

Evaluation of
INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL HISTORY
NIOD INSTITUTE FOR WAR, HOLOCAUST AND GENOCIDE STUDIES
THE MEERTENS INSTITUTE
ROYAL NETHERLANDS INSTITUTE OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN AND CARIBBEAN STUDIES (KITLV)

Amsterdam/Leiden, November-December, 2011

TABLE of CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

II. THE CONTEXT: HUMANITIES IN THE DUTCH RESEARCH LANDSCAPE

III. GENERAL OVERVIEW OF THE INSTITUTES

III.1. IISH International Institute for Social History

III.2. NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies

III.3. The Meertens Institute

III.4 KITLV Royal Netherlands Institute Of Southeast Asian And Caribbean Studies

IV. EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH

IV.1. IISH International Institute for Social History

IV.2. NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies

IV.3. The Meertens Institute

IV.4 KITLV Royal Netherlands Institute Of Southeast Asian And Caribbean Studies

V EVALUATION OF THE COLLECTIONS

V.0. Introductory remarks

V.1. IISH International Institute for Social History

V.2. NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies

V.3. The Meertens Institute

V.4 KITLV Royal Netherlands Institute Of Southeast Asian And Caribbean Studies

VI CONCLUSION AND GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

VII APPENDIX - A COMPARISON OF FTEs IN THE INSTITUTES

I. INTRODUCTION

This was an unusual evaluation, and this is an unusual report. Four institutes have been reviewed by two committees – the first time that a peer review has been conducted simultaneously among these institutes, and the first time that the collection aspects of the KNAW institutes got equal attention. These two committees each had their own focus: one evaluation dealt with the research, the other with the collections of these institutes. In this way, both aspects were guaranteed equal attention. There were separate evaluation protocols (SEPs) for both committees. The committee wants to praise the Academy for this initiative, although the SEP-C is not perfect; more about this in chapter V.0.

It would have been possible to write two reports: one about research; one about collections and it would have been possible to write four reports: one about each institute. It was a challenge for the committees to find common ground in *one* report that has unequivocal recommendations and conclusions, despite the differences in institutes and approaches. This report is the result.

The Board of the Academy installed two evaluation committees. The scientific committee consisted of:

Prof. dr. Frans Zwarts (Groningen University, chair)

Prof. dr. Sven Beckert (Harvard University)

Prof. dr. Jonathan Israel (Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton)

Prof. dr. Andreas Eckert (Humboldt Universität, Berlin)

Prof. dr. Barbara Watson Andaya (Centre for South East Asian Studies, Hawai'i)

Prof. dr. Birgit Meyer (Utrecht University)

Prof. dr. Carol Gluck (Columbia University)

Prof. dr. R. Mohrmann (Universität Münster)

Prof. dr. (Em) Anthony Reid (Australian National University)

Charlotte van Rappard (Chief Inspector Of Cultural Heritage Netherland, retired)

The committee for the evaluation of the collections consisted of

Charlotte van Rappard, chair

Ir. Marc van den Berg (University Library and IT services Tilburg University)

Dr. Leo Plugge (SURF)

Dr. Jan Boomgaard (Director Amsterdam City Archives, retired)

Gregory Green (Cornell University Library)

Prof. dr. Jaap van den Herik (Tilburg and Leiden Universities)

Dr. Bertram Mourits was the secretary for both evaluations.

The visit was conducted in the weeks of 28 November – 2 December 2011 (Research) and 5 - 9 December 2011 (Collections).

Due to the unusual nature of the site visit and the evaluation process for these four institutes, this report differs somewhat from the Standard Evaluation Protocol. The committee could not help but reflect on the nature of the evaluation, and the context and implications of what it was doing.

A short chapter preceding the actual evaluation sketches some contextual factors. Chapter 3 contains four general portraits of the institutes; the fourth chapter contains the four assessments and recommendations about research. In chapter 5, the assessments and recommendations about the collections of the institutes can be found. The committees found that research and collections need two different approaches; this explains the difference in tone of the two evaluative parts of the report.

We close with general remarks and conclusions, aimed at the institutions and at the KNAW.

II. THE CONTEXT: HUMANITIES IN THE DUTCH RESEARCH LANDSCAPE

Internationally, it is a general trend: the funding situation is deteriorating for scientific research in general and for the humanities in particular. The Netherlands are not the biggest investor in research: 1,8% of its BNP is invested in research – the state investment for research is 0,8% (in Germany, it is 2,5%).

Budget cuts by the government and less direct investments by industry and private funding will be felt severely from 2012. In 2011, the Dutch government designated ‘top sectors’, based on joint business and state investment, through fiscal incentives. NWO and KNAW agreed to participate in this policy, insisting, however, on the possibility of conducting fundamental research within these ‘top sectors’.

This implies a reallocation of research funding away from the humanities, since these are not included in the ‘top sectors’ (although some institutes and researchers see possibilities for a new fund for Creative Industries). The demand for valorisation and scientific research to demonstrate its ‘use’ for society presents a disadvantage for several fields, of which research in the humanities is a prominent example.

The consequences for humanities scholars in general are a greater prevalence of thematic streamlining, which could mean limited choices and possibilities in research fields, including those of PhDs. Funding increasingly requires research collaboration within larger projects. As top-down policy becomes more and more the decisive factor, the government and NWO will increasingly decide the research themes, and in the current climate this means more emphasis on business investment, stakeholders and valorisation.

All this affects the choice of themes of individual researchers and of institutes; to put it bluntly, it becomes tempting to choose the pragmatic path of following the money and the market. An increasing amount of research time will have to be allocated to preparing grant applications.

Researchers in KNAW institutes face difficulties similar to those of university-based researchers: the lump sum hardly allows for employing PhDs and temporary junior researchers, and there is a constant need to compete for external funds which are ever more competitive and specialized, implying paradigmatic shifts (for example, towards e-Humanities).

This context leads to the question why the KNAW organized this combined evaluation – and whether this is an indirect request to the committee to pave the way for budget cuts (by pointing toward the possibility to either combine institutes or identify less ‘valuable’ aspects of their activities). The committee did not want to become a strategic partner in these matters and therefore primarily evaluated the institutes on their own merits. In the final remarks you will find some thoughts and recommendations about a possible collective strategy that might be fruitful for all institutes and the KNAW.

III. GENERAL OVERVIEW OF THE INSTITUTES

III.1. IISH International Institute for Social History

The International Institute for Social History is the world's most important location for the research on and the collection of materials related to revolutionary and labour movements. It has been a place of safekeeping for records that have been either deemed unimportant by national depositories or a danger to various states. At the same time, the Institute has taken on a central role in research on social movements, and, most prominently so with its recent initiatives in global labour history. The Institute is of utmost importance to social historians everywhere. It is thus a national asset of the Netherlands with global reach and importance.

The institute has played a crucial role in reorienting social history to a more global approach; indeed, it has led in advocating for, and showing the potential of, the transnational turn in the discipline of history. About fifteen years ago, researchers at the institute formulated a new approach to the study of labour— which they called global labour history. Inasmuch as previous historical research on work, workers, and the institutions they created concentrated on the experiences of workers in particular modern nation states – and within these nation states, largely on male, skilled wage workers in the core industries of the second industrial revolution – the research team at the IISH has opened up new vistas by exploding some of the basic assumptions of the earlier histories. Instead of seeing a sharp dividing line between the emergence of wage labour and other forms of labour, the Institute's researchers have stressed the diversity of forms of labour under capitalism—from slavery to sharecropping, from wage work to self-employment. They have emphasized the global reach of capitalism and its impact on work regimes everywhere. And they have focused their research on labour in regions of the world once deemed peripheral to the development of capitalism in the core industrializing areas of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The Institute's researchers have embraced a history that has become more inclusive in terms of geography, that encompasses a more diverse group of workers, and that has helped to shift in important ways our perspectives on the history of capitalism. This is a paradigm-shifting development, which for the first time in two decades has given a sense of innovation and importance to the discipline of labour history more broadly.

Within the field of global labour history developed by staff members at the Institute, research has focused on four core areas. One is the group of researchers clustered around commodity studies—tracing the changing labour regimes around global industries such as oil, diamonds, and indigo. A second revolves around the global histories of particular occupations, such as dockworkers, textile operatives, prostitutes, and domestic workers, providing important and unprecedented surveys of work in these occupations. A third focus is on the study of global migrations, both free and unfree. Last, but not least, the Institute's staff is assembling large amounts of quantitative data on the history of wages globally across the past few centuries.

Beyond these research projects, the Institute plays a leading role in organizing itself as a global hub for social history. Its *International Review of Social History* is probably the

leading journals in the field, and its European Social Science History Conference has become one of the most important European history conferences, with hundreds of papers given by scholars from all over the world. Moreover, and just as remarkable, the Institute has been a catalyst for the formation of regional clusters of labour historians in West Africa, India, Brazil, and southern Europe.

III.2. NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies

Founded in May 1945 the NIOD has long played an important national and international role through its documentation and collections on the Second World War. In recent years, well before its merger with the Center for Holocaust and Genocide Studies in 2010, the Institute, under the leadership of Hans Blom, has steadily widened the scope of its activity to develop an increasingly more comprehensive and interdisciplinary approach not only to the history and aftermath of the Second World War but to other major wars and genocides of the twentieth century onwards.

The NIOD is characterized by a dual commitment to scholarship and society, to research and the public. From its beginning immediately after the end of the war, the Institute was established to collect documents, data, and knowledge about the war to the stated public end of determining pensions and war-related compensation. It began and remained part of the government until its transfer to KNAW in 1999, when NIOD became NIOD. In the intervening decades the Institute established itself as a well-known and respected scholarly source of information and knowledge about the Dutch experience in World War II.

Indeed, in 2010 when the Institute was considering a change in its name after the merger with the Center for Holocaust and Genocide Studies, polls showed that 80% of rush-hour commuters near the Amsterdam train station knew what the NIOD was, prompting the Institute to retain its name and suggesting the extent of its public presence. The Institute continues to meet its original goal of fulfilling the 'social need' for knowledge of the national past by means of independent scientific inquiry.

The NIOD has long produced scholarly work on the war, notably Loe de Jong's seminal volumes published between 1969 and 1991, and the famous TV series based on them which was broadcast during the 1960s. Under the leadership of Hans Blom, the Institute deepened its research, and after its move to KNAW, established a small but productive group of researchers. Their historical scholarship brought the Institute a wider national and newly prominent international reputation, establishing it in the forefront of the academic field of war memory that surged everywhere during the 1990s. Like similar institutes in Germany and France, the NIOD focused on the dark times of the twentieth century: war, occupation, resistance, collaboration, empire and its collapse. But NIOD, because it was more international than the others, made the Netherlands a leader in the global scholarship on the Second World War, known throughout Europe and in North America and Asia for its research, conferences, and exhibitions. That the European

Commission came to the NIOD in 2010 to host its four-year, thirteen-country, seven-million-Euro project on European Research Holocaust Infrastructure [EHRI] is further proof of the Institute's current international reputation.

National and international in scope, the NIOD plays a double role: its focus on the Dutch experience made it in some real ways the conscience of the nation in the public memory of the war. The impact of Peter Romijn's path-breaking study of Dutch mayors during the Nazi occupation on the understanding of collaboration is one example. The scope of the current *Netwerk Oorlogsbronnen*, which was part of the government program on War Heritage is another. At the same time its increasing attention to the transnational and global context of what was in fact a *world war* has kept the Institute at the leading edge of historical scholarship today. The completed project, 'From Dutch East Indies to Indonesia,' helped to change the global understanding of wartime and postcolonial Asia; recent and current work ties the Asian and European experiences of the war together, rather than treating them separately as has conventionally been the case; and the new project on Transitional Justice explicitly engages both the national and the international past in a complex, but single, collective inquiry. To serve both national and international audiences, the NIOD publishes in both Dutch and English (and some German as well).

Successful adaptation of its mission and vision has characterized the changes in the Institute over the decades. The NIOD has broadened its reach in time, now covering not just the war years but the longer twentieth century, and in space, including not only the Netherlands, Europe, and Indonesia but also other places where war and mass violence have produced political and social outcomes similar to those of the Second World War. In the 1990s the Institute contributed its scholarly investigations to the Dutch debates on Srebrenica. And it is this fit of subject matter that has made the merger with the Center for Holocaust and Genocide Studies proceed so smoothly. The strategic plan for research for the next five years shows a determination to keep the field of concern broad while narrowing the focus of research sufficiently to provide intellectual and historiographical coherence. New technologies and digital research methods, such as those employed in the War in Parliament project, are being developed to make innovative use of the unique collections of the Institute.

III.3. The Meertens Institute

The Meertens is a unique institute with a specific and interesting history. It started with a collection of dialect data in 1931, the collection of Dutch folklore started in 1934 and the famous collection of names was added in 1948. It exists in recent Dutch national consciousness largely through the work of novelist and former employee J.J. Voskuil. This proves a mixed blessing since he did not paint a very flattering portrait of the Institute. However, the institute deals with this notoriety quite well – and rightly so, because in its output, quantitatively as well as qualitatively, the spirit of the Voskuil-era has long since disappeared.

The Meertens institute has an important public function: the documentation of Dutch language and culture in the context of everyday life. Among the broader public, the Meertens institute is well known for its easily accessible databanks that offer systematic information about such Dutch traditions as first and family names, folk narratives, dialects, religious celebrations, and, famously, folk songs.

The scholarly work of the Meertens Institute deals with Variation Linguistics, Dutch Ethnology and the Collections (library/documentation). Variation Linguistics has its main theoretical basis in formal and sociolinguistic theories of syntax, morphology, and phonology. The research group in Dutch Ethnology focuses on categories of heritage, visual culture, and performance of cultural and religious practices in The Netherlands throughout its history, but also including an emphasis on the present, taking into account the increased religious and cultural diversity of Dutch society. P.J. Margry and H. Roodenburg are leading figures in research about contemporary religious culture and historical anthropology. The documentation department collects material pertaining to linguistic as well as ethnological subjects, increasingly from a research-based perspective.

The institute's characteristic focus on language and culture is reflected in the structure of the institute, with its combination of two research groups that have little theoretical overlap. Both research groups are productive and successful, but collaboration is largely restricted to research in the field of language and culture of immigrant groups, in a program that ran from 1999 to 2004. In the previous evaluation, the question was raised to what extent combined research programs were feasible. The MT has made sustained attempts to integrate the diverging aspects of the Institute's work, but real overlap still remains incidental. This is not a practical problem for the researchers, since the Institute covers discrete fields. The Meertens Institute is also one of the most enthusiastic in pursuing the possibilities of e-Humanities, which can more easily be integrated in its linguistic and philologically oriented ethnological research than in the more qualitative research also conducted at the Ethnology department.

In the meantime, cooperation with other academic institutions has increased, and this is reflected in fruitful exchange programs with several universities and KNAW institutes (NIOD, KITLV). The Meertens Institute is thus firmly embedded in the academic landscape of The Netherlands. For the largest part, the Meertens Institute is funded by the KNAW. A part of the budget also comes from contract research or other research funds. The linguistic group has a large number of NWO and ESF funded researchers, particularly PhD's.

The international standing of the Ethnology group is apparent since Meertens handles the secretariat for the Société Internationale d'Ethnologie et de Folklore, the most important international association for ethnologists and folklorists.

The research of both the ethnology and the linguistics groups has been very successful. The institute often attracts international speakers and visiting scholars, and researchers from the Meertens Institute regularly publish and present papers in an international context. All in all, the status and reputation of the Meertens Institute are beyond doubt: it occupies a solid position in the Dutch academic world. Importantly, the

institute is the only location in The Netherlands for scholarly research on popular Dutch culture. In contrast to other European countries, European ethnology (formerly 'volkskunde') is not a discipline represented in Dutch universities. This enhances the scholarly importance of the institute.

Variation Linguistics and Dutch Ethnology are most prominently present in the field of international scientific publications. The institute also tends to the onomastics heritage, which makes its work visible to the wider public, for example, with the databases of names available through its website. Although this is by far the most popular activity of the Institute in terms of the general public, the Institute plans to discontinue its support for the website, since it contributes little to academic research. This decision is evidence of the Meertens institute's commitment to scientific research.

III.4 KITLV Royal Netherlands Institute of Southeast Asian and Caribbean Studies

In the interconnected 21st century global knowledge has assumed particular centrality everywhere. At the same time as scientific knowledge has become more globalised, and expressed in English, increased cross-cultural contacts have led to cultural and religious cleavages as traditional and national identities have seemed under threat. Older types of trans-cultural knowledge, once organized as orientalism and later as area studies, have assumed new centrality as trans-regional studies. This is the context in which KITLV has reinvented itself as a centre of expertise and analysis for Southeast Asia (especially Indonesia) and the Caribbean.

While not lacking in important centres for the study of China, Japan, and the Middle East, the Netherlands is certainly best positioned to be a European and also global leader for the study of the third giant of rising Asia – Indonesia. Ranking fourth in the world by population (240 million), and first in the number of Muslims, Indonesia is a G20 member whose booming economy and successful democratic transition have seen it hailed as having 'a good chance of becoming the world's first Muslim and democratic superpower' (*Foreign Policy*, December 2010). In its biological diversity and geological and tectonic location on the ring of fire, Indonesia's environment is also disproportionately important for the survival of our human species. The Netherlands is fortunate, therefore, to possess what is almost certainly the leading centre for the interdisciplinary understanding of this important country. The KITLV is also the leading centre of expertise on the Caribbean in Europe, and one of the world leaders in this smaller but historically vital region.

In recent years the KITLV has dramatically reshaped its focus away from the specialist 'orientalist' knowledge of Indonesian languages, literatures, and cultures for which it was once unrivalled. What the evaluation committee saw was a modern organization focused almost entirely on contemporary issues of obvious high relevance, though profiting from the rich collections and experience from its 150-year history. The committee was impressed by the KITLV leadership, the quality and significance of the current research projects, and the value of the institute to the Netherlands government. The KITLV occupies a unique position

as an international centre for expertise on Indonesia; aptly described in the mass-circulation *Tempo* weekly (20 November 2011) as a Mecca for researchers.

The collections are an indispensable part of KITLV's profile, particularly on Indonesia. With around 750,000 titles, many of which are extremely rare, and unavailable elsewhere, the KITLV library is regarded internationally as the most important specialist collection in the world, notably for Indonesia. The KITLV library is accessible to researchers and it is physically close to related collections, especially those dealing with the colonial period. Libraries in Indonesia remain underfunded and inadequate. The Institute actively builds its collection by about 10,000 titles a year, the majority being Indonesian material obtained through the office in Jakarta. The digitalization program's effectiveness was shown following the 2004 tsunami, which destroyed many collections in Aceh, by its making digitally available (to Aceh, but also to the world) the entire KITLV collection relating to Aceh. Finally the rapid increase in visits to the KITLV website, to over 3 million in the last two years, is a mark of increasing global relevance.

The KITLV has operated an Indonesia office since 1969, employing one Dutch staff and about 15 local staff. Its primary role is collecting and cataloguing new material from Indonesia for the KITLV library, given the difficulty of collecting in more orthodox ways in Indonesia. The Library of Congress similarly recognizes the necessity of maintaining an effective field office to acquire current Indonesia material. The KITLV office also fills a representational function, comparable to Netherlands Centres in Rome, Cairo and Athens, but particularly valuable in a society where people respond better to personal approaches than letters. Over the years this office has been helpful to Dutch scholars researching in Indonesia, and has also built a valued profile in Indonesia through its library and especially its Indonesian-language publications (through Indonesian commercial publishers).

IV. EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH

As stated in the introduction, the committee evaluated the four institutes separately, but there were several subjects that are a point of attention for all the institutes. All four institutions have more or less outlived their original reason for coming into existence. Being very much aware of this development, all four have found new and important grounds for expanding their research domain, operating theatre and the scope of their collections. In short: the institutions have internationalized their research and their collections.

In doing so, they have also very successfully internationalized their importance. They are no longer first and foremost serving Dutch academia and society, they have also become increasingly more valuable internationally, successfully building on their original expertise. The internationalization (or if you wish globalization) we see in research in general is also taking place in the Humanities and in the four institutions.

In general, the committee noticed that, with the impending retirements of the current prominent generation of researchers, this is the time to reflect on the future, on the recruitment of younger staff, on the relation between national and international researchers.

IV.1. IISH International Institute for Social History

The Committee endorses the reorientation of IISH towards a global labour history and commends the leaders of the Institute for having taken a leadership role in global academic discourse. We applaud the global reach of its efforts, and we observe that thanks to the efforts of the Institute and its productive researchers, Amsterdam has become an important centre not just for labour history but for global history more broadly. While the committee was aware of and concerned by a certain tension that it detected between the need to continue to advance the original tasks of the Institute while combining this with the demands of a broadening in its remit and its pursuit of new global goals, overall the committee was satisfied that the Institute had succeeded in accommodating and balancing its objectives, successfully globalizing while not departing from its original mission.

The quality of the institute is very good. Its position in the international field of social history is no doubt that of a world player. The productivity of the institute is very good. The committee wants to make a critical remark about its self evaluation, which was not very clear in the way it presented the numbers from which productivity could be concluded. The committee did notice that the research staff has been reduced from 16 fte to 11.6 fte between 2006 and 2011 – even though it was difficult to get this from the self evaluation: the numbers are unclear. In the same period the collection staff increased from 38.6 fte to 41.1 fte. This is not in agreement with IISH's research ambitions (see Appendix for the numbers for all institutes).

Still, the research coming from the institute is of the highest standard, even if the balance is skewed towards some senior researchers. The relevance of the institute is very

good to excellent – its work is embedded in society as well as in scholarship, and it plays an important role in both. The feasibility of the institute is good to very good – but here the threats are most prominent. Although external funding for special (research) programs has been found, and at the moment some efforts are being made to make up for reductions in funding, the budgetary challenges to the standing organisation should have been addressed more proactively. The committee noticed a slight complacency in the general management, which might do more to search for creative solutions to the problems of the current times.

The quality of the research is very good to excellent; as has been stated above: the IISH produces world-class research. Research productivity is very good. Here we noticed that the balance between the senior staff and the younger people is somewhat skewed, so that much of the Institute's prominence rests on very few shoulders. While this is perhaps unavoidable, it remained unclear to the Committee how the leadership of the IISH is recruiting talent able to continue to secure the Institute's prominence. The relevance of the research is very good, and so is its feasibility. Some action is needed to warrant similar success in the future. Considering the global intellectual and infrastructural reach of the Institute, the Committee would like to see its recruitment efforts become more global as well. We want to encourage the Institute's leadership to consider the possibility that the next generation of leaders might carry Brazilian, Senegalese, or Indian passports. It will be a challenge to reconcile this new and necessary global reach with the Dutch location and funding, and how to maintain a creative connection between collection policy and research once the collecting focus has shifted outside Europe. This global reach will require a clearly defined thematic focus in recruiting new staff, probably in the area of comparative labour organisation and mobility.

There was concern among some members of the Committee that the powerful orientation of the Institute's research to small, well-defined, research areas prevents the emergence of different approaches and the recruitment of talented researchers. Some members of the Committee felt that recruitment should be focused on the very best historians of global labour, and that the exact nature of their research should be left to individual researchers. While the possibility of 'dilution' is bemoaned in the Institute's report, we actively encourage the Institute to seek out some 'dilution' in the interest of recruiting world-class scholars. Too much focus constrains debate and may keep alternative voices and approaches from emerging.

The Committee was impressed by the scholarly output of the Institute, but would like to encourage the Institute to help researchers focus on the production of monographs, 'big' books that make a difference to the discipline at large, such as Marcel van der Linden's *Workers of the World* or Jan Luiten van Zanden's *The Long Road to the Industrial Revolution. The European Economy in a Global Perspective, 1000-1800*. While programmatic essays and essay collections have left, as mentioned before, a deep imprint on the profession, it would be good to increase the number of important monographs that would find a wide readership within the scholarly community. We would like to see the Institute provide incentives to its researchers to write such books.

The Institute does an important job in organizing networks among labour historians in the global South, for instance, in bringing together labour history associations of India and Brazil. It is not clear, however, what the role of the Institute in these networks should be in the future.

The leadership should make clearer the future role of the Institute's offices in Africa, Asia, and Latin America —and especially how they might not only collect sources for the Institute's collections but also become nodes of research in their regions.

IV.2. NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies

Since most other European countries have not invested in a specialized institute for the collecting of materials and the study of the Second World War in the way the Netherlands has, the committee is keen to acknowledge that the NIOD is a major player in all international debates and conferences about the war and the Holocaust to a greater extent than most other countries, and that this enhances the moral standing and general prestige of the Netherlands in international relations, not only in the United States and Israel but also in many other countries. The Institute's vital independence from the government as well as from all special interests enabled it to report on issues relating to the Bosnian struggle, Iraq, and other wars as well as the recent genocide tragedies in Africa and elsewhere with a rare and impressive degree of authority and objectivity. The committee affirms that the NIOD plays a highly important public role and is a valuable asset in international cultural relations for the Netherlands as well as a valuable vehicle for academic research of a kind that could not easily be replicated or carried out by any university department.

The research committee reached positive conclusions about the quality, viability, and validity of the Institute's research activity, its methods, and procedures and about the viability of the Strategic Policy Plan for the management of NIOD's research and collections in the period 2010-2015. In terms of the Standard Evaluation Protocol: the quality is very good to excellent, the productivity and feasibility are very good, the relevance of the Institute is excellent. All aspects of research are 'very good'.

The committee has two main reservations in its otherwise favourable report on the NIOD. First, in a context in which it is not realistic to think in terms of any increase in public funding, there is an imbalance that needs to be addressed between the research staff and resources for research, on the one hand, and the staff and resources devoted to collections and administration on the other. There is a clear need to increase the relative proportion of PhD and post docs in relation to the number of tenured senior research staff, without reducing the number of senior researchers. This means that the temptation to save sizeable sums by not replacing senior staff who will be retiring over the next few years should be strenuously resisted and that the number of junior researchers should be increased by gradually decreasing the number of archival, administrative, and technical staff. No doubt there will be internal resistance to this. But the committee felt that this is a high priority in order to reap the optimal benefits from the expertise and collections of the Institute. Such a

solution would make it possible to provide for a small number of annual visiting lectureships, enabling a flow of university lecturers from the Netherlands and abroad to spend their sabbatical leaves at the Institute. This would intensify the interaction between the Institute and universities and further broaden its international network of collaboration and influence.

The committee felt that the Institute is fully aware of the importance of computerized scholarship and has made commendable efforts to digitize and develop the methods of e-humanities, where appropriate. Computerization makes certain kinds of research more efficient and provides access to key research tools for interested members of the public. The committee expects solid and exciting results from the use of the methods of e-humanities in its proper sphere.

The importance of its public role has made the Institute an important force in Dutch society, helping it to confront its wartime past and making the Netherlands an international model for scholarly research and public education. Even as the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport declared recently that 'war is being pensioned off,' it chose to continue support of the NIOD's contribution to the program in War Heritage, suggesting the continuing social need for such projects. The Institute's new initiatives relating to the Holocaust, comparative genocide, and transitional justice speak to the global culture of public memory and its role in political transitions.

The cohesive community and quality of the management are evident in the achievements of the past years and the plans for the next five years. There is a high level of cooperation among the staff, a professional approach to management and presentation, and an impressive expression of satisfaction among the PhD students and the postdocs, who praise the attention they receive from the senior researchers, the access to the outstanding research collection, and the opportunity to create and enter networks of Dutch and international scholars. The gender balance is notable, and the Institute makes excellent use of its historic building, which now combines a modern library and reading room with the stately rooms of the old building in a location easily accessible to the public.

The relevance of research to public and scholarly domains remains as high as ever, not only because interest in the Second World War remains strong but because of the contemporary importance of subjects such as war, genocide, and mass violence. The Institute is a model of the combination of social and academic needs and pursuits. Its researchers have a commendable record of scholarly productivity (112 books, 195 book chapters, etc., between 2003 and 2011, as given in Appendix 10) even as they devote time to the planning of exhibitions and documentaries, running programs for school teachers, and speaking and writing for the general public.

Intelligent planning and partnerships characterize the research group and suggest that the Institute will continue to produce excellent scholarly products even as it extends its reach comparatively and chronologically. The NIOD has an impressively wide range of collaborative partners, including Dutch government, universities, other KNAW institutes, and civil society organizations as well as international institutions and EU organizations. Its PhD

students benefit from a dual association with their universities and the Institute, while the Master's track in Holocaust and Genocide Studies (107 students, 2003-11) links the NIOD researchers to the University of Amsterdam.

Success in securing external funding has brought additional projects, personnel, institutional partnerships, and dynamism to the NIOD, now assisted by a part-time coordinator for external research funding. Its plans to continue this pattern are commended.

Some areas of concern: The small size of research staff is in part a result of the Institute's gradual shift to emphasize research as well as documentation, but the number of researchers could certainly be larger. The senior research staff remains small, and the recently enlarged number of PhDs and postdocs, who are temporary but bring dynamism (and external funding) to the Institute, might well be increased even more.

The balance between scholarly and public activities, which has long been the particular strength of the NIOD, must continue to be well managed in order to preserve the academic productivity of the researchers while maintaining their valuable contributions to schools and society.

NIOD should aim to enlarge its research staff (in comparison with the collections staff), and encourage ever thicker and more numerous ties with universities here and abroad while preserving its partnerships with government and civil society. The Institute's course is right; it just needs to increase the size and breadth of what it is already doing so well.

IV.3. The Meertens Institute

The committee recognized the quality and importance of the work done at the Meertens institute. As a place for research in ethnology, it has no equal in The Netherlands and it is a prominent player internationally. The Variation Linguists working at the Meertens produce outstanding results as well.

The quality of the institute is good to very good. The historical development has made for an effective institute with relevant research results. The productivity of the institute is very good; it occupies an important position in the academic and social landscape. The Meertens Institute has a relatively high number of special chairs at various Dutch universities for its outstanding researchers. It also offers a fine research environment for PhD-students. Therefore, the relevance of the institute is good to very good. Its identity is somewhat unclear, largely due to the past dependency on its dual origins. The feasibility of the institute is good.

The quality of research is very good, the Meertens institute has a strong position within academia, mostly on the national level, but increasingly international as well. The productivity is equally very good. The relevance is good to very good, the subject matters of the Meertens research will have increasing relevance for society in the future, documenting and generating insights into the way cultural diversity is influencing culture in The Netherlands.

The committee noted that the attitude of the management towards the relationship between the two research groups within the institute remains ambivalent. This can be explained because the theoretical and methodological orientation of the two groups differs widely. This was pointed out in previous evaluations as well. Vitality and feasibility of the research are good to very good, but they are a point of attention.

There is a lack of clarity with regard to the way in which the research department and the collection department can work together. Since the amount of labour, time, and cost that go into documentation and digitalization is considerable, its scope and integration into research are in constant need of examination. The management acknowledges this problem; the director is critical of the need to maintain all aspects of the collection.

The relevance of the institute is good to very good: the focus on cultural diversity means that the work done at The Meertens is in the forefront of political and social developments.

The productivity is very good: The ethnology group publishes numerous books, articles, as well as CDs. Some of these results cater to the interests of the general public, thus proving not only the scientific but also the social relevance of the Meertens Institute. As the Institute is the only place in The Netherlands where ethnology is an academic subject, the Institute lives up to its unique responsibility for this field.

The evaluation committee came to the conclusion that the vitality and feasibility of the Meertens research are not as good as 5 years ago (our assessment now is good to very good, where it was very good in 2006). The financial situation caused by changes is a problem, but not the only one.

There are also some problems in management that are the cause of the declining feasibility. The Meertens Institute has planned a new internal structure, in which work will no longer be done in 'research groups' but organized on the basis of themes. This is a new effort by the management to do something about the separation between the two groups. It is positive that the Institute is working to bridge the gap – but whether this will provide the solution remains to be seen. It is not immediately apparent whether more overlap will indeed result from a thematically based approach, and the committee is also not sure that the management has sufficient support among the staff. There is a discrepancy between the ambitions of the director and the state of affairs at the institute. The institution as a whole: good to very good.

One of the proposed themes – 'Dutchness' – carries a lot of promise. However, its presentation was not entirely convincing. The project itself, including the way in which it is framed, should be rethought. The task will be to make clear how research on 'Dutchness' in present-day multicultural Dutch society links up with broader public and scholarly debates.

The Meertens Institute is a prominent advocate of the e-Humanities. It is productive in this field, but this emphasis risks marginalizing the researchers and fields less susceptible to aggregating data.

The committee recommends the continued pursuit of intense collaboration with other fields, including sociology, anthropology, and psychology as well as with history and

social geography. A second important recommendation is the recruitment of younger senior researchers into leadership positions of the institute, to ensure that the Institute will remain an important force in the future.

Personnel changes are a difficult subject, not just for this institute, so there is a general recommendation, not exclusively aimed at The Meertens (see chapter VI).

IV.4 KITLV Royal Netherlands Institute of Southeast Asian and Caribbean Studies

The KITLV has managed to obtain external funds greater than might be expected from its size. The exemplary goal set by KITLV management of obtaining €100,000 in external funding per year for every research FTE has been met over the past reporting period. The committee noted the success of the EDEN project in Southeast Asian environmental history, now fulfilled in a number of influential monographs, notably Peter Boomgaard's path-breaking *Southeast Asia: An Environmental History* (Santa Barbara: ABC-Clio, 2007), and David Henley's carefully documented *Fertility, Food and Fever: Population, Economy and Environment in North and Central Sulawesi, 1600-1930* (Leiden: KITLV Press, 2005). The project 'Renegotiating Boundaries', to which 'In Search of Middle Indonesia' is the sequel, has also produced influential monographs such as Gerald van Klinken's *Communal violence and democratization in Indonesia; small town wars* (London: Routledge, 2007; Indonesian translation Jakarta: Jakarta: Obor & KITLV-Jakarta, 2007).

This contributes to the assessment of the quality of the institute as very good to excellent. The productivity is very good, and the relevance of the institute is very good to excellent. The funding situation is not without problems, but vitality and feasibility of the institute are very good. The assessment of the research is in general: very good (quality, productivity, relevance and vitality and feasibility).

Among the projects still under way the committee wished particularly to commend the Tracking Development Project as a model of contemporary relevance and scholarly content. Funded by the Netherlands Foreign Ministry at €2,575,000, this project is unusual and innovative, combining policy relevance and high intellectual value. The implications of the research question which asks why African tropical societies have languished while those in Southeast Asia had brought millions out of poverty, will be far-reaching. Although publications are in an early stage, the conclusions are already changing priorities for development aid in the Foreign Ministry.

'Recording the Future' is an example of the kind of long-term project that would be impossible outside the setting of a Research Institute. The audio archive previously created by KITLV provided the departure point for this innovative film project that expands the technical frontier by returning to the same sites every four years and using various techniques to systematically record daily activities in eight different areas of Indonesia. The hundreds of indexed hours have created a visual and audio archive that will only increase in value over time.

'Post-colonial Migrations and Identity Politics' was funded with €652,000 from NWO and KNAW, and in cooperation with IISH and Meertens. This is the first comprehensive effort to investigate the comparative impact of post-colonial migration to the Netherlands and the creation of local identities. A major focus concerns issues of postcolonial citizenship and the relationship between contemporary Dutch society and its colonial history.

The KITLV strengths are its unique collections, its high profile in Indonesia, the Antilles, Suriname and the world, its productive relationship with Leiden University, its excellent management, its interaction with policy-makers in government, its effective pursuit of external funding, and its strategic position for the Netherlands' place in the world.

Its weakness is its small size, rendering it vulnerable to threats to viability. The building is also inadequate for current needs.

The number of full-time researchers at KITLV is small by the standards of KNAW Institutes or global norms for independent research institutes. The committee recommends an increase in core funding to KITLV, to support its efforts to expand the pool of researchers by raising external funds and economising on support staff. The committee suggests shifting some core funding in all the institutes to short-term positions that would increase interaction with universities and other institutions. The modest size of KITLV provides less leeway for this, but any increased funding should be devoted in large part to such appointments.

While the location of KITLV in Leiden as part of an area studies focus is a key recommendation of the committee, a merger of KITLV with Leiden University would expose it in the longer term to institutional vagaries that might compromise its scholarly effectiveness. This would be a loss to KNAW, to the national interest, and of course to the productive autonomy of the Institute itself.

The committee endorses the decision of KNAW and the KITLV itself that it is time to transfer its monograph publications program to one or more external publishers. The role the Institute once played as a publisher of classical text editions, linguistic, and ethnographic studies is now virtually ended, and such works should in the future be published in Indonesia and Malaysia. The KITLV Jakarta office does and should play a key role in building this capacity in Indonesia, and in translating some of the major Dutch texts of a former era. KITLV research and publications are now in the mainstream of contemporary social science. They can and do find publishers elsewhere. The shift out of publishing will free some resources for strengthening the research program.

The Committee believes that KITLV's two well-regarded journals should continue to be edited in the Institute, but be printed and distributed by commercial publishers. Digital access to journals has given the larger global publishers economies of scale in production and distribution that small organizations cannot match. The *Bijdragen van het Koninklijk Institute* is the oldest and most prestigious periodical for Indonesian cultural and social studies, and should be continued. The committee suggests, however, that the rather painful issue of a title more meaningful to readers of English and Indonesian should be squarely

faced, as well as the possible relocation of some of the publishing functions to Southeast Asia.

V EVALUATION OF THE COLLECTIONS

V.0. Introductory remarks

The committee appreciates the effort that has gone into the making of the SEP-C but nevertheless came to the conclusion that it is not yet an efficient instrument to evaluate and measure collections and collection management. The SEP-C is still too much inspired by the SEP, which is predominantly an instrument to measure research. The methodology is not adequate for measuring collections. There are many parameters concerning value, management, and handling, so that a collection evaluation tool must necessarily be complex.

On the one hand, a simple list of standard facts and figures - such as sent to the committee as requested from the institutes – would provide much useful information, now sometimes hidden in long-winded prose. On the other hand, the scoring system of the SEP-C leaves no room to differentiate between the intrinsic worth of a (paper) collection and the data which make the collection available for researchers and other users (to give just one example).

Therefore the committee has described all collections according to the following parameters: Historical value, Value for research, Cataloguing standards of the institute, Percentage of collections catalogued, Use of procedures and protocols and Conservation standards (which includes risk management).

In general, the committee found the level of collection management and especially of conservation management not up to standards used today by archival and other heritage institutions, NIOD excepted. While the KNAW institutes all possess world-famous collections and seem to be proud of them, the interest of the management disproportionally lies in upholding this fame, rather than in safeguarding the heritage.

The committee encountered a lot of problems: storage space at risk from leaks or temperature shifts, non-monitoring of acclimatisation apparatus, inadequate measures for theft prevention and non-identification of the most fragile material at the greatest risk of deterioration. The committee feels that postponement of building improvements, which should be funded or undertaken by the KNAW or the building owner, should not have prevented the management of these institutes from taking temporary measures to safeguard their collections. None of the institutes, except NIOD, has given the committee an up to date collection plan. Also there seems to be a dearth of clear, written procedures for acquisition, inquiries into the legal status of acquired material, deaccessioning, loaning, reading room procedures and calamity plans. Concrete examples will be provided in the separate descriptions of the collections below.

Much can be gained by providing collections staff with adequate training in modern collection management, through close cooperation with leading institutes in this field, such as the National Archives or the University Libraries in Amsterdam and Leiden.

In cataloguing and digitisation the committee was surprised to notice that the institutes in some cases developed and followed their own systems, where cooperation with institutes with comparable collections might have meant less effort and expenditure on both sides and more beneficial results for (external) researchers and the general public.

The legal situation and ownership of the collections is different at each of the four Institutes: the collections of the IISH are owned by the Independent Foundation IISH; those of the KITLV are owned by the Learned Society; and a large part of the collections of the NIOD, especially the older collections, are owned by the Dutch state. Only the Meertens seems to own its collections outright, and these are therefore the only part of the Institutes' collections where the KNAW has a direct say in their management. At the other Institutes management and preservation of the collection are regulated by various legal and loan agreements. This makes for a confusing plethora of legal situations, especially with regard to ownership, decision-making responsibility, and liability in case of mismanagement and/or calamity.

The committee strongly recommends establishing a new collections agreement for all Institutes, in which collections management in all its facets is addressed. Such issues as preservation, digitization, acquisition and deaccessioning policies, copyrights, loans in and out, etc. should be addressed in an uniform manner that makes clear who has the responsibilities for them and their funding. As for the self-evaluation, the committee recommends requesting more specific numbers and information; a PEST analysis (Political, Economic, Social, Technological) could be a useful addition to the SWOT analyses.

V.1. IISH International Institute for Social History

The IISH collects archives, documentation, publications, objects, images, and datasets pertaining to, on the one hand, individuals and organizations belonging to movements that address important social issues, and on the other hand, labour relations and living conditions of working people. The social issues that constitute the focus of the institute are poverty, exploitation, human rights violations, political oppression, war, labour migration, housing, and landownership. The IISH actively seeks out and acquires material that is consistent with its collection profile in Russia, South and Southeast Asia, the Middle East and Central Asia, Africa, Latin America, and The Netherlands. It also actively collects material from international organizations with no clear regional base. The IISH no longer actively acquires material from the countries of Western and Central Europe (where most of its older collections have their origins).

The self evaluation of the IISH is singularly lacking in clarity when it comes to facts and figures concerning collection management. This, together with the fact that the Collection Department was undergoing reorganisation, made it difficult for the committee to assess various aspects of the IISH's collection management.

All previous review committees have remarked that the IISH should reconsider the scope and focus of its vast collections. In consultation with the KNAW the IISH has answered

that it felt that this scope was essential for the collections profile. This committee wishes to repeat the remarks of its predecessors, adding that in the view of the coming financial restrictions, making choices in what material to collect and preserve may be necessary. It is of course the management of the IISH who must take these decisions, but some solutions to an unbridled growth of the IISH holdings and financing of the running costs of collection management should be considered. The self evaluation addresses this issue but does not offer any practical solutions, and during our visit, it became clear that the limitations of the core budget will increasingly be a problem.

The quality of the collections is good to very good. The 'core collection' (Marx, Engels, Kautsky, Bakunin, Bernstein) is of outstanding quality, though it forms a minor part of the total. For scientific research in the field of the 19th and 20th social history, this core collection is irreplaceable. Also, its social significance is extraordinary. These collections and archives contain evidence of a social and economic world that affected the life and happiness of millions of people around the world.

The coherence of the collections is rather unbalanced: the importance of the international core collection outreaches the profile of the Dutch national and local collections by far. But the extent of the Dutch collections is overwhelming (67%), and one might wonder how this enormous abundance contributes to the mission of the institute. The 'regional desks' concept is very well thought out and is a good and practical solution for a research driven collection mission. The committee encourages the work with these regional desks to continue and be expended, as well as more collaboration between IISH and KITLV.

Acquisitions in collections of the IISH are defined by three parameters: 1. continuity of the original collections, 2. relevance to (current) research and 3. safeguarding endangered collections.

A new collection plan should be written, with serious attention to modern standards of collection management. Also, there needs to be a balance between the size of the collection and the size of the staff taking care of the collection; without it, more problems are inevitable.

The committee was left with the impression that the IISH is spending much effort on Dutch collections which are not in danger at all and could possibly be kept somewhere else. When accepting archives from associations such as Amnesty International or Greenpeace, which are not immediately threatened by destruction or disappearance, the Institute might consider adopting a more systematic approach by charging an initial fee for incorporating description, cataloguing and packing according to modern conservation standards; and possibly a smaller annual fee for maintenance.

The committee feels that most of the archives presently taken in by the IISH are in the appropriate place. There could be more consultation with other archives to find a suitable location, for example, for archives of politicians, trade unions, et cetera. Such measures would at least slow the average growth of 600 metres per annum that the IISH now envisages for the future, and ensure that the new storage space on the fifth floor will be sufficient for growth for the near future for those collections that are either threatened or

rare. The historical relevance of these collections is without doubt, but this relevance is threatened by extraordinary growth as well as by insufficient registration and maintenance of the collection and archives.

There is an imbalance between growth and processing time. The core collection and archives have a high international scientific relevance. It is a pity that these collections are not online, since the collections and archives are without doubt important for society as a whole. Possible clients include, for example, those engaged in family searches, information on emigration and immigration, etc. The relevance of the collections is very good but there is potential for expanding their relevance and users.

The descriptions of the collection are good, though it is not entirely clear how many of the archives are accessible. On the description level, it is not clear how many 'structured' data (registers) and 'unstructured' data' (archives) remain to be processed. After the reorganization, the IISH has chosen to pursue an integrated collection management. This shift in position and network building from a national and professional level to an international level, is a positive development, but it is too bad that the IISH does not take advantages of existing national networks (Brain, ICA, e-depot developments). IISH is involved in relevant partnerships and communities, and also in several European programs, but there is no electronic access through services like the national Archive Bank and Beeldbank.

The storage space of the IISH is adequate in terms of acclimatisation and storage. However, the space is used both for collection material that has undergone preliminary conservation treatment and material that is still in the condition in which it was received, i.e. without adequate pest control, packaging in acid-free materials and elimination of unwanted material such as staples, etc.

As for the current state of the collections: there is no division between 'raw' and processed materials. There should be a quarantine space, and greater provision against theft. Written procedures should be established for acquisition and processing. One of the most urgent issues is the digitisation of audiovisual materials, if necessary in cooperation with other KNAW-institutes. The state-of-the-art studios and conservation knowledge of the Meertens Institute could possibly be helpful in this. The committee fears that some of this material may already have deteriorated beyond retrieval or restoration. Material that is not available elsewhere should urgently be identified and digitized and a systematic plan to accomplish this should have the highest priority. This was already stressed in the Strategy Memorandum 2007-2010, but the recommendation has not successfully been implemented. The institute has searched for funding for this project but has apparently not given it the priority which due to the rapid deterioration of this material, it should have had.

Noteworthy is a project dealing with 'the memory of the IISH' which aims to transmit and retain knowledge about the collection held by older staff members about to retire. The self evaluation does not give details about protocols or methods for how this is to be done.

There is limited action in the field of digitization due to lack of funding and no clear collection plan. Digitization projects for which grants have been actively acquired seem, for

the past few years to have concentrated primarily on Dutch collections. Priority should be given to identification and digitization of unique material in these collections, together with the 'scanning on demand' method as described. Access on macro and meso-level is good, and integrated access is well done. The availability of digitized documentation online is rare – scanning on demand seems to be the best strategy here. Preservation problems, which must be considerable (19th century acid paper archives), are not mentioned in the self evaluation. There is no clear storage policy. The committee suggests reconsidering the server room: is it necessary for IISH to have and maintain these expensive facilities on its own? The IISH is looking for improvement to raise output and rightly so, but all in all, the committee rates the productivity of the collections: good.

The vitality/feasibility of the collections is good to very good. The IISH has a broad mission – which implies the need for a well-defined strategy with clear goals and results. The IISH has chosen a changing orientation towards a global approach. This will have consequences for networks, new alliances, and collections. It is remarkable though, how little the IISH knows about its users and visitors. This is true of other Institutes, but since the IISH uses the Vanguard Method, it should have a clearer view of its public and be able to obtain a clearer profile of the people using the collections. Knowledge of its collections could be more widespread, with the potential of exploring more consumer groups interested in the use of these collections. It is difficult to evaluate the interaction between future collection-building policies and the research program.

Much of the IISH material is not owned by the institute but is held on loan. As such it can be retracted by the depositors. The committee approves of the Institute's aim to make clear and binding contracts for these loans.

V.2. NIOD Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies

The Self Evaluation gives an excellent overview of NIOD's activities and ambitions. Mission, goals, and results are evaluated against the background of last year's experiences and future developments. In a transparent and concise style the NIOD's protocol explains the efforts and results of scientific research and societal activities.

The quality of these collections is excellent: library, archives, and collections are of an outstanding and unique quality. They are not only of an extraordinary historical, social, and scientific value, but the collection in itself represents an important emotional beacon of recent Dutch history. The profile of the collections is very coherent. Library, archives, and image collections are built up in relation with the mission and goals of the Institute, and there is a clear view of what should be collected and what should be left to other Institutes.

The integration of the management of the collections (library, archives, and audiovisuals) is a good response to the coming developments in the field of ICT. On the European, national, academic and professional level, the management of the NIOD is active and considered a serious and reliable partner. There are good facilities for the users. Though

the online service has some limitations, it is possible for a researcher to prepare for a visit to the Institute in a thorough and useful way.

The storage space of the NIOD, in the vault of what was once a German bank, is excellent. Temperature and humidity are constant and monitored externally. There is a warning system which alerts the storage staff to any change. Documents are wrapped and boxed in acid-free material. For recent vast acquisitions such as the important Red Cross Archives on World War II, which will be given into the care of the NIOD, external solutions have been found to supplement the limited storage space of the NIOD.

The relevance of the collections is very good to excellent. The NIOD's research into the recent past is linked to future research. The Institute is broadening its perspective to include a more general view of persecution, genocide, and transitional justice.

NIOD is putting a lot of effort into integrated services. The goal is clear: to create a 'virtual search room'. In that way the NIOD is following the path of many other institutions. Their plan to reach this ultimate dream is realistic and pragmatic, through strategic alliances with DANS, National Archives, Royal Library and Brain. Therefore, the productivity of the collections is very good to excellent. The acquisition policy is goal orientated. The NIOD takes part in public activities, and online access on macro- and meso-level is in general possible. Many documents have been digitized, although there is still work to be done towards the digitization of the whole collection.

The NIOD is one of the few organizations in the Dutch scientific field that reaches out to a wider general audience. Their 'Teaching the Teachers' plan is outstanding. And with success: the public considers the NIOD a most reliable and trusted authority. In conclusion, the vitality/feasibility of the collections is very good. NIOD used to work in isolation, but it is now firmly embedded in society and academia alike. The management is slightly defensive about the possibilities of e-Humanities, but that does not mean they do not embrace the possibilities, even if they do not always like the label.

V.3. The Meertens Institute

The self evaluation of the Meertens Institute is a well-documented protocol. Though the Institute is in the middle of an organizational transition, the results of the past and the plans for the coming years are presented in a transparent and convincing way. In the field of its domain the Meertens is a national and international player. Though the Institute has an eye open to the shortcomings and the limits inside and outside the organization, it is certainly not hampered by them. The ambition, written in the chapters of the 2012-2017 research program, is promising and daring.

The Meertens has a large collection of index cards, census materials, and books in the fields of onomastics, ethnology, and linguistics. The quality of the collections is very good. The collections are unique, and they provide the research community dealing with language and Dutch popular culture with an indispensable and invaluable source. The variety of the

collections covers the broad field of everyday culture. Much of the documentation is not yet digitally available.

As the focus has gradually shifted from documentation towards research, the need is apparent for a much more sharply defined acquisition policy, as well as a policy to make the collections digitally accessible. The Institute wants to lead in the field of digital humanities in their fields of inquiry, i.e. language variation and everyday culture. It is looking for alliances on the European level (CLARIN, on which it relies rather heavily). It is working on further digitization and presenting more data on the internet.

Cooperation and clustering of digital activities within the framework of the Academy is strongly favoured by current management. The Meertens is a frontrunner where it concerns building and e-Depot and virtual search rooms. The four institutes are too small to deal with these new developments separately, and collaboration in the digital field is favoured by the committee.

The relevance of the collections is very good. The Institute makes its materials available to researchers from other Institutes, universities, as well as to amateur ethnologists and local historians and the general public. The social relevance of the material is without doubt, most apparent however in the collections that, ironically, the Meertens is thinking of discontinuing: the names database. This policy shows the commitment of the management to scientific research, rather than to its popularity with the general public. This is especially apparent in the attitude towards the onomastics department. This is no longer a scientifically viable research area, which is the reason the management gives for discontinuing its activities. Yet this is the most popular database for the general public, so the Meertens is seeking collaboration with the Bureau of Genealogy to ensure that these name databases will continue to be available.

The vitality/feasibility of the collections is very good. The Meertens Institute was and is very active, and the present image of the Institute is very dynamic. The director knows how to communicate, and the strategic papers for the period 2012-2017 are highly goal oriented. The Institute realizes the impact of ICT developments in its scientific research and responds in an adequate way. The committee noticed remarkable differences in attitude considering the library/archives: the people working in ICT are more ambitious than staff working with the physical part of the archives. Though the data mining of the collections is used effectively and ingeniously with aggregated material on specific subjects, the digital accessibility of the collection as a whole for the general public in contrast, is limited.

The Institute has a strong national and international position with a visible director. Research results draw the attention of society. The biggest problem is in the area of feasibility and project management: there is no effective 'closure' (ending) of projects, no funding for maintenance, and continuity demands can prevent innovation. This means that there's a serious risk of 'orphan projects,' for which even the data are not easily available.

Another problem is the fact that the views of the management are not always shared by the entire staff. The profile of the Meertens is so dependent on the ideas of the director, that some of the staff feel left behind.

The productivity of the collections is very good. Analogue data are kept in an acid free environment, and the audio department is very effective. The committee recommends more collaboration with other institutes in need of similar activities (especially the IISH).

Like the other four institutes, the focus of the Meertens has increasingly become more research-driven. That means documentation and collection building are following the path of the research. Data is collected in the frame of the scientific research. To increase productivity – mostly in research – a new organization is being created: ‘theme groups’ instead of ‘departments’. It is unclear what this will mean for collections. Nevertheless, the relevance for scientific research of the Meertens material is undisputed. The ICT approach of the libraries is old-fashioned; there is no connection to WorldCat and Union Catalogue (GGC).

Until now only a limited part of the analogue data is available on the website. In the coming years huge efforts will have to be made to eliminate this lack of electronic information.

There is no monitoring, no collection plan, no written procedures, no calamity plan. Storage is open, and the Meertens cannot influence the storage room of the adjacent ministry of Justice. Any calamity there – fire, water, pest outbreak – can directly threaten the Meertens’ collections. It is also not clear what the institute has done about the recommendations of the 2006 evaluation. In short, the committee is extremely critical about collection management at the Meertens: it is unacceptably sloppy.

The building may function well for Meertens researchers, but the quality of air and climate in the stacks are not suitable for some of the rarer and more valuable books found there and the monitoring of these seems to be non-existent. To the extent that these valuable items are not heavily used by the researchers of the institute, a more adequate accommodation should be found. This was in the report 5 years ago, but no measures have been taken.

If material can be stored and profitably used somewhere else, the Meertens envisages no obstacles to deaccessioning. The director has an ambiguous attitude towards some of the collections, though not as much as some researchers. This calls for a good ‘de-acquisition’-plan, preferably in cooperation with university library collections and Dutch archival institutions.

V.4 KITLV Royal Netherlands Institute of Southeast Asian and Caribbean Studies

The self evaluation is somewhat overshadowed by the uneasy discussion between the KITLV and the KNAW Board about the institute’s future policy and position in the academic field; discussions were still going on at the time of the site visit.

The KITLV hosts a unique collection about the colonial of The Netherlands past as well as the postcolonial period up to the present with broad scientific and social significance, since this is a past that still interweaves with the present. The Institute is a strong player in its field. The quality of the collections is very good to excellent – and the committee would

not have hesitated to grade the collections 'excellent' if not for the problems in storage. The profile of the collection is of an outstanding quality. The information density is high with an emphasis on the Indonesian topics. Of course this is a logical consequence of the dominance of the East Indies in Dutch colonial politics and the history of the Institute itself.

The Institute is trying to cope with new developments in the digital field. The organization is adapted to the new developments, but resources for digitization projects are limited. The housing problem, and thus the storage problem, is urgent.

The relevance of the collections is very good. For studying the pre-, colonial and post-colonial history of the Dutch colonies the work and collections of the KITLV are indispensable. Especially the work of KITLV Jakarta is of great value and in Indonesia, the KITLV is doing a better job of collecting material than any other place in the world, including the Library of Congress. The KITLV has a collection policy dating from 2008. As the collection plan is more of an overview of past performance, there is an urgent need for a new plan.

The vitality/feasibility of the collections is very good. In view of the difficult relation between KITLV and the Academy, this point was sensitive, although relations seem to be better now. KITLV is operating in several networks: Leiden University, the Royal Academy, National Archives, university libraries (national and international) and research institutes. For future planning the Institute is asked to seek for strategic partners. KITLV has to make clear if it is research or collection driven. If it is research driven, then the collections are supportive. The director of the KITLV considers the National Archives in The Hague and other archival institutes as strategic partners (see for example the project 'The Dutch and the Atlantic World').

The quality of storage for an extremely valuable part of the collection is unacceptable, especially after the renovation plans were cancelled. This was mentioned in previous reports and it has become an extremely urgent matter. Part of the depot is under glass roofs, where highly valuable material (extremely valuable map and photo collections) is stored. It is no exaggeration to say that this is an accident waiting to happen.

The committee appreciates the cost-effective deployment of a small proportion of the KITLV budget (14.5 fte, i.e. less than 5% of budget) through its Jakarta office to facilitate book selection and cataloguing, publishing and translation, conferences and research itself. Over time, even more of KITLV's scholarly functions may be able to be transferred cost-effectively to Jakarta.

The future policy is reaching out for outsourcing. The institute wants to work closely with DANS. Electronic access through the web is possible for several collections. The audiovisual collection is impressive and easily accessible.

The productivity of the collections is very good. Digitization depends on special funds and in combination with partnerships. The distinction between digitization for the protection of valuable documents and digitization for 'content' should be made, and there is need for a clearer acquisition plan. Description standards are modified to raise production. It is not clear on which level the standardization of description and metadata is developed and

implemented. The OCLC system is linking Leiden and Jakarta. The output of the KITLV in cataloguing in digital format is the highest of all the KNAW institutes.

The KITLV shares its digital infrastructure with the university and it should look into the possibility of working even more closely with the Leiden library. KITLV's collections will still have their own identity, even when incorporated in larger frameworks. Similar to the other KNAW-institutes, the KITLV is constantly looking for a balance between a collection-driven and a research-driven approach. The collections are unique; the KNAW stresses the importance of research. To make sure the equilibrium is found, the KITLV should retain its independence.

The Netherlands has the world's most important collections on colonial and pre- as well as post-colonial Indonesia, spread over several institutions (KIT, Bronbeek, Nusantara, NIOD and Museon). Catalogues and digital archives are not entirely connected and can only be partially searched through a single portal. The KITLV should take the initiative to create a portal of this kind.

VI CONCLUSION AND GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Historically, these four institutes started out as documentation centers. More and more research was generated through these institutes over time, and since they became KNAW institutes, the research has become more dominant. The committee found that the transition is not yet complete: a relatively large percentage of staff is still devoted to documentation and collections.

As much as the Academy stimulated research, the state of affairs with the collections is not similarly up to date. The KNAW has been too passive in its efforts to integrate the two aspects of these institutes. Staff devoted to the collections should be trained better in order to prepare the institutes for the future in all aspects of their work. At the moment, all institutes have their own approach to collection managements, which leaves ample room for improvement. There is one exception: The NIOD has an agreement with the National Archives in The Hague about their collection management. By doing so the Institute curtailed the unbridled influx of archives and can concentrate more on their research projects. This is a very positive example how to deal with the abundance of archival material.

The collections are valued highly by both the collections and the research evaluation committees. A matter of concern is the size of the research staff at the institutes compared to the staff that is involved in collection management and public services. In the appendix you will find the figures for 2006 and 2010, based on the fact sheets that were provided by the Academy.

The question arises whether the disproportionate number of staff members involved in collection management can be justified on other grounds than historical ones alone. In light of the findings of the committee for the evaluation of the collections, it would seem possible to economize on effort, staff, and expenditure by more cooperation among the institutes. The Institute that has made most progress in its transition to a full-fledged research institute is the NIOD. But the reduction of the research staff at the IISH and Meertens is worrisome from this perspective. Nowhere has the gap between research and collection management become as big as at IISH.

There is need for a strategy by KNAW, on mutual subjects like: human resources, such as attracting new international talent; financial resources, such as getting more international commitment to support the research and collections; infrastructure, being part of an international infrastructure for the Humanities and what this means for the Dutch Humanities infrastructure as a (leading) node in the global ecosystem; division of tasks, such as reflecting on what (research and collection) tasks are better served elsewhere given the more international approach of research.

Some of the institutions are making steps towards answering these questions, but the approach seems currently fragmented over the institutions. In order for the institutes to face the challenges ahead, they need to work more closely together within and with the

KNAW on the aforementioned mutual subjects. Collaboration and sharing may mean some loss of autonomy, but it also opens up opportunities for a larger value for a wider audience and the willingness of that audience to invest in Humanities.

From this conclusion, the committee wants to make several recommendations; to the Institutes as well as to the Academy:

1. The Committee was unanimous in its conviction that these four Institutes constitute a national and international asset which should be acknowledged and supported even more than they are at present. The Institutes have given Dutch scholarship a presence and reputation in global research in the humanities and social sciences that is unparalleled. Their unique contribution derives from their specialized focus and collections, which have only become more relevant in these times of great financial pressure and intellectual homogenization.

2. The committee believes that while electronic processing of large data sets offers interesting possibilities in some areas (as demonstrated by projects in each of the Institutes evaluated), the application of e-Humanities technologies should not be adopted as an overriding criterion for funding in the humanities. Computation of large data sets is only one methodological approach among many. To do so would be to inappropriately privilege one approach unlikely to produce seminal results in other areas.

3. The committee appreciates the separate identities of the Institutes, but recommends more collaboration among them. This does not imply the need for relocation or centralisation. The location of KITLV in Leiden appears logical and necessary, because of the complimentary collections of KITLV and UBL, the sharing of PhD students on a large scale, and the development of Leiden as the national centre for transregional global studies.

4. The committee was impressed with the internal accountability system adopted by KITLV, determining the expectations for productivity in relation to the time of each staff classed as research-related. We recommend that other KNAW humanities institutes adopt similar procedures, making future evaluations more meaningful.

5. The committee was concerned by the current balance in age and gender in the institutes, most prominent in Meertens and the IISH. This is a consequence of past hiring strategies, and because this is a generation about to retire, there is a threat (knowledge might be lost) as well as an opportunity: to reorganize staff and find new researchers. The committee recommends that the model for KNAW Institutes in the Humanities should be a nodal structure in which the institutes play a galvanic role for international and national networks. A key recommendation in this connection is to reserve a proportion of KNAW-funded posts for competitive fixed-term appointments (typically 1-3 years) of scholars both from Dutch universities and from abroad.

The Committee recommends that each Institute formulate a mid- to long-term personnel plan to take account of the following conditions: schedule of retirements, balance between tenured and temporary appointments, age spread among tenured staff, gender representation, and ratio between research and collections staff. The goal is greater flexibility and dynamism, for example, by increasing the number of younger researchers and temporary appointments in respect to tenured staff and shifting the proportion of staff from collections to research. NIOD's good practice of involving postdocs could increasingly be adopted by other institutes.

6. The Committee recommends that the institutes strengthen their existing relations with universities, including those with PhD students, postdocs, visiting researchers, and collaborative projects. These relations have already proved valuable and should be expanded wherever possible. Because the institutes perform an intensive and focused research function that present-day universities typically cannot, these relationships benefit the universities and their students as much as they do the Institutes.

7. One final general recommendation for all institutes: find out more about your users, through surveys, but also through analytical tools for websites.

8. A more general collection policy should be put into place as a consequence of creating a specific SEP-C. At the moment, collection policies are often implicit, and it would be useful to formulate general goals and guidelines on the basis of which individual policies could be described. The same is true for the ICT and research environments. The academy should explicitly encourage and support collaboration and expertise sharing within the Academy, especially in the field of digitization. The individual institutes should embrace this opportunity with or without KNAW support

9. The Committee recommends that KNAW revise the SEP and the SEP-C to make comparisons more easy and relevant. At the moment, international criteria do not always apply; this can be a drawback for research with a Dutch focus, as often practiced by the NIOD and Meertens. Also, the SEP leaves too much room for interpretation; the numbers provided to the committee were disparate and difficult to interpret.

10. The Committee is persuaded that the Academy should provide a clearly stated policy of support for the institutes so that they can formulate their strategic plans for the future. The institutes are one of the most important pillars of the prestige of the Academy internationally in the humanities and social sciences and as such should be supported. In The Netherlands, the universities may be more well-known than the institutes, but internationally, the face of Dutch research is visible primarily thanks to these institutes.

APPENDIX

A Comparison of FTEs in the Institutes

	2006	2010
IISH		
Research	16.0	11.6
Collections	38.6	41.1
NIOD		
Research	14.6	28.6
Collections	19.0	18.4
Meertens		
Research	20.9	16.3
Collections	13.7	13.0
KITLV		
Research	11.2	11.9
Collections	20.5	20.6
Total		
Research	62.7	68.4
Collections	91.8	93.1
	154.5	161.5