

**Research Review  
of  
Arts and Social Sciences,  
Maastricht University  
2005-2010**

# Table of Contents

---

## **Preface**

- 1. The review procedure and the external review committee**
- 2. General Remarks**
- 3. Assessment at the institute level**
- 4. Assessment per programme/institute**
  - a) Research Programme “Politics and Culture in Europe” (PCE)**
  - b) Research Programme “Science, Technology and Society” (STS)**
  - c) Research Programme “Arts, Media and Culture” (AMC)**
  - d) The Globalisation and Development Initiative (GDI)**
  - e) Sociaal Historisch Centrum voor Limburg (SHCL)**

**Appendix A: Short curriculum vitae of the committee members**

**Appendix B: Schedule site visit**

**Appendix C: SEP criteria and scores**

# Preface

---

Visitations and research evaluations are an arduous but necessary and important task. That task was made easier by the agreeable mix of collegial personalities and of fields of expertise gathered in this committee, by the thorough preparation and extensive documentation furnished by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, by the hospitable reception given to the committee during the on-site visit, and by the frank and friendly spirit in which staff members engaged with our queries during the interviews.

I would also like to express my special appreciation for the invaluable support provided by the committee's secretary, Sylvia Bastiaanssen.

**Prof. dr J.Th. Leerssen**  
chair

# 1. The review procedure and the external review committee

---

## **The Review Committee**

In January 2011, the Executive Board of the Maastricht University, in consultation with the Board of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences (FASoS), decided to carry out an external evaluation of the research of the Research Institute for Arts and Social Sciences. In accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 for Research Assessment in the Netherlands (SEP), the review procedure included self-evaluation documents provided by the institute and an assessment by an external peer evaluation committee. On 18 January 2011, the Executive Board of the Maastricht University appointed as members:

Prof.dr. Joep Leerssen (University of Amsterdam; chair);  
Prof.dr. Desmond Dinan (George Mason University);  
Prof.dr. Astrid Erll (Goethe-Universität Frankfurt /Main);  
Prof.dr. Thomas F. Gieryn (Indiana University, Bloomington);  
Prof.dr. David E. Nye (University of Southern Denmark);  
Prof.dr. Patricia Pisters (University of Amsterdam);  
Prof.dr. Helen Wallace CMG FBA (London School of Economics).

A short curriculum vitae of the members is given in appendix A.

Drs. Sylvia Bastiaanssen was appointed as secretary to the committee.

As part of the assessment, the Committee visited the Faculty in September 2011.

## **Independence**

All members of the Committee signed a declaration and disclosure form to safeguard that the panel members judge without bias, personal preference or personal interest, and the judgment is made without undue influence from the Institute, the programmes or other stakeholders. Any existing professional relationships between Committee members and programmes under review were reported and discussed in the Committee meeting. The Committee concluded that there was no risk in terms of bias or undue influence.

## **Data provided to the Committee**

The Review Committee received detailed documentation consisting of the following parts:

1. Self-Evaluation Report Research Institute for Arts and Social Sciences 2005-2010, with appendices.
2. Self-Evaluation Report Executive Summary.
3. Letter Executive Board, dated 23 June 2011.
4. Key articles and books arranged by programme or institute (five articles and books of book chapter per research programme and three per institute).

## **Procedures followed by the Review Committee**

In accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP), the Review Committee based the assessments on the self-evaluation documents provided by the Institute, the key publications and the interviews with the management, with the leaders of the programmes, and with a considerable number of individual staff members. The interviews took place in September 2011 (see the schedule in Appendix B) on location at the Institute.

The SEP (chapter 3, p. 8/11) requires the Review Committee to assess the research on four main aspects, namely:

- Quality*
- Productivity*
- Societal relevance*
- Vitality & feasibility.*

These four main SEP-criteria are elaborated in the table in appendix C.

The ratings used are:

- Excellent (5)*
- Very good (4)*
- Good (3)*
- Satisfactory (2)*
- Unsatisfactory (1)*

The meaning of these scores is explained in appendix C, based on the SEP, chapter 3 (p.12).

Before the meetings, the members were requested to use checklists for their provisional judgment, to be used as starting points for discussions. The members used these lists individually (before the gathering of the committee) for their provisional judgment, because they were seen mainly as starting points for discussions with the other members during the site visit. The use of this checklist did not in any way imply that the final score was an average of all scores. The final score was only given after careful consideration by the entire committee.

The Committee's assessment at the institute level primarily focused on strategy and organization, whereas the programme assessment primarily focused on performance and activities of researchers and the results of their work (output and outcome). At the institute level, the Committee paid explicit attention to the (policy regarding) education and training of PhD students.

In this evaluation report, each section opens with a factual-descriptive summary of the Institute and its Programmes and Centres, followed by the Committee's assessment, summarized in the figures assigned per performance category as stipulated in the Standard Evaluation Protocol. At the smaller level of the Programmes and Centres, the relationship between description, comments, evaluative figures and recommendations will be so obvious as to require no typographical emphasis or phraseological belabouring.

## 2. General Remarks

---

The experiences of evaluation committees during their on-site visits may also reflect back on the procedural parameters established for them and for the Faculty concerned, and some of these should be brought to the attention, not just of those parties involved but also of the authorities who established the Standard Evaluation Protocol.

Two such points came to the Committee's notice during this evaluation visit.

[1] The evaluative category of “Relevance” can cover various forms of academic outreach. The committee found it necessary to apply it in slightly different meanings in different cases, ranging from interaction with decision makers in public institutions to successful popularizing publications offering academically-informed reflection to the cultural field-at-large. In future, the SEP may wish to distinguish between such nuances of outreach, valorization and impact.

[2] As the committee are fully aware, the bibliometric classification and evaluation of research output is a vexed affair subject to strenuous debates in different sections of the academic field. It may be advisable to map the types of publication as used for evaluation purposes and in SEP as closely as possible onto those now used in Faculty output registration (METIS systems and the like). The definition and usage of certain publication categories such as “professional” may stand in need of some adjustment.

# 3. Assessment at the institute level

---

## The Research Institute for Arts and Social Sciences

*Director of the Research Institute:* dr. Th. Conzelmann

*Dean of the Faculty:* prof. dr. R. de Wilde

*Programme leaders:* prof. dr. T. Blom; prof. dr. ir. W. Bijker; prof. dr. A. Knotter; prof. dr. M. Meijer; prof. dr. V. Mazzucato; prof. dr. S. Wyatt.

*Research staff 2010:* 67.8 fte.

The Research Institute for Arts and Social Sciences focuses on societies and cultures as they unfolded during the modern and contemporary era. The researchers study the interrelationships of Europeanization, globalization, scientific and technological development, political change and cultural innovation. They are interested in how today's societies cope with these challenges through practices of remembrance; governance techniques; strategies for managing knowledge, technologies and risks; and ways of dealing with diversity and inequality. Their traditional focus on the development of societies and cultures in Western Europe is increasingly juxtaposed by a focus on the whole of Europe and on global affairs.

The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at Maastricht University was established in 1994. Its Research Institute encompasses and organizes all research conducted by the academic staff of the Faculty. The main organizational format through which the research is conducted are (currently three) research programmes called 1. Politics and Culture in Europe (PCE); 2. Science, Technology, and Society Studies (STS); 3. Arts, Media and Culture (AMC). Each programme comprises around 30 researchers. An additional fourth programme has been developed: the Globalization and Development Initiative (GDI).

Apart from the research programmes, there are research centres housed by or associated with the Faculty: the Centre for Gender and Diversity (CGD); the Virtual Knowledge Studio (M-VKS); and the Sociaal Historisch Centrum voor Limburg (SHCL, Centre for the Social History of Limburg). While the CGD and the M-VKS are integrated into the AMC and the STS programme respectively, the SHCL is an independent entity.

The Research Institute unites the research being done in the programmes and centres of the faculty in a common organizational framework. A director who also acts as the Associate Dean of Research leads the Research Institute, while the heads of the research programmes and centres are responsible for the management of their entities. The HRM aspects of the research institute are dealt with by the academic departments (Philosophy, History, Literature & Art, Technology & Society Studies, Political Science) of the faculty jointly with the Faculty Board.

*(Committee recommendations are given in **bold**)*

Over the past five years, the faculty has undergone a process of substantial growth and consolidation. That achievement, which in no small measure may be credited to the Dean's leadership and commitment to research, is commendable. Research at the Maastricht Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences is now in every respect a fully-fledged participant in the Dutch research community, in some cases firmly established in the national or even international forefront. A point of concern registered in earlier evaluations, viz. the relatively low rate of successful PhD thesis completion, continues to be a worry, but the committee realize that this is to some measure a nationwide problem for Arts and Social Sciences. In addition, the newly

established Graduate School appears to have tackled the problem of tracking and supporting PhD researchers and has expressed confidence that their efforts will in the coming years show improved PhD throughput. The committee notes with special appreciation that the Graduate School dovetails its local support for PhD researchers with continued commitment to the nationwide disciplinary support offered by the National Research Institutes and Graduate Schools. This commitment is also evinced by Maastricht's role as administrative centre for the KNAW-accredited Netherlands Graduate Research School of Science, Technology and Modern Culture (WTMC). **The committee recommends that the Faculty and its Graduate School continue their efforts to acquire promising PhD projects and candidates and to bring them to the completion of their degrees.**

This recommendation should be seen in the light of possible trend reversals in the coming period. Much of the Faculty's fine performance in the past five-year period was predicated on a pattern of growth, in the form of burgeoning student enrolment (which yielded more research potential for a growing staff) and in the form of successful grant applications. It may well be that student numbers and the availability of second-stream funding will in the near future begin to decline. Maintaining and consolidating the growth patterns of recent years will then become an arduous task. The Dean's commitment to sustaining all parts of the Faculty's research palette, in the face of possible future losses of resources, has been noted and appreciated.

The Faculty's personnel and HR management must be praised for its prudent and often inspired hiring policies, which, in accordance with recommendations from previous evaluations, have done much to attract national and international expertise and talent and to prepare the Faculty for inevitable generational turnover. However, HR policies for the position of junior research staff at the level of "lecturer" are a point of concern. Teaching loads are high, expectations for research productivity are unclear, and prospects for tenure (or other long-term appointments) are equally ambiguous. Since lecturers' work is thought of highly enough to include two publications by lecturers among the faculty's "key publications", surely their position deserves a careful and caring recalibration, in line with other policies for various types of post-PhD researchers. **The committee recommends that the faculty instigate a dialogue with junior and non-tenured research staff to clarify expectations and long-term prospects.** The instrument of granting microcredits of "seed money" to individual researchers is highly useful; **the committee recommends a vigorous protection of such "trickle irrigation" stimulants.**

A salient feature of the Faculty is its location, acentric within the Netherlands and close to a Belgian and German hinterland. This is reflected in an international mixture both of students and staff, and the fact that English enjoys an established position as a working language. If the Faculty were to project its achievements as a research environment into the future, it may consider using this situation to better advantage, as a trans-border regional beacon or "hub" along a Cologne-Brussels axis. This would involve an increased use of the rich "branding" potential of the Maastricht name towards increased scholarly visibility in trying to achieve beacon status as a landmark or centre for transnational research cooperation. Attracting editorships of leading journals, hosting conferences or lecture series in the respective programme areas, and making more use of visiting lecturerships would aid in broadcasting local research agendas as a visible and recognizable "Maastricht programme" in the academic field at large.

Increased visibility (which would depend upon **an improved and more easily navigable web presence**) also implies **the use of the Maastricht "biotope"**, its urban/cultural environment, as a platform for outreach and valorization. The committee expect that, in the future, increased value will be placed [a] on the outreach of academic insights for the benefit of the public at large (not only by means of printed publications, but also by means of different cultural and communicative disseminations) and [b] on influence among decision makers in public administration, politics and commerce. Conversely, research themes in all programmes and centres may explore the potential of drawing on the availability of research library collections, also those of a more historical nature, and on data and research collaborations in the vicinity, both locally and in the adjacent regions across the Dutch border. The committee's observations and recommendations with regard to the SHCL and GDI centres may well be applicable to the Faculty at large.

The Faculty's organizational matrix, while not always easily comprehensible, has stood its research in good stead over the past years. Interdisciplinary research structures should not, however, be allowed to shackle individual or disciplinary-based research; that danger may become more pronounced if the future targets set within the organizational matrix should be unduly challenging. An over-extended ambition in target-setting may well prove counterproductive.

A faculty bracketing the methodologies of Arts and Social Sciences is in a unique position to allow the three dimensions of empirical analysis, philosophical/theoretical reflection and diachronic/historical extension to cross-fertilize. In the matrix structure as organized at present, the third of these three may be at risk of dilution across the different compartments. **Spontaneous individual or disciplinary research ambitions and collaborative trends across matrix compartments should be given room to develop**; this desideratum may apply particularly to researchers in the historical sciences. For such researchers (but not only for them) library facilities are of paramount importance. **Future self-evaluations should include reports on the faculty's library policy** (both intramural and in the setting of the municipal and regional "biotope").

The Faculty's policy of bibliometrically stimulating research output in the direction of refereed journal articles serves an aim which the Committee fully endorse. The Committee also noted with approval the Faculty's realization that monographs and edited collections may for many specialisms in the Humanities continue to be among the most substantial and impact-rich form of publication. **The Committee recommend that the Faculty maintain a careful balance between these two principles**, complex though that is, on the basis of collegial input from all specializations concerned.

**Quality: 4**

**Productivity: 4**

**Relevance: 5**

**Vitality and Feasibility: 4**

## 4. Assessment of the Research Programmes

---

### a) Research Programme “Politics and Culture in Europe” (PCE)

*Programme director:* prof. dr. T. Blom

*Programme coordinators:* prof. dr. T. Christiansen; dr. N. Randeraad; prof. dr. S. Vanhoonacker.

*Research staff 2010:* 17.7 fte

The research programme Politics and Culture in Europe (PCE) seeks to understand and explain the process of European integration and its political, institutional and ideational characteristics. It does so by taking into account the historical and cultural contexts as well as the international, if not yet ‘global’ context of EU policy making. Topics range from reflections on the history and democratic credentials of the EU polity to the empirical and theoretical analysis of Europeanization processes; from research on the EU’s foreign and security policy to the study of Euroscepticism in its different forms; from scrutiny of administrative cultures and bureaucratic politics at the national and supranational levels to historical research on the constitutive role of statistics for state and polity building.

This programme has been very successful in attracting large numbers of students and simultaneously building a solid and productive research agenda organized around a clear focus. A steady output of research findings had been maintained, often with international publishers. The programme is among the leading ones nationally and has positive visibility internationally; leadership and a good collegial organization have helped to ensure this robust position, and the programme has made excellent use of the scholarly and academic resources at its disposal. The political and social relevance of the programme is beyond doubt.

The programme’s productivity-oriented strategy may however need some recalibration for the coming period. In the present situation (the prospect of diminishing student numbers and funding resources for relatively narrow-focused EU courses and research projects, not least because of the profound transitions facing Europe), PCE may need to rethink its focal point (“Administrative Governance”) and its overall direction both in quantitative terms and in a conceptual sense. Overly ambitious quantitative targets (numbers of papers in refereed journals) may shift attention away from programmatic innovation and would thus become detrimental to the group’s intellectual edge. It may be necessary to develop research emphases besides Administrative Governance in order to maintain dynamism and topicality. The acquisition of a Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence is a notable achievement that will reinforce the Programme’s international position and, linked to a recent professorial appointment, inspires confidence in the vision and future of PCE.

**Quality: 4**

**Productivity: 4**

**Relevance: 4**

**Viability and feasibility: 4**

## b) Research Programme “Science, Technology and Society” (STS)

*Programme director:* prof. dr. ir. W. Bijker

*Programme coordinators:* prof. dr. K. Bijsterveld; prof. dr. T. Swierstra; dr. J. Wachelder; prof. dr. S. Wyatt (M-VKS)

*Research staff 2010:* 21.7 fte

The aim of the STS Research Programme is to study science-technology-society relations: the social construction of science and technology, the techno-scientific constitution of society, and the interactions between science and technology. The emphasis of Maastricht STS research is on ‘*cultures of innovation*’. The main topics studied by the programme are: Governance of risk and vulnerability, Technological cultures of sound, Media technologies in knowledge and culture, Scientific research and innovation cultures, and Techno-moral change. The STS programme also hosts the Maastricht Virtual Knowledge Studio (M-VKS), which forms an integrated part of the STS programme, but was administered separately during the assessment period because of its relationship to the KNAW.

Under Wiebe Bijker's leadership, STS has developed from having an already strong organizational structure towards enjoying a vibrant organizational culture. The tradition of excellence that has been cultivated in STS will very likely survive the inevitable retirements of its founders. Thanks to judicious appointments, the award of a substantial and prestigious VICI incentive, and successful collaboration with the Virtual Knowledge Studio, this research programme is poised to maintain in the future its excellent track record and internationally leading position. This field of research is no longer the virgin territory that it was when the Maastricht STS group first arrived on the scene; new trends, initiatives and groups are emerging worldwide which will in time confront STS with fresh competition. However, the programme has an excellent perception of new developments around them and is prepared to play into these changes or indeed anticipate them. The supervision and support for a new generation of researchers is well organized locally as well as in the national research institute WTMC.

A research programme of this excellence sheds lustre on the Faculty and the University, and we believe that its accomplishments deserve to be shared widely both within and outside the academy.

**Quality: 5**

**Productivity: 5**

**Relevance: 5**

**Viability and feasibility: 5**

## c) Research Programme “Arts, Media and Culture” (AMC)

*Programme director:* prof. dr. M. Meijer

*Coordinators:* dr. A. Swinnen (CGD); prof. dr. R. van de Vall; dr. G. Verbeeck; dr. L. Wesseling.

*Research staff 2010:* 16.5 fte

The AMC programme studies how developments in the arts and in the media relate to socio-cultural and political changes. AMC researchers are interested in the ways in which cultural artefacts and practices operate as socially and politically shaping forces. They study the spectrum of high-brow, middle-brow and low-brow culture, ranging from poems and installation artworks to political essays, monuments and digital games. What unites these inquiries is the interest in the practices through which they are produced, distributed and received. The researchers of this programme are united by a foundation in the hermeneutic tradition, and they use methods and concepts from reception studies, post-phenomenology, on- and offline ethnography and anthropological field work in order to come to terms with readership, spectatorship, and the rise of new types of audiences. In 2009 the Centre for Gender and Diversity (CGD) became part of the programme. The focal point is ‘Cultural Memory and Diversity’.

In a Faculty where the notions of culture and media are all-pervasive but not always thoroughly reflected upon or theorized, the Programme of Arts, Media and Culture occupies a crucial position. AMC researchers alone can offer challenging and informed operationalizations of the faculty's key concepts, and a proper humanities perspective, to researchers in other programmes.

AMC has faced a period of transitions which appear to have been excellently handled, resulting in an integrated and collegial team of researchers. The comparatively high number of "lecturer"-ranked collaborators, with a low amount of research time, may affect the overall research output of this programme adversely in quantitative terms. AMC has performed admirably in maintaining high-quality visibility in its Dutch-language publications, with excellent relevance and outreach that informs cultural reflection in society at large. In addition, they have managed to achieve a growing visibility internationally.

The fact that AMC has not yet been able to deliver a solid output of refereed international publications commensurable with other research programmes, places the overall performance of AMC lower than that of several individually-productive researchers. While the Committee salutes the appointment of Van de Vall, improvement in the coming period will depend on effective replacements for chairs now approaching pension age.

AMC's research focus on Cultural Memory and Diversity is a good extrapolation of the expertise and interests of the researchers and has functioned well in the merger between the former programme and the now-integrated Centre for Gender and Diversity. However, it may be more emphatically presented as the common factor in the various research projects as a joint programmatic concern; it may not yet provide a sufficiently unifying programmatic basis for the formulation of joint projects. Here, as in other parts of the faculty, the development of a shared "Maastricht programme" would be beneficial, and that may need to rely more on a methodological or operational focus than on a thematic or substantive one.

**Quality: 3**

**Productivity: 3**

**Relevance: 5**

**Viability and feasibility: 4**

## d) “The Globalisation and Development Initiative” (GDI)

*Programme director:* prof. dr. V. Mazzucato

*Coordinators:* dr. D. Schans, dr. C. Leonards.

*Research staff 2010:* 5.8 fte

The Globalisation and Development Initiative (GDI) was established in October 2008 to bring together new and existing research conducted within FASoS focusing on the Global South (developing countries as well as recently emerging economic powers such as Brazil, Russia, India and China). The GDI centres on exploring the linkages between the Global South and the rest of the world as well as within the Global South. Researchers use political economy and transnational approaches to investigate such linkages. GDI focuses on three specific areas which give the initiative its own distinctive profile. The first is transnational migration, the second area is the interaction between transnational movements and local civil society actors and the third theme is research on transnational cultures of development.

This new initiative is off to a flying start with the appointment of a promising and energetic professor, the involvement of an internationally highly regarded scholar on a part-time basis, and a clear research focus emphasizing transnational issues. The committee note in passing that the dovetailing of [i] a postcolonial world-system view of global power relations and exchanges with [ii] the approach of multi-sited ethnography may be more effectively presented if the notion of Transnationalism is explicitly incorporated into the Initiative's self-description. The Committee also note that the method of multi-sited ethnography creates heavy budgetary demands that may be challenging to sustain during fiscal retrenchment.

GDI is an excellent response to the University's policy of situating European affairs in a more global context. At this early stage, the Committee can only endorse and encourage the GDI's ambitions, while pointing out that case studies of migrant experiences need not restrict themselves to the Dutch trading metropolises but can, also over a slightly longer (pre-1980) historical period, fruitfully examine experiences in cities and mining industries along the Cologne-Aachen-Liège-Brussels axis. Both in considering its future working cases and in addressing the trans-European world, GDI can and should be a force for two-way synergies with other research programmes and centres.

**Quality: 5**

**Productivity: 4**

**Relevance: 4**

**Viability and feasibility: 5**

## e) Research Institute “Sociaal Historisch Centrum voor Limburg” (SHCL)

*Programme director:* prof. dr. A. Knotter

*Coordinator:* dr. W. Rutten

*Research staff 2010:* 1.8 fte

The *Sociaal Historisch Centrum voor Limburg* (SHCL) was founded in 1949. It is an independent research facility, connected to FASoS. It provides a research infrastructure for comparative regional history by giving access to historical sources, maintenance of a library collection, developing research, publication of a yearbook and a dissertation series. The SHCL conducts research in the field of historical border studies and the comparative history of mining and mining regions.

In the past period, this centre, which continues to serve as a regional documentation centre with extramural funding, has found an energetic fresh research focus and potential for academic expansion in taking regional history from its introspective local-documentary base towards an internationally comparative analytical context. Following on a policy of involving historians and cases from adjacent regions across the border, the SHCL has now situated the Maastricht/Limburg region in the international framework of Border Studies. This has resulted both in excellent high-quality publications and in a viable and academically promising vision for future research.

The SHCL is an excellent example of fruitfully combining local "roots" with an international outlook and relevance, and of combining an obvious social/cultural outreach with high academic research standards. It can in this respect count as an example to the faculty at large and as a possible concourse or point of reference for historians in other programmes. Greater integration of the centre with other parts of the Faculty, e.g. by means of collaborative projects, would be mutually beneficial. An obvious weakness lies in the very tenuous staffing of the centre, which ought to be bolstered both at mid-ranking and at junior (PhD/postdoc) level.

**Quality: 4**

**Productivity: 5**

**Relevance: 4**

**Viability and feasibility: 5**

## Appendix A: Curriculum Vitae of the committee members

### Chair: Prof. dr. Joep Leerssen

Academy Professor and Chair of Modern European Literature  
University of Amsterdam  
Dept. of European Studies

Joep Leerssen studied Comparative Literature and English at the University of Aachen and Anglo-Irish Studies at University College Dublin; he took his PhD in 1986 cum laude at the University of Utrecht. Since 1991 he has held the Chair of Modern European Literature at the Universiteit van Amsterdam and has co-directed its programme in European Studies. He was also in charge of launching the University's faculty-wide Research Master's Programme in Literary Studies. Additionally he served from 1996 until 2006 as director of the Huizinga Institute. His work moves in four contiguous fields: Irish intercultural history, the theory of national stereotyping; the history of romantic nationalism in Europe; the history of the humanities. He is a member of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, Honorary Member of the Royal Irish Academy and Honorary Fellow of Trinity College Dublin. In 2003 he held a visiting chair at Harvard University as Erasmus Lecturer; he held the Parnell Fellowship at Magdalene College Cambridge in 2008-09, was awarded the Spinoza Prize in 2008 and a KNAW Academy Professorship in 2010.

### Prof. dr. Desmond Dinan

Professor of Public Policy and Ad personam Jean Monnet Professor  
George Mason University  
School of Public Policy

Desmond Dinan is Professor of Public Policy; Director, International Commerce and Policy Program and holds the Jean Monnet Chair in European Public Policy at George Mason University. He has been an adviser to the European Commission in Brussels and a Visiting Fellow at the Netherlands Institute for International Relations, The Hague. He was a Visiting Professor at the College of Europe, Bruges campus (1998-2000) and the College of Europe, Natolin campus (2005-2008). His research interests include the historiography of European integration; the history of the European Union (EU); institutions and governance of the EU; enlargement of the EU; regional integration in the context of globalization; and prospects for global governance. He has written several books on the EU and, since 1999, has written the article on institutions and governance for the Journal of Common Market Studies' highly regarded annual review of developments in the EU. He has received the George Mason University Student Government "Professor of the Year" Award for Excellence in Instruction and the School of Public Policy's annual teaching award. Professor Dinan is a native of Ireland and a permanent resident of the United States.

Areas of Research: European Union Governance and Institutions, Global Governance.

### Prof. dr. Astrid Erll

(Anglistik: Literatur-/Kulturwissenschaft)  
Institut für England- und Amerikastudien  
Neue Englischsprachige Literaturen und Kulturen  
Goethe Universität, Frankfurt/ Main

Astrid Erll is Professor of Anglophone Literatures and Cultures at Goethe-University Frankfurt am Main. From 2007 to 2010 she was Professor of English Literature and Culture at Wuppertal University. She studied English, German and Psychology, and took her Ph.D. at Giessen University in 2002 (Habilitation 2006). In 2009/10 she spent a year at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study. Her main fields of interest are comparative literature and cultural history, memory studies, postcolonial studies, media theory, and narratology. Publications include an introduction to memory studies (*Kollektives Gedächtnis*, 2005 / *Memory in Culture*, 2011) and a book on the medial representations of the "Indian Mutiny" (*Praemediation - Remediation*, 2007). With A. Nuenning she is general editor of the series "Media and Cultural Memory" (de Gruyter, since 2004) and co-editor of *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook* (2008). With A. Rigney she edited *Mediation, Remediation and the Dynamics of Cultural Memory* (2009).

**Prof. dr. Thomas Gieryn**

Ruby Professor and chair  
Department of Sociology  
College of Arts and Sciences  
Indiana University Bloomington

Professor Gieryn received the B.A. Magna Cum Laude from Kalamazoo College (1972) and the Ph.D. in Sociology from Columbia University in New York (1980). He joined the Department of Sociology at IU in 1978, and has also taught at Nankai University (Tianjin, China) and at Cornell University. In 1996-97, Professor Gieryn was The Ralph and Doris Hansmann Member in the School of Social Science at the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton. Professor Gieryn's research centers on the sociology of science: how can science be understood as a social, cultural, historical and human endeavor? His earliest work focused on problem-choice: how scientists go about choosing problems for investigation. He then turned his attention to the cultural authority of science as an institution. Why is scientific knowledge routinely accepted as credible? Most recently, Professor Gieryn has investigated the epistemic significance of place. Of what consequence are geographic location and even architecture for the process of knowledge-making? His book *Cultural Boundaries of Science: Credibility On the Line*, was published by the University of Chicago Press in 1999, and won the Robert K. Merton Book Award from the Section on Science, Knowledge and Technology of the American Sociological Association (incidentally, a prize named for Professor Gieryn's mentor at Columbia). His research has been supported by grants from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and the National Science Foundation. In 1990-94, Professor Gieryn served on the Advisory Board of the exhibition on "Science in American Life" at the Smithsonian's National Museum of American History. He has been awarded the Edwin H. Sutherland Teaching Award from the Department of Sociology (1982), and the President's Award for Distinguished Teaching (1994). Professor Gieryn was appointed Rudy Professor of Sociology in the College of Arts and Sciences in 2000, and Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs in 2009.

**Prof. dr. David Nye**

Professor of American History  
Center for American Studies  
University of Southern Denmark

David E. Nye graduated from Amherst College and completed his MA and PhD at the University of Minnesota. He has taught American studies in the United States, Spain, the Netherlands, and Denmark, and lectured throughout Europe on American history and culture. The 16 books he has edited or written include *Electrifying America* (winner of the Dexter Prize and the Abel Wolman Award), *American Technological Sublime*, *Narratives and Spaces*, and *Consuming Power: A Social History of American Energies*. He also served as the narrator and one of the scriptwriters for the eight part Danish television series, "Inventing Modern America." As the first chair of Odense's Center for American Studies, he founded the OASIS publication series in 1992. Formerly President of the Danish Association for American Studies and Vice-President of the Nordic Association for American Studies, he co-edited the journal, *American Studies in Scandinavia* from 1996 to 2003. He has been a visiting scholar at Harvard, MIT; the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study, Leeds, Cambridge, Notre Dame, and Warwick. his *America as Second Creation: Technology and Narratives of New Beginnings* (MIT, April, 2003) was nominated for the Pulitzer Prize. He received the 2005 Leonardo da Vinci Medal from the Society for the History of Technology, its highest honor. His *Technology Matters: Questions to Live With* (2006), has also appear in French and German translation, and received the Sally Hacker Prize in 2009. His most recent book is *When the Lights Went Out* (2010).

**Prof. dr. P.P.R.W. (Patricia) Pisters**

Professor of Film Studies  
University of Amsterdam  
Faculty of Humanities

Patricia Pisters is professor of Film Studies and head of the department of Media Studies. She studied English, French and Film Studies in Nijmegen, Paris and Amsterdam . In 1993 she started to work as guest lecturer at the department of Film- and Television Studies of the University of Amsterdam. In

1998 she defended her PhD-thesis *From Eye to Brain* on the philosophical work of Gilles Deleuze and its significance for film theory.

She has been a contributing editor to film magazine *Skrien*, a collaborator of the International Film Festival Rotterdam and advisor of the Dutch Fund for Cultural Broadcast Productions. She is member of the advisory board of DDG (Dutch Directors Guild). In 2010 she was research fellow at the IKKM (Internationales Kolleg für Kulturtechnikforschung und Medienphilosophie) of the Bauhaus University in Weimar. Her current research focuses on the relationship between digital screen culture, philosophy and neuroscience. Her book *The Neuro-Image: A Deleuzian Filmphilosophy for Digital Screen Culture* is forthcoming with Stanford University Press. In July 2010 she co-directed with Rosi Braidotti (University of Utrecht) the third Deleuze Studies Conference Connect, Continue, Create ([www.deleuze-amsterdam.nl](http://www.deleuze-amsterdam.nl)) which included among other events a summer school Mille Gilles and a double art exhibition *The Smooth and the Striated*.

**Prof. dr. Helen Wallace CMG FBA**

Emeritus Centennial Professor

European Institute

London School of Economics and Political Science

Professor Helen Wallace became a Centennial Professor in the European Institute at the London School of Economics and Political Science in September 2007. She is also Honorary Professor at the University of Sussex. Previously she held posts at the European University Institute, the University of Sussex, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, the Civil Service College and UMIST, and she also directed the Economic and Social Research Council's "One Europe or Several?" Programme (1998-2001). She has had visiting assignments at universities and research institutes across Europe and in the United States. She is a leading expert on the politics of European integration, on which she has authored and coauthored numerous publications. She also contributes to public debates on European issues and periodically acts as an adviser on European policy to public bodies in the UK and to the European Union institutions.

## **Appendix B: Schedule site visit Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Maastricht University**

### **Wednesday, 14 September**

Arrival of committee members at hotel Derlon

20:00 Get-to know dinner for the committee and the secretary (no FASoS involvement)

### **Thursday 15 September – Spiegelzaal**

9:00 Opening and welcome (committee; G. Mols, rector UM; R. de Wilde, dean FASoS; T. Conzelmann, research director FASoS)

9:30 Meeting with PCE programme (committee / PCE team: Tannelie Blom; Sophie Vanhoonacker; Nico Randerad; Thomas Christiansen)

10:30 Internal discussion (committee) – room 0.001

10:45 *Break*

11:00 Meeting with AMC programme (committee / AMC team: Lies Wesseling, Maaïke Meijer; Renee van de Vall; Aagje Swinnen; Georgi Verbeeck)

12:00 Internal discussion (committee) – room 0.001

12:15 Meeting with SHCL (committee / SHCL team: Ad Knotter; Willibrord Rutten)

13:00 Internal discussion+ Lunch (committee) – room 0.001

14:00 Meeting with Faculty Board (committee / FB: Rein de Wilde; André Koehorst; Thomas Conzelmann)

14:45 Meeting with Graduate School (committee / T. Swierstra, director GS; T. Conzelmann, former director GS; I. Raaijmakers, PhD representative in GS Board; G. Somsen, academic coordinator GS)

15:45 Internal discussion (committee) – room 0.001

16:00 *Break*

16:15 Open hour (time for exchange between committee and individual academic staff members)

18:00 Internal discussion (committee) – room 0.001

18:15 End of meetings

19:30 *Dinner in Restaurant Petit Bonheur (Kapoestraat 32) (committee / dean, heads of the research programmes and centres, director GS, research director, PhD representative)*

21:30 *End of day*

## Friday, 16 September – Spiegelzaal & Turnzaal

- 8:30 Meeting with the GDI (committee / GDI team; Valentina Mazzucato; Djamila Schans; Kim Caarls; Chris Leonards)
- 9:15 Internal discussion (committee) – room 0.001
- 9:30 *Break*
- 9:45 Meeting with STS programme (committee / STS team: Wiebe Bijker; Sally Wyatt; Tsjalling Swierstra; Jo Wachelder; Karin Bijsterveld)
- 10:45 Internal discussion (committee), formulation of preliminary findings – room 0.001
- 13:00 *Lunch (committee, no FASoS involvement)-room 0.001*
- 14:00 **Turnzaal:** Presentation of preliminary findings (committee / FASoS)
- 15:00 End of official programme, coffee and cake  
Farewell

## Appendix C: Evaluation criteria and scores (chapter 3, SEP)

CRITERIA	SUB-CRITERIA	ASPECTS THAT MAY BE CONSIDERED
<b>Quality</b>	A1. Quality and scientific relevance of the research A2. Leadership A3. Academic reputation A4. Resources A5 PhD training	Originality of the ideas and the research approach, including technological aspects; Significance of the contribution to the field; Coherence of the programme; Quality of the scientific publications; Quality of other output; Scientific and technological relevance Leadership of primary individuals; Mission and goals; Strategy and policy  (Inter)national position and recognition; Prominence of the programme director and other research staff; Impact and significance of research results in the field  Human resources; Funding policies and earning capacity; Relevance of research facilities  Objectives and institutional embedding; Structure of programmes; Supervision; Success rates; Educational resources
<b>Productivity</b>	B1. Productivity strategy B2. Productivity	Productivity goals; Publication Strategy; Rewards and sanctions  Scientific publications and PhD-theses; Professional publications; Output for wider audiences; Use of research facilities by third parties
<b>Relevance</b>	C Societal relevance	Societal quality; Societal impact; Valorisation
<b>Vitality and feasibility</b>	D1. Strategy D2. SWOT-analysis D3. Robustness and stability	Strategic planning; Investments and collaboration; Research topics planned for the near future and their perspectives; Flexibility and anticipation of expected changes.  Analysis of the position of institute and programmes; Analysis of strengths and weaknesses  Research facilities; Financial resources; Staff competition; Mobility and attractiveness; Expertise within the institute.

The scores on a five-point scale are:

<b>5</b>	<b>Excellent</b> Research is world leading. Researchers are working at the forefront of their field internationally and their research has an important and substantial impact in the field.
<b>4</b>	<b>Very Good</b> Research is considered nationally leading. Research is internationally competitive and makes a significant contribution to the field.

<b>3</b>	<b>Good</b> Research is considered internationally visible. Work is competitive at the national level and makes a valuable contribution in the international field.
<b>2</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b> Research is nationally visible. Work adds to our understanding and is solid, but not exciting.
<b>1</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory</b> Work is neither solid nor exciting, flawed in the scientific and/or technical approach, repetitions of other work, etc.