. In the current situation, a new full professorship is automatically translated into a new research group. The committee believes this is not a path that leads to a viable future.

The committee therefore urges GIA to rethink its organizational setup and to consider a smaller number of research groups, in order to increase both synergy and critical mass.

Finally, the buildings and collections should also be taken into consideration when thinking about the strategy. The committee was impressed with the collections of both archeobotany and zoo-archaeology; both collections can be called world-class. However, the housing of these collections is below par and old-fashioned, which may pose a threat for long term preservation. Since a new housing plan obviously cannot be realized by either GIA or the Faculty of Arts by itself, the committee believes the University of Groningen should take its responsibility and seriously search for ways to improve the building(s) and the necessary infrastructure. In paragraph 3.3 (item a) we will say more about this issue.

3.2 Research quality, societal relevance and viability

In this section, we discuss the three main SEP-criteria: research quality, relevance to society and viability. An explanation of these criteria and the scale used can be found in appendix 1. The committee has come to the following conclusion on these criteria:

SEP-criterium	Score
1. Research quality	2 (very good)
2. Relevance to society	3 (good)
3. Viability	3 (good)

1. Research quality

The committee encountered an amazing variety of research across the five research groups and, in general, the committee witnessed research that is done to a high standard, building onto an existing track-record. In each research group, interesting outputs have been noted: for instance Peter Jordan’s research on cultural transmission among hunter-gatherers (Arctic and Antarctic studies), the international renowned Digital Plant Atlas (Bio-archaeology Research Group), the annual excavations at Crustumerium (Classical and Mediterranean Archaeology), Voutsaki’s research on the role of archaeology in contemporary society (Greek Archaeology) and the research on coastal archaeology in Northwestern Europe (Pre- and Protohistoric Archaeology).

The Arctic and Antarctic Research Group has had a change in leadership; since 2013, it is headed by Prof. Peter Jordan. This change in leadership has also resulted in a shift in research focus; there has been a widening of scope from a traditional focus on the historical archaeology of European activities in the Arctic to a more regional and comparative concern with human-environment interactions over the long-term. This has stimulated new and world-leading research on the archaeology of the indigenous inhabitants of the Arctic, combining cutting-edge use of bio-archaeological approaches with detailed knowledge of the substantive cultural history and historical ecology of Arctic groups.

The new Bio-archaeology Research Group joins the Palaeobotany and Archaeozoology laboratories together into a single research unit. This new group has been working hard to raise the profile of GIA’s collections. Individually, the research undertaken within the two laboratories is of high quality and both have been generating excellent research outputs. However, there is little evidence of a shared ‘Bio-archaeological’ research vision and the review process revealed no genuine collaboration between the two laboratories. For Bio-archaeology to become an effective research group, a coherent and united vision is required.

The Classical and Mediterranean Archaeology research group (CMA) builds on a long-standing tradition of fieldwork-based research in Central and South Italy. The emphasis of the research has squarely been placed on the collection, evaluation and dissemination of data through extensive fieldwork campaigns. The research group has also been forward-looking and proactive regarding management and curation of their digital data.

However, rather less attention has been afforded to refining and elaborating the broad research interests into socially and economically relevant topics. This includes taking up or engaging more consistently with new theoretical insights that might be of relevance, such as social landscapes, places of memory, commemoration, connectivity, subalternity, community formation et cetera.

The Greek Archaeology Research Group (GA) was established in 2011 with the promotion of Voutsaki to a Full Professorship. The group's research covers the archaeology of the Greek world, including Aegean prehistory, as well as the Near East in the Hellenistic and Roman times. The PRC does not question the relevance of the research area, but it has doubts about the organizational separation from the Classical and Mediterranean Archaeology Research Group. This subdivision puts the GIA's research efforts in the Mediterranean in danger of a lack of focus and critical mass. Regionally and thematically there seems to be a limited coherence within this relatively small group.

The Prehistoric and Protohistoric Research group (PP) has a focus on the analysis of the long-term development of human-environment relations, comparing cultural landscapes from the Mesolithic to the Iron Age in a diachronic perspective. A second research area is the reconstruction of historic coastal and maritime cultural landscapes, especially the terp-mound areas of the Northern Netherlands. The quality of research is excellent with respect to the transdisciplinary connections between the natural sciences and the humanities throughout all analyses. A growing potential of research might be seen in further wetland archaeological investigations.

Overall, the committee found clear evidence for solid research with sound methodological underpinnings. The strength of the institute seems mainly to be found in its field work. However, to move from (very) good to excellent, more has to happen. Research and interpretation may be conventional at times, as is for instance evident from an emphasis on settlement patterns, elite culture and state formation, but it also seems to the committee that there is nevertheless much potential for innovative research, some of which is already beginning to be transformed into practice. The committee has also seen much variation across the research groups. In general the committee believes that the research group of Arctic and Antarctic Studies is leading the way when it comes to good practice in terms of research coordination and internal discussion and that their model might beneficially be followed by other groups.

Another issue is the infrastructure, as mentioned in the previous section. One of the strengths of GIA is formed by its world-class collections – but these very collections are threatened by the outdated buildings in which they are housed. The laboratory infrastructure is still fully functional, but it is getting outdated as well. Although the laboratory staff show an admirable 'can do'-mentality, substantial investments in state-of-the-art equipment and curatorial facilities are needed if the institute want to be able to compete with other institutes abroad.

The research community is a real strength of the institute on all levels. The postdocs form a vibrant research community, the committee has seen a group of scholars with a real dedication to the research groups they are attached to.

2. Relevance to society

Relevance to society is a broad subject that can be realized in a number of ways. The SEP specifically mentions the quality, scale and relevance of contributions targeting specific economic, social or cultural target groups; advisory reports for policy; and contributions to public debates. In general, the committee has seen societal relevance in a number of cases, for instance exhibitions, small projects and publications. However, in the view of the committee, the potential of GIA in this area is much greater. Specifically, the committee believes that GIA could contribute more to the University of Groningen research priority 'Sustainable Society'. This priority allows for contributions with a marked societal relevance that are closely related to the research interests of the various research groups. Take for instance the Arctic and Antarctic Studies: their research interests include sustainability, climate change and the fragility of the polar regions in

the light of human interference. But in the view of the committee this group could highlight their activities much more, including giving more attention to indigenous inhabitants of the Arctic and Antarctic regions, and relating the group's work to the themes of a sustainable society and resilient communities.

The Classical and Mediterranean Archeology research group has worked on an exposition about the excavations at Crustumerium (near Rome). At the time of the site visit, this exposition was shown at the Glyptotek in Copenhagen. In 2018 it will be moved to the Allard Pierson Museum in Amsterdam. The CMA research group also interacts with the local community; the group is very well embedded in Italy. However, the committee believes that demonstrating the wider societal relevance of GIA's work could be increased, and particularly raising the profile of its activities among different constituencies and stakeholders in the Netherlands.

The Greek Archaeology research group has a strong interest in the role of archaeology in contemporary society. This implies a focus on outreach as well. Outreach activities are most prominent in the Ayios Vasilios project (the excavation of the North Cemetery of the Mycenaean palace of Ayios Vasilios). Outreach at this project includes an extensive public archaeology program in order to inform and involve local inhabitants, to explore attitudes to archaeology and changing perceptions of the past, and to promote sustainable tourist development of the area. The research group is still relatively young, so a lot of the potential still remains to be realized.

The Prehistoric and Protohistoric Archaeology research group has two research themes that can be easily related to societal issues. Both the analysis of the long-term development of human-environment relations and the context of the historic coastal and maritime cultural landscapes are relevant for contemporary discussions on sustainability and climate change. The research group contributes to exhibitions (for instance the Firdgum project) and organizes open days, lectures and school engagement. Here, as with the Arctic and Antarctic studies, the relation with climate change and sustainability in general could easily be explored further. This is also true for the Bio-archaeology research group: both the botany and zoology collections and related research have a huge relevance for sustainability and for addressing issues of global biodiversity, but much of this potential remains to be realized.

All in all, the committee believes that GIA is moving in the right direction, but the program directed towards societal relevance could easily be more ambitious. The committee advises specifically that there is a need for GIA to investigate which contributions the various research groups could make to the University priority 'Sustainable Society' and how these may align more generally with the United Nation's Agenda 2030 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

3. Viability

The viability of the research institute depends on the strategies set out for the coming years and on the extent to which it is capable of meeting its targets in research and society during this period. In the conclusion of 3.1 we have already mentioned a number of important issues concerning the strategy and future of GIA. In this section, we will summarize our main findings.

In general, the research of GIA constitutes an excellent basis on which to build. Overall, the various research groups are aware of future research priorities; moreover, they are well positioned in their respective networks and have access to sufficient funding opportunities. Also, as we have mentioned in 3.1, the vision of GIA is excellent. What is needed in the view of the committee, is a viable strategy that is based on this vision and that includes the following items:

- a view on the position of the laboratory infrastructure (and investments needed);
- a view on the collaboration across research groups and on the most viable organizational structure;
- a long-term housing plan, aided by the Faculty of Arts and the University of Groningen.

The various research groups already possess a number of building blocks for the development of this strategy. For example the Arctic and Antarctic Studies show a clear strategic vision that is also being revised on a regular basis. The Classical and Mediterranean research group are at the forefront where data management and data integrity are concerned. The Bio-archeology research group is the natural home of a science lab with a lot of potential. The challenge is to unify these building blocks in a coherent and viable strategy.

The first point implies a clear vision on the position of the lab infrastructure. Does GIA have the ambition to become a state-of-the-art science-based archaeological institute with the full scope of equipment this ambition implies? Or does the institute wish to specialize in certain laboratory services while leaving other services to partner institutes? How attractive must the laboratories be for outside researchers? These questions need to be answered to develop a viable strategy. Of course, each choice in this area leads to necessary investments, so an investment plan is needed as well.

The second point is about the collaboration within GIA and the way this collaboration is stimulated by the organizational structure. As mentioned in 3.1, the committee believes that the traditional organization in chair groups is more an obstacle than an incentive for developing the institute. The distribution of a limited number of resources over five organizational units is fragmenting the necessary research effort. More critical mass is needed, especially within a collaborative discipline like archaeology. While there certainly have been collaborative efforts between the various research groups of GIA, the committee feels quite strongly that there should be many more of those, and that any formal barriers should be removed. This holds in particular for the divisions between chair groups, of which the one between the Classical and Mediterranean and Greek Archaeology groups comes to mind as the prime candidate for elimination. As mentioned above, the committee urges GIA to consider an organizational setup with fewer research groups, to increase both synergy and critical mass.

A viable strategy on the lab infrastructure and the organizational structure inevitably leads to the third and last point: a long term housing plan. The committee advises GIA to discuss this item with the Faculty and University board and seek their cooperation to develop a housing plan in which the labs and research units can find a natural home.

3.3 Additional questions regarding GIA's preparation for the future

GIA has asked the review committee specifically to look at GIA's preparation for the future. More specifically, GIA has asked for the committee's assessment and advice on the following three topics:

- a. The increasing role of methods and investments from (natural) sciences in archaeological research;
- b. The ongoing shift towards more central responsibility for data management and digital archives;
- c. GIA's ambition on the one hand to play an important role in the globalizing archaeology, and on the other, its strong and well anchored regional role.

In this section, these topics are discussed in more detail.

a. Methods and investments from (natural) sciences

The committee recognizes the challenges posed by these developments. On the one hand, we note that, internationally, only a small number of archaeological units worldwide is able to keep up with the required investments of the ever more sophisticated and more expensive laboratories. On the other hand, in order to make these investments worthwhile, international collaborations are becoming equally indispensable for these very same institutions. Furthermore, the integration of archaeological theory into both cultural and scientific archaeology is necessary for the qualified interpretation of the new data qualities. In view of these

developments, the translation of theoretical backgrounds and both scientific and typological analysis is possible in the detailed integration of material culture studies.

In the case of GIA, the critical element is constituted by its truly world-class paleo-botanical and zoological collections. These collections represent considerable research potential, as they offer both outstanding materials and opportunities for the development of new scientific techniques. These methodological advances can also be achieved with the technology as currently available at GIA or in other Groningen research units, but also through the provision of samples for external researchers. The committee feels that, given the significance of these collections, this should be reflected by their housing. Currently, there is a pressing need to enhance the storage and security of the collections to safeguard them for the future. Whilst investment is clearly required here, GIA should not feel the need to keep up with each and every technological innovation – for this, intra-institutional collaboration (e.g. Isotope Research Centre) and international collaborations seem the way forward, as several of GIA's staff have already demonstrated. The activities of all of GIA's research groups likewise warrant maintaining and updating as necessary the current capacities of artefact conservation and illustration.

b. Data management and digital archives

The ongoing shift towards more central responsibility for data management and digital archives requires rapid action by central units at Groningen University. GIA has been notably proactive in this regard: especially the Classical and Mediterranean research group has been working towards the management of the datasets derived from their projects, while the paleo-botanical and archeozoological laboratories have been developing extensive digital collections-based archives. However, without clearly defined standards and criteria, their efforts risk being less than efficient – while they underscore the urgency of immediate action.

c. Globalizing archaeology versus regional role

GIA's ambition on the one hand to play an important role in a rapidly globalizing archaeology, and on the other, its strong and well anchored regional role, require in the committee's view explicit recognition of and rapid action regarding the recommendations made for the Institute's organization and, especially, pooling of its research units. This is in our view the most appropriate and practical way forward to create a more substantial critical mass in terms of research capacity. A more substantial research capacity will enable GIA to step up to the theoretical and scientific challenges of a globalizing archaeology and help set agendas, and to maintain its strong presence on the ground with fieldwork projects in a number of European regions. This, we would stress, needs to go hand in hand with addressing points a and b, above, as they are interlinked. In the committee's view, the pooling of research units in a manner that maximizes the opportunities to utilize the available world-class collections and also to manage and interrogate the large data sets generated by previous and on-going GIA research to address clearly articulated, cross-regional and comparative research questions will add critical mass to GIA's academic output. It would also help reduce risks to the security and integrity of the collections and data sets, while in the medium term also potentially result in cost-savings to the institution.

3.4 PhD training

At the time of the site visit, GIA had 20 PhD-students working in the various research groups; almost one third of its staff. PhD-training is a joint effort by GIA and the Graduate School of the Humanities (GSH). All GSH-members follow a 30 ECTS training program, which they compose themselves, in accordance with their specific needs. The GSH acts as a broker for these training programs, offering a number of in-house courses. The training program of GSH comprises 9 ECTS of compulsory modules and up to 14 ECTS from optional modules. Compulsory modules include *Ethical research practice*, *Managing your PhD*, *Communicating research*, *Self-profiling* and *Dissertation design*. An example of an optional module is *Didactic Skills* (5 ECTS).

The remainder of the training program may consist of graduate courses, seminars, workshops, conferences and summer schools, offered by national research schools and international research networks.

Each PhD has a coordinator from GSH and one or more supervisors from GIA. Before the official start of a PhD project, a Training and Supervision Plan (TSP) is drafted by the PhD and his or her supervisors. After the first year, a legally required formal evaluation takes place. This first-year review results in a 'go-no go' decision.

The committee spoke with a number of PhDs, representatives from GSH and supervisors. In general, the PhDs are satisfied with their position. Among the strong points, they mention the academic freedom within GIA – more specifically the freedom to develop their own fieldwork and freedom to build their own networks – and the laboratory facilities. PhD supervision receives mixed reviews: some of the students maintain a good informal relationship with their supervisors and promotors, others would like to spend more time with their supervisor and receive feedback on a regular basis.

The GSH-courses are perceived as being rather generic, more fitted to the needs of linguists than to those of archeologists. One PhD candidate thought the GSH-courses were “a waste of time”, and added that his supervisor decided he wouldn't have to follow any GSH-courses. Even if this is an anecdotal comment, the committee advises that the relevance of the GSH-program for GIA PhDs be evaluated in order to determine whether the courses can be adjusted to better fit the needs of the GIA PhDs.

Another issue raised was the social coherence of the PhD community and the way they fit into the GIA research community. GIA organizes a number of events for the entire research community, such as the annual field day and a number of lectures, but even so, some of the PhDs (especially those working part-time) feel rather isolated, also because they work in different buildings. There appear to be plans to organize a two-day conference where the PhDs can present their results. In the committee's view, this would be an excellent idea.

The most important issue with the PhD program is the relatively long completion time (up to 9 years). This issue was also noted by the previous peer review committee, but it has not been resolved so far. The Faculty is currently implementing a new requirement that all new PhDs have to complete their work within four years. Because the first PhDs who started since new measures were introduced have yet to graduate, it is too early to tell how effective these measures are.

According to the PhD candidates themselves, the most crucial point here is the requirement for them to produce their PhD in the form of a book: “The bottleneck is the book”, as one PhD put it. In some cases, a collection of published articles is acceptable as a thesis. This might allow supervisors and promotors to reduce the number of required articles in order to restrict the writing time, thereby making it possible for a PhD to finish on time. However, not every type of research can be captured in a series of articles, and in some NWO proposals it is stipulated that the final thesis should be a book. The committee advises GIA to be more lenient on this point and allow for the award of PhDs by publication (i.e. comprising a number of published, peer-reviewed journal articles or book chapters) whenever this is possible.

A final point on the post-graduate environment regards the teaching opportunities given to PhDs and postdocs. Both groups can take limited pedagogical courses, but especially the postdocs mentioned that they were not allowed to teach classes as a matter of principle, even if in some cases specific circumstances have allowed a handful of students to teach classes or entire courses. Since teaching is an important aspect of academic careers and career advancement, they would like to have the opportunity to teach and for instance to obtain the *Basiskwalificatie Onderwijs* (BKO), the mandatory certificate for all teaching staff at Dutch universities. The committee fully supports this request and would like to see PhDs to be encouraged to hone their teaching skills, and strongly believes that at the very least there should be no barriers for those students who wish to teach.

3.5 Research integrity

GIA's research is conducted within an ethical framework that follows the policy set out by the three Humanities faculties of the University Groningen (Arts, Philosophy, and Theology and Religious Studies). If the research concerns human participants, the Ethical Review Committee examines whether the proposed research project complies with the ethical rules for this type of research.

The main issue during the assessment period is the storage, curation and access to research data. At faculty level a Research Data Management Committee is in operation. This committee advises research directors on drawing up and implementing a Research Data Management Plan. The basic principle is 'Open, unless...'. The faculty has developed a Research Data Management System, partly together with the university library. This system is currently being implemented; it is still work in progress.

The assessment committee was provided with a presentation of archiving and research data policy within GIA. The GIA researchers are developing their own bottom up initiatives, since there is not yet a functioning system at university or faculty level. When applying for NWO-projects, time and money for archiving is included. Legacy data or PhD-projects are another matter; many PhDs don't include an archive in their projects. Choosing an archiving standard is an issue; currently, GIA researchers develop their own standards. GIA cooperates with DANS (Data Archiving and Networking Services) and the KNAW (Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences).

GIA has recently started a data sharing project (open data) in which the researchers learned a lot from each other. The researchers the committee has spoken to, are considering taking the national lead in this respect, for example in bio-archaeology. This would allow GIA to develop its own standards and to focus on the quality part: the requirements to make the data re-usable. The committee believes this is an excellent idea.

4. Research review of the research groups

4.1 Arctic and Antarctic Studies (AAS)

This research group is embedded within the Arctic Centre, and as a direct consequence many of its research activities are multi-disciplinary in nature, involving not just archaeologists, but also historians, biologists, environmental scientists, anthropologists and geographers, among others. The group has had a change in leadership during the assessment period following the retirement of Prof. L. Hacquebord and his replacement by Prof. Peter Jordan in the first half of 2013. The group's submitted research output for the assessment period reflects this change in leadership and consequential shift in research focus. Both in terms of publications and research direction, there has been a widening of scope from a traditional focus on the historical archaeology of European activities (especially mineral exploration and exploitation, and scientific exploration) in the Arctic to a more regional and comparative concern with human-environment interactions over the long-term (i.e. at centennial and millennial scales).

As a consequence, this has stimulated new and world-leading research on different aspects of the archaeology of the indigenous inhabitants of the Arctic (such as on the origins of pottery manufacture and the functions of these vessels), that have combined cutting-edge use of bio-archaeological approaches with detailed knowledge of the substantive cultural history and historical ecology of Arctic groups. Prof. Jordan brings a wide-ranging, and theoretically informed knowledge of the diversity of Arctic hunter-gatherer communities, and his recent book (2015) *Technology as Human Social Tradition*, has already been hailed as both theoretically and analytically ground-breaking. The studies of the industrial archaeology and the history of large scale resource exploitation of Polar areas produced by other members of the research group are similarly of international significance, albeit rather more regionally focused.

The research group as currently constituted is dynamic and exceptionally active. The group is especially well connected both nationally and internationally, and its members participate in a variety of policy-related networks and are thus well placed to both set and drive the research agenda over the coming decade. The cross-disciplinary nature of the current research projects are a particular strength and are all aligned with a clearly articulated research vision and strategy that are highly relevant to addressing current global challenges. The group has set itself several ambitious, but attainable, research goals, with considerable societal relevance particularly in the areas of using knowledge of past human-environment relations and interactions over the long-term to identify possible sustainable and resilient pathways to the future.

Overall, the research group is especially viable and needs to be assessed in terms of its holistic approach, rather than more narrowly in terms of its strictly archaeological activities (although these are currently world-leading). The group could be strengthened by the inclusion of additional staff members with skills and expertise (such as in arctic climate science, environmental anthropology and/or political ecology) that supplement existing capacities. The group could also build on the success of its recent collaboration with the Bio-archaeology research group to develop some clear research questions concerning the long-term historical ecology of different Arctic and Antarctic communities. Some of this research could also aim to track shifting networks and commodity/resources flows between Arctic regions and areas further south and thus strengthen collaboration with members of the Prehistoric and Protohistoric Archaeology group.

4.2 Bio-archaeology (BA)

The recommendations of the last review were that GIA's bio-archaeology research and facilities were strengthened, brought more centrally within the GIA's research strategy, and that the globally important palaeobotany and archaeozoology collections were made more visible internationally. To this end, considerable investment has been made, notably with the appointment of Dr Canan Cakirlar. A new Bio-archaeology Research Group has been created, joining together the Palaeobotany and Archaeozoology

laboratories into a single research unit. This new group has been working hard to raise the profile of GIA's collections: Cappers has continued to publish important collections-based identification manuals (an impressive n=3 since the last review) whilst Cakirlar has been rationalizing the osteology collection and publicizing it through multiple fora, including international conferences (e.g. by hosting the Archaeozoology of South-West Asia, 2015 meeting).

Individually, the research undertaken within the two laboratories is of high quality and both have been productive in terms of generating excellent research outputs during the last review period. The archaeobotany laboratory has a large team of researchers with a well-established identity and tradition of palaeobotanical analysis, led by Cappers, who represents the research group on GIA's Management Team. By contrast, the archaeozoology laboratory is just becoming established, so the group's identity is, understandably, less well defined and its remit is more nebulous. This should not, necessarily, be regarded as a bad thing. The committee noted that Cakirlar's publications were returned not only for the Bio-archaeology research group but also for the Prehistoric and Protohistoric research group, suggesting a strategy of integration that seems more consistent with GIA's research vision. Indeed, the panel questioned whether the Bio-archaeology Research Group, as currently formed, is viable as a stand-alone research unit. We would, therefore, like to raise the following points for GIA's consideration.

- There is little evidence of a shared 'Bio-archaeological' research vision and the review process revealed no genuine collaboration between the two laboratories. This may be linked to their split base, which could be remedied if both laboratories were moved into a single, purpose-built location (this might also address the pressing need to increase the safety and storage of the collections (see also chapter 3). However, the committee felt that the two laboratories have a fundamentally distinct research approach, which is unsurprising as archaeobotany and archaeozoology are very different fields, with different methods and approaches, and cannot always be neatly lumped together (there are few institutions where the two are united successfully).
- For Bio-archaeology to become an effective research group, a coherent and united vision is required. To achieve this, greater parity between the laboratories is needed and equal representation on the Management Team might help (the archaeozoology laboratory currently has no voice on the MT).
- Whilst GIA has a long tradition of environmental archaeology, it is important to note that theoretical paradigms have changed considerably during the time that the collections have been developed. In the view of the committee, both palaeobotany and archaeozoology are methods for answering archaeological questions: they represent a means to an end, rather than archaeological research in their own right. Therefore GIA needs to think carefully about how it wishes to present and promote its Bio-archaeology research strands.
- There is a fine line to be walked between stressing GIA's bio-archaeological expertise and resources so that they do not become side-lined or perceived as representing data-generating services for 'real' archaeologists (to some extent the laboratories and staff are currently being used as servants for the other research groups and as sample providers for non-GIA researchers). At the same time, all those involved in bio-archaeological research need, first and foremost, to be archaeologists who lead international archaeological projects that ask major cultural questions. GIA's current management structure appears to be less than ideal to reach these goals.

4.3 Classical and Mediterranean Archaeology (CMA)

The Classical and Mediterranean Archaeology research group (CMA) builds on a long-standing and internationally well-regarded tradition of fieldwork-based research in Central and South Italy, which has consistently focused its efforts on understanding the complexities of state formation and urbanization over the long term between Prehistory and Late Antiquity.

As evident from the key publications and other outputs over the period of assessment, the emphasis of the research has squarely been placed on the collection, evaluation and dissemination of data through extensive fieldwork campaigns with a range of sophisticated strategies. This has been successful in its own right, as high-quality and richly varied, valuable collections of both material and digital, especially spatial, evidence have been compiled. The research group has also been commendably forward-looking and proactive regarding management and curation of their digital data. However, rather less attention has been afforded to refining and elaborating the broad research interests into socially and economically relevant topics. This explicitly includes taking up new theoretical insights that might be of relevance, such as social landscapes, places of memory, commemoration, connectivity, subalternity, community formation et cetera.

Over the period of assessment, the group has produced a healthy output of academic publications, which have appeared in a range of journals and serials, a good number of which are peer-reviewed and of international reputation. These include a commendable number of monographs.

The members of this research group have all consistently undertaken outreach activities in their Italian study regions, and they have established truly excellent contacts with both academic counterparts and local authorities in their study regions, both archaeological and otherwise. One outstanding result is the exhibition on the research group's flagship field project at Crustumerium, north of Rome. This exhibition has been co-curated with Italian and Danish colleagues and will be shown in Copenhagen, Amsterdam, and Rome. At the same time, however, even if not entirely absent, there has been rather less active engagement of local people in research activities.

The viability of the research group in the long term is on the one hand shored up by the rich data collections and fieldwork experiences that have been built up, as they offer an excellent platform from which to undertake new work; future academic success is on the other hand predicated on effectively making this evidence and these experiences relevant to broader and contemporary research questions that drive the discipline of Archaeology globally, and that articulate them in the light of social needs in Italy, at home, and elsewhere. The fact that the Classical and Mediterranean research group has trained a number of Italian scholars and gave them a chance to obtain their PhD and/or post-doc positions is a good step in this direction.

4.4 Greek Archaeology (GA)

The Greek Archaeology Research Group (GA) was established in 2011 with the promotion of Voutsaki to a Full Professorship. Because of this the group was not included in the previous assessment for 2004-2009. The group's research covers the archaeology of the Greek world, including Aegean prehistory, as well as the Near East in the Hellenistic and Roman times. Special focus is given to theoretical archaeology, mortuary analysis and the archaeological past in present society. The group is deeply involved in significant fieldwork in the region and strongly embedded in an international scholarly network. The GA was very successful in attracting research funding, especially in the Netherlands. The research of the group was seriously hindered by the regional impact of the crisis and the Arab spring.

The PRC does not question the relevance of doing research in Greece or the eastern Mediterranean, but it has doubts about the organizational separation from the Classical and Mediterranean Archaeology Research Group. The PRC is convinced of the strengths of existing inter-collegial contacts, but the subdivision puts the GIA's research efforts in the Mediterranean in danger of a lack of focus and critical mass – even though the GA group has brought a number of researchers to the GIA that would not otherwise have joined the institute. Regionally and thematically there seems to be a lack of focus within this relatively small group. In the near future this problem could be aggravated with the possible promotion of De Jong to a full professorship. The GIA staff had indicated their willingness to discuss this issue as part of a wider discussion taking into account the age composition of the teaching staff.

The chair of GA has a strong focus towards a theoretically and methodologically informed way of doing research. Much of the work done within the group however seems to lack such an explicit orientation.

The PRC applauds the chair's and group's interest in recent (i.e. 20th century) political entanglements with the past and initiatives towards a strong engagement with contemporary societal problems. This is however in an embryonic state. In addition one should be aware – as the GA group without a doubt already is – of a worsening of research conditions in the regions explored by the GA because of political and economic developments. For the GA group, as mentioned in the self-evaluation, this development is an incentive to fundamentally rethink archaeology's role in dealing with the larger issue of a globalizing world.

4.5 Prehistoric and Protohistoric Archaeology of NW Europe (PP)

The Prehistoric and Protohistoric Research group (PP) has a focus on the analysis of the long-term development of human-environment relations, comparing cultural landscapes from the Mesolithic to the Iron Age in a diachronic perspective. A second research area is the reconstruction of historic coastal and maritime cultural landscapes, especially the terp-mound areas of the Northern Netherlands. The quality of research is excellent with respect to the transdisciplinary connections between the natural sciences and the humanities throughout all analyses. The publication of results in high-ranked periodicals and monographs is an expression of the detailed documentation and analyses of the empirical focus on excellent archives in the Northern Netherlands. The strong role that research plays (integrating excavations by contract archaeologists) is reflected in the high number of PhDs. A growing potential of research might be seen in further wetland archaeological investigations.

The PP is well-rooted in the regions and quite successful in public outreach activities. It plays a very important role in the communication of archaeological discoveries to contemporary society and nearly all researchers take part in media activities. The PP group is very active in linking museums, governmental organizations and universities on national and international levels.

As the PP has the longest tradition in the institute and is also the largest group of the institute, we could identify it as a core group. In addition to the notable funding successes and the national and international commitment of the researchers, the PP should be able to address further major issues in archaeology.

5. Recommendations

- The committee advises GIA to hold regular strategic meetings to build a common strategic vision; the monthly meetings of the Arctic and Antarctic research group may serve as a model for these meetings, using the Advisory Board as a mechanism for achieving change.
- Having met with the 'Advisory Board' the panel felt that this group could be given greater strategic power as its role is currently unclear, although its gender-balance was noted as being better than that of the management board. The committee suggests that membership of the board could be expanded to include external 'critical friends'.
- The committee urges GIA to think about and discuss an organizational setup with a fewer number of research groups, to increase both synergy and critical mass. More specifically, the separation between the Classical and Mediterranean and the Greek research groups and the position of the Bio-archeological group need to be reconsidered.
- In the committee's view, GIA staff should also be encouraged to collaborate across research groups, however constituted. An obvious opportunity for collaboration would be the wetland research carried out in both northern Groningen and central Italy.
- The committee advises GIA to discuss the current housing situation with the Faculty and University board and seek their cooperation to develop a long-term housing plan in which the labs and research units can find their proper place. Since the upgrading of the laboratories and collection facilities requires substantial investment, the committee advises to look for NWO or EU investment subsidies.
- The committee believes that GIA's societal relevance initiatives could be more ambitious. The committee advises GIA specifically to investigate which contributions the various research groups could make to the University priority 'Sustainable Society'.
- The committee advises GIA to evaluate the GSH-program and to see whether the courses can be adjusted to fit better the needs of the archaeology PhDs.
- The committee advises GIA to allow PhDs to write their dissertations in the form of a collection of articles whenever this is possible, without making concessions, however, to the quantity and substance of the published work.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Explanation of the SEP criteria and categories

There are three criteria that have to be assessed.

- Research quality:
 - Level of excellence in the international field;
 - Quality and Scientific relevance of research;
 - Contribution to body of scientific knowledge;
 - Academic reputation;
 - Scale of the unit's research results (scientific publications, instruments and infrastructure developed and other contributions).

- Relevance to society:
 - quality, scale and relevance of contributions targeting specific economic, social or cultural target groups;
 - advisory reports for policy;
 - contributions to public debates.

The point is to assess contributions in areas that the research unit has itself designated as target areas.

- Viability:
 - the strategy that the research unit 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;
 - the governance and leadership skills of the research unit's management.

Category	Meaning	Research quality	Relevance to society	Viability
1	World leading/excellent	The unit has been shown to be one of the most influential research groups in the world in its particular field.	The unit makes an outstanding contribution to society	The unit is excellently equipped for the future
2	Very good	The unit conducts very good, internationally recognized research	The unit makes a very good contribution to society	The unit is very well equipped for the future
3	Good	The unit conducts good research	The unit makes a good contribution to society	The unit makes responsible strategic decisions and is therefore well equipped for the future
4	Unsatisfactory	The unit does not achieve satisfactory results in its field	The unit does not make a satisfactory contribution to society	The unit is not adequately equipped for the future

Members Peer Review Committee Groningen Institute of Archaeology (GIA)

[Prof. P. \(Peter\) van Dommelen](#) (chair)

Joukowsky Family Professor of Archaeology and Professor of Anthropology. Peter van Dommelen is a Mediterranean archaeologist, whose research and teaching revolve around the rural Mediterranean past and present. The regional focus of his work lies in the western Mediterranean, where he carries out long-term fieldwork on the island of Sardinia. He concentrates on later Mediterranean prehistory and the earlier part of Classical Antiquity - roughly the first millennium BCE but comparative studies of ethnographic and recent historical context in the Mediterranean and elsewhere play a crucial role in his research and teaching.

Affiliations:

2015 – present	Director of the Joukowsky Institute for Archaeology and the Ancient World, Brown University
2012 – present	Joukowsky Family Professor of Archaeology and Professor of Anthropology, Brown University, USA.
2008-2012	Professor of Mediterranean Archaeology, University of Glasgow, UK.
2005-2008	Senior Lecturer in (Mediterranean) Archaeology, University of Glasgow.
1997-2005	Lecturer in (Mediterranean) Archaeology, University of Glasgow.
1993-1997	Graduate research assistant in the Department of Archaeology, Leiden University, The Netherlands.

[Prof. J. \(Johannes\) Müller](#)

Professor of Pre- and Protohistory / Prehistoric Archaeology and director of the Institute of Pre- and Protohistoric Archaeology in Kiel. Johannes Müller is initiator and spokesman of the graduate school "Human Development in Landscapes" (DFG-Initiative of Excellence) and coordinator of the DFG's priority program "Early monumentality and social differentiation".

Affiliations:

2004 – present	Professor (C4) of Prehistoric Archaeology, Kiel University, Germany.
2004 – present	Director of the Institute of Pre- and Protohistoric Archaeology, Kiel.
2000 – 2004	Professor (C3) for Pre- and Protohistoric Archaeology, University of Bamberg, Germany.

[Prof. P.J. \(Paul\) Lane](#)

Professor of Global Archaeology. Paul Lane is an archaeologist with over twenty-five years' research experience in Africa. His main research interests are in the organisation and use of space and time in pre-industrial societies, the historical ecology of African landscapes, the archaeology of colonial encounters, cultural perceptions of place, the materialization of memory, maritime archaeology and the transition to farming in Africa.

Affiliations (since 2000):

2013 – present	Professor of Global Archaeology, Uppsala University, Sweden.
----------------	--

- 2007 – 2012 Senior Lecturer in Archaeology and Director and coordinator of the Historical Ecologies of East African Landscapes (HEEAL) project, University of York, UK.
- 1998 – 2006 Director , British Institute in Eastern Africa, Nairobi, Kenya.

[Dr N.J. \(Naomi\) Sykes](#)

Associate Professor in Zooarchaeology. Naomi Sykes' research focuses on human-animal-landscape relationships and how they inform on the structure, ideology and practice of past societies. Her approach is to integrate animal bone data with other categories of material culture, and with wider archaeological, historical, scientific and anthropological discussions. As such, her research has wide geographical and temporal applicability.

Affiliations:

- 2006 – present Department of Archaeology, University of Nottingham
- 2005 – 2006 Lecturer in Bio-archaeology, University of Cardiff
- 2002 – 2005 Research Fellow, University of Southampton

[Prof. J.G.A. \(Jos\) Bazelmans](#) (external member)

Professor 'Archaeological preservation of monuments' by special appointment at the VU Amsterdam and Senior Advisor Kennis (CSO) to the Board of Directors of the Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands ('Rijksdienst voor Cultureel Erfgoed'). His research and education focuses on the cultural-political and –philosophical aspects of heritage care.

Affiliations:

- 2015 – present Senior Advisor 'Kennis' to the Board of Directors of the Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands.
- 2003 – present Professor 'Archeologische Monumentenzorg' by special appointment at the VU Amsterdam.
- 2009 – 2015 Member of the Board of Directors of the Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands; Head of the 'Kennis' department.
- 2001 – 2009 Head of the Research department of the Rijksdienst voor het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek (until 2006, thereafter: 'Rijksdienst voor Archeologie, Cultuurlandschap en Monumenten').
- 2000 – 2001 Senior researcher at the 'Rijksdienst voor het Oudheidkundig Bodemonderzoek' (a predecessor of the Cultural Heritage Agency of the Netherlands).
- 1995 – 2000 Lecturer at the Faculty of Pre- and Protohistory, Leiden University, The Netherlands.

[E. \(Erik\) van der Spek, MA](#) (secretary)

Erik van der Spek regularly acts as secretary of accreditation panels for the NVAO (Dutch-Flemish Accreditation Organization) and QANU (Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities). Since 2016 he is also a lecturer in the Master's degree Communication and organization at the University of Utrecht.

Appendix 3: Programme of the site visit

Time	Location	Event	Persons
Sunday 6 November			
18.30 - 21.00	Land van Kokanje, Oude Boteringestraat 9.	Opening dinner	PRC: Prof. Peter van Dommelen; Prof. Paul Lane; Prof. Johannes Müller; Dr Naomi Sykes; Prof. Jos Bazelmans; Erik van der Spek, MA. (6)
Monday 7 November			
09.00 – 11.00	Van Swinderen Huys, Bestuurskamer. Address: Oude Boteringestraat 19.	PRC preliminary meeting	PRC (6)
11.00 – 11.30	Van Swinderen Huys, Bestuurskamer.	Formal opening: meeting with Faculty Board and GIA MT	PRC + Prof. Gerry Wakker (Dean); Prof. Daan Raemaekers (vice Dean and GIA MT); Prof. Peter Attema; Prof. René Cappers; Prof. Peter Jordan; Prof. Sofia Voutsaki; Maarten Schunselaar, MA (policy advisor). (13)
11.30 – 12.20	Van Swinderen Huys, Bestuurskamer.	Meeting with Advisory Board	PRC + Frits Heinrich, MA (PhD student); Prof. Peter Jordan (chair); Miriam Los-Weijns, MA (technical staff). (9)
12.30 – 13.30	Land van Kokanje, Oude Boteringestraat 9	Lunch	PRC (6)
13.30 – 14.00	Van Swinderen Huys, Bestuurskamer.	Meeting with PhDs	PRC + Sarah Dresscher, MA (Arctic and Antarctic Studies, 2nd year); Annette Hansen, MA (Biorarchaeology, 2nd year); Jorn Seubers (Classical and Mediterranean Archaeology, almost completed); Vana Kalenderian, MA (Greek Archaeology, 2nd year); Marco Bakker, MA (Pre- and Protohistory of Northwestern Europe, 3rd year). (11)
14.00 – 14.30	Van Swinderen Huys, Bestuurskamer.	Meeting with GSH and promotores	PRC + Prof. Jan-Wouter Zwart (dir. GSH); Prof. Peter Attema; Prof. René Cappers; Prof. Peter Jordan; Prof. Daan Raemaekers; Prof. Sofia Voutsaki (12)
14.30 – 15.00	Van Swinderen Huys, Bestuurskamer.	Presentation RDM and digital archive	PRC + Dr Canan Çakirlar (head of Zoology collection); Dr Martijn van Leusen (chair RDM committee); Dr Hans Peeters (lecturer PP, coordinator); Kirsten van der Ploeg (archivist). (10)
15.15 – 16.00	Van Swinderen Huys, Bestuurskamer.	Meeting with RG Pre- and Protohistory (incl. Bio-archaeology)	PRC + Dr Stijn Arnoldussen (UD); Dr Canan Çakirlar (UD); Prof. René Cappers; Dr Hans Peeters (UHD); Prof. Daan Raemaekers; Dr Johan Nicolay (UD). (12)
16.20 – 17.00	Van Swinderen Huys, Bestuurskamer.	Meeting with RG Classical & Mediterranean Archaeology	PRC + Prof. Peter Attema; Dr Martijn van Leusen (UHD); Dr Elisabeth van 't Lindenhout (UD); Dr Bert Nijboer (UD). (10)
18.30	Bistro 't Gerecht, Oude Boteringestraat 43.	Dinner	PRC (5)

Tuesday 8 November			
09.00 – 11.00	Reception at Poststraat 6 .	Visit lab and reference collections, meeting with technical staff	PRC + Archaeobotanical Collection: Prof. René Cappers (Head of collection) & Rita Palfenier (technical assistant); Laboratory for Conservation and Material Studies (LCM): Drs. Gert van Oortmerssen (restorer) & Dr Bert Nijboer (UD, head of LCM); Zooarchaeological Collection: Dr Canan Çakirlar (UD, head of collection) & Christian Küchelmann, MA (technical assistant); Drawing Office: Siebe Boersma (draughtsman), Erwin Bolhuis (chair of draughtsmen), Miriam Los- Weijns, MA (draughtswoman) & Sander Tiebackx (draughtsman)
11.00 – 11.40	Bestuurskamer Letteren, 1315.0331. Address: Oude Kijk in 't Jatstraat 26 .	Meeting with RG Greek Archaeology	PRC + Prof. Sofia Voutsaki. (6)
12.00 – 12.30	Bestuurskamer Letteren, 1315.0331.	Meeting with postdocs	PRC + Dr Mans Schepers (Pre- and Protohistory of Northwestern Europe, NWO Veni laureate); Dr Tymon de Haas (Classical and Mediterranean Archaeology, NWO Free Competition); Dr Luca Alessandri (Classical and Mediterranean Archaeology, NWO Free Competition). (8)
12.30 – 13.30	Canteen Harmoniecomplex, Oude Kijk in 't Jatstraat 26 .	Lunch	PRC (5)
13.30 – 14.10	Bestuurskamer Letteren, 1315.0331.	Meeting with RG Arctic and Antarctic Studies	PRC + Prof. Peter Jordan; Dr Frigga Kruse (postdoc); Dr Maarten Loonen (UHD); Dr Annette Scheepstra (coordinator WBPI). (9)
14.10 – 17.00	Bestuurskamer Letteren, 1315.0331.	PRC discussion	PRC (5)
17.00 – 17.30	Bestuurskamer Letteren, 1315.0331.	PRC presentation and formal closing	PRC + Prof. Peter Attema; Prof. Gerry Wakker; Prof. Daan Raemaekers; Maarten Schunselaar, MA. (9)
18.30	t.b.d.	Closing dinner (optional)	PRC (5)

Appendix 4: Quantitative data

SEP table D3a: Research staff

	2010		2011		2012		2013		2014		2015	
	#	fte										
Scientific staff (HGL/UHD/UD)	3/3/9	7,2	4/3/8	7,1	4/2/10	7,1	5/0/10	8,3	4/0/9	7,9	4/2/8	7,6
Postdocs	13	4,8	12	5,8	9	6,0	8	4,8	13	5,8	15	7,4
PhD students	18	14,0	20	14,9	17	13,0	18	11,7	20	12,1	20	15,3
Total research staff	46	26.0	49	27.8	42	26.1	41	24.8	46	25.8	49	30.3
Support Staff	14	9,1	14	8,7	13	8,4	13	8,3	15	8,3	14	8,0
Total Staf	60	35,1	63	36,5	55	34,5	54	33,1	61	34,1	63	38,3

SEP table D3b: Research Output

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Refereed articles	15	21	21	25	25	14
Non-refereed articles	14	8	11	9	12	4
Books	9	3	6	8	7	1
Book chapters	27	10	25	20	36	10
PhD theses	5	2	3	4	3	3
Conference papers	9	9	5	3	5	4
Professional publications	21	9	25	37	37	46
Publications aimed at the general public	12	26	11	11	11	8
<i>Other research output</i>						
Web publication/site	0	0	0	3	4	2
Book/Film/Article review	2	9	5	10	6	8
Data set/Database	0	0	0	1	0	0
Poster	0	0	0	1	6	2
Other contribution	10	2	1	1	1	3
Digital or Visual Products	0	0	0	0	1	0
Book editing	0	1	0	1	3	1
Inaugural speech	0	1	0	0	0	0
Special issue editing	1	0	0	0	1	0
Total publications	125	101	113	134	158	106

SEP table D3c: Funding (2010 – 2012)

	2010		2011		2012	
	Fte	%	fte	%	fte	%
Direct funding	15,4	59%	16,0	58%	13,2	51%
Research Grants (NWO)	8,9	34%	9,2	33%	8,0	30%
Contract research	1,7	7%	2,6	9%	4,9	19%
Total Funding:	26,0	100%	27,8	100%	26,1	100%
<i>Expenditure</i>						
Personel costs	2167,6	81%	1901,5	72%	2658,9	79%
Other costs	505,2	19%	748,8	28%	695,9	21%
Total expenditure	2672,8	100%	2650,3	100%	3354,8	100%

SEP table D3c: Funding (2013 – 2015)

	2013		2014		2015	
	fte	%	fte	%	fte	%
Direct funding	12,2	49%	12,1	47%	13,8	46%
Research Grants (NWO)	7,9	32%	9,2	35%	10,5	34%
Contract research	4,7	19%	4,6	18%	6,0	20%
Total Funding:	24,8	100%	25,9	100%	30,1	100%
<i>Expenditure</i>						
Personel costs	1219,8	73%	1816,4	78%	3094,1	88%
Other costs	451,3	27%	522,1	22%	410,5	12%
Total expenditure	1671,1	100%	2338,5	100%	3504,6	100%

SEP table D3d: PhD Candidates

	Male		Female		Total
	#	%	#	%	
Starting year					
2007	3	50%	3	50%	6
2008	0	0%	2	100%	2
2009	4	67%	2	33%	6
2010	0	0%	3	100%	3
2011	2	50%	2	50%	4
2012	1	25%	3	75%	4
2013	2	100%	0	0%	2
2014	3	43%	4	57%	7
2015	0	0%	3	100%	3
	15		22		37