

Creativity & Inspiration

**The 2017 evaluation of the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study
in the Humanities and Social Sciences (NIAS)**

Amsterdam, December 2017-January 2018

Contents

- I. Introduction 5

- II. Review of the Institute 7
 - 1. Strategy, mission and targets 7
 - 2. Assessment on the basis of SEP-terms 7
 - a. Research quality 8
 - b. Relevance to society 9
 - c. Viability 10

- III. Recommendations 12
 - 1. The Selection Process 12
 - 2. The Scientific Advisory Board 12
 - 3. A National Institute 13
 - 4. Financial Stability 13
 - 5. Cherish your Alumni 14
 - 6. Lobby for the Institute 14
 - 7. Communication Strategy (& Visibility) 14

- IV. Appendices 15
 - 1. Members of the Assessment Committee 15
 - 2. Program of the Site Visit 17
 - 3. Quantitative data on Financing 18

I. Introduction

This report reflects the evaluation of the NIAS, commissioned by the board of the KNAW. In principle, every six years each KNAW institute is evaluated by an independent evaluation committee, but the assessment of NIAS was postponed for three years to make it possible to incorporate the move from Wassenaar to Amsterdam in 2016.

The review committee consisted of:

- Prof. dr. Ivo Giesen, Private law, Utrecht University, Chair
- Prof. dr. Andrea Evers, Health Psychologist, Leiden University
- Prof. dr. Fred Weerman, Dutch Linguistics, University of Amsterdam
- Dr. Thorsten Wilhelmy, Comparative Literature, Secretary Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin (WIKO)
- Prof. dr. Björn Wittrock, Social sciences, SCAS, Uppsala University
- Dr. Bertram Mourits, Independent secretary

Short CVs of the members of the committee are included in appendix 1.

The site visit took place on November 28 and 29, 2017. The program of the site visit is included in appendix 2. The review committee had received several documents in advance.

- *Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021*
- *Terms of Reference for the external evaluation of NIAS of the period 2011-2016 (ToR)*
- *Manual for research assessments of the Academy Institutes (2016)*
- *Self-evaluation 2008-2017*
- *From Cloister to Beehive (Midterm-evaluation, 2014)*
- *Results and recommendations of the Evaluation of NIAS 2002-2007*

and, during and after the site visit:

- *NIAS Highlights of the Academic Year 2016-2017*
- *Research Group 2017-2018*
- *Financial Summary NIAS*

The assessment was conducted as much as possible in accordance with the (procedures as described in the) *Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021* but in some instances this SEP protocol could not be followed. This is due to a difference in nature between NIAS and the other KNAW institutes that needs to be noted: there are no scientific research programs formulated or conducted by NIAS and its staff since the institute functions as a facilitator in different parts of the scientific process of academics working on their own research agenda. Therefore, judging the quality of scientific output, can only indirectly (if at all) be an indicator of the quality of the institute as such, and it is thus impossible to provide the SEP Protocol D1 Table with output indicators.

In light of this, the committee was asked to assess to what extent NIAS fulfils its role as a place where researchers in the humanities and social sciences have the chance to develop their academic work in ways that are not possible in their institutions of origin, and how much the interdisciplinarity that characterizes NIAS' quarters actually influences scientific work done there. Furthermore, the committee was provided with specific Terms of Reference (ToR) by the

KNAW that differ somewhat from the SEP standard. These terms will be referred to hereafter in due course.

The format of this evaluation report is in general in line with the structure provided for by the SEP protocol, but again, some differences from that format were unavoidable (e.g. there are no PhD programmes to assess and research integrity is not a policy issue for NIAS).

II. Review of the Institute

1. Strategy, mission and targets

NIAS is a national institute that offers fellowships to Dutch and international scholars and thus the opportunity for them to stay at the institute and work on their own projects, be it (usually) scientific research or the writing of a book or paper. NIAS offers offices, research facilities, a library and accommodation, in case commuting to Amsterdam would take longer than 90 minutes one way. Researchers can apply for funds that enable their home university – at least to a certain extent – to replace them in their teaching responsibilities; this gives researchers working at NIAS the time to work on their projects without the distraction of everyday obligations, in an environment with several other scholars from different fields, as well as some artists, authors and journalists, that may broaden their horizon. The projects are for the most part initiated on an individual basis by the fellow in question, but there are also theme groups (comprised of two or more fellows and possibly also some guest researchers) in which scientists from different fields work on shared themes, from different angles and territories. The fellows are usually selected from the fields of humanities and social sciences but the directorate also connects with the life sciences, where possible, in order to allow interdisciplinarity to blossom on a daily basis.

It became clear for the committee that the main aim and strategy of NIAS – to provide researchers with time, space and sources of inspiration for their academic work – was shared and highly appreciated by everyone involved with NIAS. The whole institute is centred on providing ideal circumstances for focused research, and the committee heard this ideal described in many colourful ways. NIAS is, the committee concludes, what it wants to be: a safe haven for curiosity driven science in a day and age where these kinds of circumstances have become increasingly rare.

The interdisciplinary nature of the group of fellows of a particular academic year has the promise to yield surprising cutting-edge results. These cases, where the whole is more than the proverbial sum of its parts, are largely due to the role of the director in the last stage of the process of selecting the fellows, since at that stage the balance (between disciplines, gender, age, and so on) within the group of fellows is set.

This selection procedure, in short, is currently as follows: application is completely open to the outside world, even though the director does sometimes inform interesting researchers of the possibilities of applying for a fellowship (without any promises or giving any guarantees). There are no research programmes and no permanent fellows, an aspect of NIAS that is cherished by both the directorate and the scientific advisory board. Every proposal is judged by two independent external reviewers, usually from a list of some 60-80 experts in their respective fields. The criteria are: quality of the project, quality of the applicant, and value of the project to the scientific community. Only the proposals that are deemed to be excellent (rated as A) in all three categories are allowed in the final part of the selection process, where the directorate of NIAS compiles the group of fellows for one year, based on factors such as Dutch vs. international, disciplines, region, gender, age, other forms of diversity.

2. Assessment on the basis of SEP terms

In line with the ‘Strengths’ mentioned in NIAS’ own SWOT analysis, the visitation committee came to the unanimous conclusion that NIAS is an excellent institute that can still hold its own against the best Institutes for Advanced Study in the world. It is a service orientated and

welcoming place for reflection, imagination, a haven for intellectual retreat that offers a break from everyday routine to make room for creativity and inspiration, and thus for better research.

The institute is unique in the Dutch landscape. It has an excellent international reputation as well, with outreach all over the academic world, although this comes with one notable reservation: there is a strong emphasis on the Anglo-Saxon academic world.

The committee sees NIAS as an inspiring place where mono-disciplinary questions can be asked and answered in an interdisciplinary context; occasionally, a thorough interdisciplinary approach is practiced in the theme groups. The organisation of NIAS – with the daily communal lunch and weekly seminars centred around the research by and for the fellows – orchestrates cross-fertilization as a matter of course. There seems no need to force this upon the fellows more than through these measures. For the committee, NIAS thus ranks as an institute with added value, both nationally and internationally.

a. Research quality

The quality of the research conducted at NIAS, one of the most important factors in SEP reports, is difficult to judge adequately, as said: NIAS does not have its own scientific program. The institute is a facilitator, not an instigator or conductor of research.

Having said that, it has become quite clear that the output of NIAS fellows is very high, qualitatively and quantitatively; the selection process a fellow has to go through before becoming NIAS fellow to a large extent guarantees this.

For the same reason, the institute's role as regards knowledge utilization and open access is inherently limited: the fellows (or perhaps: the institutes actually employing the fellows) are 'in control' (and thus responsible) when it comes to the (form of) dissemination and the use of the knowledge they gained while working at NIAS. The institute can only facilitate and stimulate here. Nonetheless, the committee sees opportunities for more outreach, e.g. by involving alumni more and triggering them in this respect (see the Recommendations in Chapter III). Also, a follow up of what has become of certain topics, research initiatives etc., after a given period of time, could be more thorough than is currently happening.

With regard to this subject, KNAW asked the committee explicitly to answer two questions. Firstly, if NIAS is "able to attract the most talented scholars and are they a reflection of the national scientific landscape, so that NIAS is able to play its national role?" With a relatively small research group (currently around 30 fellows), it is of course not possible to have a true "reflection" of the broad scientific landscape in the social sciences and humanities, but NIAS is able to select 'the best in the field'. And certainly on the basis of the Research Group 2017/18 the 'traditional', or at least: perceived, bias in favour of applicants from specific universities (e.g. Leiden University) is much less apparent than in former times; indeed, the spread amongst institutions from all over the country, is established: there are fellows from Tilburg, Groningen and Maastricht.

The second question put to the committee by the KNAW is related: 'Are there enough high-quality foreign applications?' Of course, the committee could not re-do or review an entire round of the selection procedure, so we cannot answer questions about the overall quality of the (non-selected) international applicants. But the committee can reiterate that more than 50% of the applicants are from outside The Netherlands, and high quality scholars from prestigious institutions all over the world are or have been present at NIAS. Given the fact that NIAS is

positioned in an international landscape in which there are currently some 150 competing IAS active worldwide, the quality of the international scholars it manages to attract is very high.

A related question asked by KNAW deals with the selection procedure: is it “sufficiently transparent and suitable for selecting the most talented applicants? Is the procedure efficient?” To start with the latter question: the procedure now involves two expert reviewers and the directorate, which is rather efficient from the perspective of time and effort put in from the review side. And although the procedure takes a significant amount of time, the committee does not consider an 8 month period to be (too) extensive, nor did the fellows that the committee spoke to. A move away from home – sometimes with family – and/or work for 5 or even 10 months takes time for planning anyway.

As to its transparency and suitability, the committee would like to express some hesitations. The fact that the directorate chooses from the applicants deemed excellent by their peers, makes the process somewhat vulnerable, and allows for improvement. Moreover, the simple mixing of candidates into a representative group following the results of an external evaluation is neither a satisfying principle for an Institute for Advanced Study nor a satisfying role for its director. The fact that neither the Scientific Advisory Board nor any other person or organ are actively involved in this process, does not alleviate this situation. The Scientific Advisory Board currently only assesses the selection process in general, afterwards.

It has also become clear that the selection process has the full attention of the directorship: the new director as well as the current, interim director are acutely aware of the necessity to further improve this process. This is apparent from the self-evaluation as well as from the discussions during the site visit. The committee agrees with this and will expand on this point in chapter III (Recommendations).

In summary: the committee assesses this aspect of NIAS as world leading/excellent (1)

b. Relevance to society

The second subject that has been evaluated by the committee was the relevance to society of the NIAS. There are two ways in which this relevance takes shape. First there is the cooperation with institutes and companies that sponsor fellowships at NIAS. Currently there are sponsorships from, for example, the Nederlandse Stichting voor Psychotechniek [the Dutch Foundation for Psychotechnique], the Royal Library, as well as UNESCO-L’Oreal: a scholarship especially devoted to women in science. These collaborations are very successful. There is, at the same time, a common understanding to make sure co-sponsorships will never make up more than 50% of the fellows.

Even more important – and essential to the mission of NIAS, as well as being a result of that mission – is the fact that by being isolated from their universities and day-to-day routines, the fellows are in the position to go beyond their usual contributions to science and to add a whole new spectrum of valuable insights, thanks to the increased creativity offered at NIAS. The high importance for society thereof seems, albeit largely unquantifiable, undeniable.

What is more, the output of NIAS fellows, during and also well after their stay, is not limited to the academic world: they often also hold (public) lectures (e.g. the newly developed, yearly NIAS lecture) and publish through non-academic fora, thus increasing public outreach. And the presence of artists, journalists and authors amongst the fellows is also an important factor here. NIAS is a place for academia, but also for the arts and society.

In summary: the committee assesses this aspect of NIAS as world leading/excellent (1)

c. Viability

NIAS's current viability has to be seen in the perspective of the recent move from Wassenaar to Amsterdam, and KNAW asked the committee to answer two questions about this move. The first question asks: "Is the leadership of the institute sufficiently aware of the opportunities this new environment offers for stronger positioning of the institute?"

This was an open question for the committee which we can now unequivocally answer in the affirmative. Risks as well as opportunities have been considered thoroughly, and several developments can be directly traced to the move.

As the midterm evaluation by NIAS in 2014 suggested, the move from a 'Cloister' to a 'Beehive' brought along with it the risk of less cohesion within the institute. The Wassenaar surroundings provided little to no distraction, whereas Amsterdam obviously has plenty to offer. Still, the fellows of 2016-2017, as well as the current occupants at NIAS, stressed the fact that there is a lot of interaction among the fellows, and there seemed little regret that NIAS is no longer situated in Wassenaar.

The fact that Amsterdam is located within reach of most universities, libraries, collections, museums, etc., increases its attraction for international fellows. Not surprisingly, the number of applications increased noticeably, making NIAS one of the most popular institutes within Europe. In the joint fellowship program EURIAS that is run by a consortium of 19 IAS's, NIAS attracts the second most applications: after Paris and before Berlin.

After the move to Amsterdam, there have also been shorter fellowships initiated at NIAS, fellowships of five, sometimes three months. There is a risk that social and intellectual cohesion will be more difficult to sustain, but on the positive side: the diversity of applicants with regard to gender as well as age, has since increased considerably. The fellows' house in the centre of town is a major asset to invite the group to spend time with each other. Apartments and communal rooms are crucial for the fellows invited as well as for the interaction among them, and the evaluation committee can testify that what is offered in Amsterdam is of high international standard. Shorter fellowships also make up for the fact that Amsterdam has less housing available for fellows than Wassenaar had, while in the meantime the number of applications has increased.

The trend seems to be that more early or mid-career female scientists want to work at NIAS: the average age of fellows is dropping and the number of female fellows is rising. According to one of the previous fellows this is related to the fact that the Amsterdam incarnation of NIAS is easier to reach. Also there is an increased presence of researchers who are in mid-career, whereas Wassenaar often attracted more senior researchers.

The conclusion has to be that this move was a good decision, probably even a necessary one for the long term viability of the institute, although the possible long term effects of the move still need to be monitored.

The move of course also created new challenges, especially with regard to housing, which is obviously much more expensive in Amsterdam than it was in Wassenaar. We will return to this subject in our Recommendations.

The second KNAW question to be answered deals with the communication strategy of the institute. At this moment, that leaves somewhat to be desired and we will return to that subject in our recommendations, but the committee acknowledges the fact that this is work in progress and that resources to do so have been scarce. Work on the new website will be finished

shortly and the self-evaluation report has some promising ideas to increase visibility and improve the communication strategy (e.g. interviews and impressions of work done at NIAS).

Unsurprisingly, the finances are the most problematic aspect of the viability of NIAS. The budget cut of 2014-2015 (when the lump sum was reduced from €2.511.000 to €1.750.000) has strained the service-orientated staff of the institute to its utter limits. The level of service is still very high, and the appreciation of the fellows for the warm and welcoming staff is beyond question, but new budget cuts would create problems that might be difficult to solve: NIAS already has a very modest budget, especially when compared to similar prestigious international institutes. What is troubling here, because it allows for 'easy' cutbacks, is that NIAS has a relatively simple option to control the budget: inviting less fellows means spending less money. And even though that might seem as an attractive avenue to those in need of finding additional ways to save on spending (instead of having to fire permanent scientific staff members) this is obviously not a viable or fair solution to financial difficulties. One should not overlook the fact that less fellows means: higher relative overhead costs, a reduced chance of successful interdisciplinarity; NIAS would threaten to lose its viability and might not be as attractive for other excellent researchers.

Furthermore, the committee reiterates that NIAS's financial position has weakened considerably over the last years; among others due to a human resources problem (laying off an expensive but no longer maintainable employee) the institute's equity has fallen below the desired percentage of (in NIAS' case) 26%. This makes the institute financially vulnerable, especially if NIAS wants to continue to compete with other IAS's all over the world that are in much healthier financial condition. For example, the compensation offered to universities in order to invite the fellows to come to Amsterdam is rather small compared to what international competitors may offer – a fact that will have an impact also on the quality of the researchers an institute is able to attract. In that sense, the current size, financial policy and state of play does not contribute in the manner it should do to NIAS' mission. We will come back to this in chapter III (Recommendations).

In summary: the committee assesses this aspect of NIAS, weighing the different substantive and financial sides to it, as very good (2)

III. Recommendations

The review committee would like to offer the following recommendations, which are in line with most of the elements mentioned in the SWOT analysis by NIAS itself.

1. *The Selection Process*: Although the selection procedure has functioned well until now, and its primary focus on ‘excellence’ is to be continued, this is an element that needs to be addressed, in light of current demands as regards transparency. The procedure is already under review and most of the suggestions in the self-evaluation report seem worth considering further. The idea that the procedure is open is appreciated by the committee but increased clarity seems to be necessary to further attract the best possible fellows.

Thus the committee recommends adjusting the procedure in the near future, keeping the following points of interest and/or questions on the agenda:

- Who are the (external) reviewers that NIAS uses and are they known to the public? Are they, and should they be connected to NIAS? Is the quality of the reviews satisfying, and are they comparable in terms of standards applied, criteria, quality of argument etc.?
- Should there not be a committee ‘in-between’ these reviewers and the director, who should remain to have the final say, advising him on the final balancing act when selecting the group of fellows? Would the Scientific Advisory Board be a suitable organ for that role (possibly in a new set up)?
- And while being fully aware of the enormous amount of extra work that would entail, how about conducting pre-selection interviews (either via skype or live) with candidates? Although the committee itself is not sure whether that be beneficial and would not overburden the staff, it might be considered, particularly in order to find out whether an individual candidate is capable and prepared to interact with fellows from different scientific backgrounds.
- Consult the KNAW and see whether elements and/or procedures of their selection procedures could be helpful for NIAS to implement.

Further, we would like to recommend to continue the policy of striking a balance between ‘end of career’ researches and people who are in the middle of their academic career. The possibility of inviting specific candidates could also be explored further, although one should look beyond the NWO and ERC laureates only. Maintaining diversity – gender, age, disciplines, but certainly also territory (which is underdeveloped), and so on – should remain a prominent goal and could be served by specific invitations. The international character of NIAS should definitely remain one of the overall principles: defining NIAS as a national institute does not mean that the number of Dutch fellows should be increased. Quite the contrary: being the national institute would mean that its international outreach and visibility is crucial for this position. Also, not unimportantly, when attracting possible fellows, the open-mindedness (in the academic, cross-disciplinary sense of the word) of the candidates should also be one of the main concerns; the urgency of the topic at hand might be another (new) element for selection, also in light of NIAS’ relevance to society. The foregoing implies that the committee would not recommend to start from pre-designed, top down implemented research clusters or themes.

2. *The Scientific Advisory Board*: Related to the previous recommendation, and in order to strengthen the governance of NIAS, the Scientific Advisory Board should be expanded to at least

twice its current size. Moreover, at the moment the Board is too limited in its scope: more disciplines should be represented, reflecting the broad area of Social Sciences and Humanities. At least one of these members should be an international IAS-specialist who knows the specific problems an IAS encounters. The expansion of the Scientific Advisory Board might also strengthen the negotiation (lobbying) position of NIAS with regard to the Dutch universities as well as the KNAW (see also #6).

With a bigger and broader Scientific Advisory Board, its role in the selection procedure may increase too, see above at #1. The alternative option to install a separate, new organ for selection purposes, next to the Scientific Advisory Board, may have the advantage of keeping separate different tasks and different responsibilities but the drawback may be a more complex governance structure. In general a larger, more pro-active role of the Scientific Advisory Board might be useful. We would also recommend that NIAS make more use of experts in subject related KNAW-institutes; this could also enhance the ties between NIAS and the KNAW (and its Humanities and Social Science cluster in Amsterdam).

3. *A National Institute.* NIAS should continue to emphasize its role as a national institute for scientists from all of the country and from abroad. In the international context, and for its international outreach, it actually makes sense for NIAS to portray itself as a *Dutch* institution; especially since NIAS is in Amsterdam, the Dutch context has a lot to offer, certainly in the humanities and social sciences. Here, too, more options are available in Amsterdam than what has been exploited until now. Academics in the life sciences make up a much smaller part of the roster, which is hardly surprising due to lack of facilities (i.e. laboratories). Occasionally, the presence of fellows from the life sciences is to be welcomed, also in order to be attractive as an interdisciplinary platform for the broad variety of Social Science and Humanities, but it should not become NIAS' core business to attract people from the natural sciences (the committee does not consider the relative lack of fellows from the natural sciences to be a 'Weakness').

4. *Financial Stability.* We would strongly advise against any further budget cuts. There is an obvious tendency to recommend this with regard to excellent institutes, but the committee stresses that this statement goes well beyond that standard reflex. The quality of service and staff at NIAS is still very high, despite the cutbacks through the years, but it is of the utmost importance for NIAS that things stay that way in order to maintain its current position in the field of IAS's where competition is growing. Thus, it is equally important that the budget for the staff and fellows is not reduced any further. The staff is now dedicated but small in size, and thus vulnerable. We suggest KNAW to seek responsibility here also, e.g. by contributing to repair the situation with regard to the limited equity (and by tackling the underlying HR problem that presses heavily on the financial situation of NIAS) and to help out when specific investments (see e.g. below at #7) are needed.

Another financial aspect has to do with the new (more expensive) housing situation in Amsterdam. In the longer run, this might add to the vulnerability of the financial situation. The committee recognizes that the move to Amsterdam is of recent date and therefore most possibilities still need to be explored, but this has to be done swiftly. Several ideas came up during the site visit, including the sub-lending of the apartments during summer time (e.g. in a joint initiative with the Young Academy), housing in somewhat more distant locations (e.g. Haarlem)

or on a more modest level (e.g. other arrangements for relatives); the possibilities here are plentiful but they need to be explored soon rather than later.

The third recommendation related to finances is also partially taking place already: finding external sources of finance. For example in the creation of a fund: *Friends Of NIAS*. This might be a viable strategy to find money, e.g. in the Amsterdam cultural world, and it would also increase the social presence of NIAS in The Netherlands. Also new forms of sponsorships (alumni, commercial) should be further explored, in collaboration also with neighbouring institutes, of course without threatening the independence of NIAS. The ‘Opportunity’ of attracting European grant money as mentioned in the self-evaluation, might be too ambitious however.

5. *Cherish your Alumni*: To increase its visibility in the long run and to put more emphasis on its academic successes, but also in relation to its knowledge utilization, it is advisable for NIAS to actively stay in touch more with the fellows after they have left, and make use of their strong commitment to NIAS by defining them as ambassadors. The ‘follow up’ strategy needs to be professionalized such that in publications, prizes and awards of alumni the relation with NIAS becomes better visible. The committee senses that it might very well be possible to profit more from the gratitude of successful ex-fellows. The committee advises that an overarching Alumni strategy be thought out, e.g. to improve visibility and create more funding by relating to these alumni.

6. *Lobby for the Institute*: The institute needs a strong advocate, reflecting the important and unique position it has among the KNAW (research) institutes; its vulnerability financially demands a somewhat stronger sense of urgency from the leadership and the power to lobby its cause effectively (see #2 also). Here too, we wish to stress how important it is to increase support (practical and financial) from universities, and faculties. The new director should thus invest in the ties with the universities and, in particular, the faculties from which the institute will recruit fellows. Therefore, the added value that research done at NIAS has, compared to regular research time at universities, should be made more explicit. Support of university administrations (and the VSNU) is important, but to really gain that support, the added value for a university is apparently often still too unclear. Since there are no regular output indicators to help out here, which might make it more difficult for NIAS to legitimize its position, there is ample need for a strategy to make its output, through the fellows, more visible (see also recommendation #5).

7. *Communication Strategy (& Visibility)*: Investments are necessary in the area of the communication strategy because the aims and strategy of NIAS are not fully broadcasted as of yet, leaving its visibility less than to be desired. The committee is aware of the fact that a new website is in advanced stage of preparation, and the first samples looked promising. But continuity in communication strategies (e.g. announcements of lectures, press communications, etc.) demand ongoing commitment and the investments to back that up. Given the financial state of affairs, this is a dilemma, but the committee would expect the KNAW to be of assistance here were possible to make sure that scientific creativity and inspiration can continue to thrive at NIAS.

IV. Appendices

1. Members of the assessment committee

Prof. dr. I. Giesen (chair)

Ivo Giesen (1972) was appointed in 2004 as Professor of Private Law at the Molengraaff Institute for Private Law, Utrecht University, and is currently also member of the *Utrecht Centre for Accountability and Liability Law* (Ucall). After defending his thesis at the University of Tilburg on 'Bewijs en aansprakelijkheid' (Den Haag 2001), he worked there as both postgraduate and senior lecturer. Since 2006, Ivo Giesen also serves as honorary deputy justice in the Court of Appeal at 's-Hertogenbosch. His current research interests include the (multidisciplinary) study of Tort Law, Civil Procedure, Adjudication and Administration of Justice, and the areas of law related to these subjects. Giesen holds several editorial positions and was elected as member of the Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences (KNAW) in 2010 and as member of the Hollandsche Maatschappij der Wetenschappen (KHMW) in 2017. In 2012 he was chosen as Utrecht University's 'Teacher of the Year'. In 2008 he was Visiting Professor at Rhodes University, Grahamstown, South Africa, and in 2017, he was visiting teacher at Leuven University, Belgium.

Prof. dr. A.W.M. Evers

Andrea Evers is professor of Health Psychology and chair of the Health-Medical-and-Neuropsychology-Unit at Leiden University. She received her PhD (cum laude) in 2003 at Radboud University, she was appointed professor of Psychobiology at Radboud University in 2011 and Professor of Health Psychology at Leiden University in 2013. Andrea Evers obtained several awards and personal grants for excellent researchers (e.g. NWO-Veni 2004, NWO-Vidi 2009, ERC Consolidator Grant 2013, NWO-Vici 2017) for her innovative, interdisciplinary and translational research on psychoneurobiological mechanisms and treatments for health and disease. Her research is characterized by a strong interdisciplinary focus, particularly due to connecting Social Sciences with Biomedical and Life Sciences, in addition to collaborations with Neuroscience and Humanities. In the period 2013-2018, she was a member of the Young Academy (De Jonge Akademie) of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Sciences.

Prof. dr. F.P. Weerman

Fred Weerman (1957) is professor of Dutch Linguistics and currently dean of the Faculty of Humanities of the University of Amsterdam. He studied Dutch Language and Literature and General Linguistics at Utrecht University, where he received his doctor's degree in 1989. In 1988 he was appointed assistant professor at this university and in 1989 associate professor. In 1998 he became also affiliated to Utrecht's University College. He was appointed full professor at the University of Amsterdam in 2001. He was a visiting professor at several universities, among which Madison, Wisconsin and the Australian National University, Canberra. He was a fellow of the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in 2011. Weerman was, amongst others, chair of the *Landelijke Vereniging van Neerlandici (LVVN)* and several NWO Veni committees. He was a member of the supervisory board of the Fryske Akademy of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) and served in several committees of the *Taalunie*. He holds several editorial positions. He is chair of the supervisory board of CREA, the cultural organization of the University of Amsterdam (UvA) and the Amsterdam School of Higher Education (HvA)

Dr. Thorsten Wilhelmy

Thorsten Wilhelmy (1973) studied Comparative Literature, German Literature, and History at Saarland University and earned his doctorate in 2003 with a thesis on the reception of mythology in the narrative texts of Thomas Mann, Christa Wolf, John Barth, Christoph Ransmayr, and John Banville. From 2003 to 2008, he was a consultant with the Bischöflichen Begabtenförderung Cusanuswerk (Cusanus bishop's program to foster the gifted) and, from 2008 to 2012, a consultant with the Science Council in the Department of Tertiary Education. Between 2005 and 2012, he also had a teaching position in Comparative Literature at the University of Bonn. Since 1 August 2012, Thorsten Wilhelmy has been the Secretary of the Wissenschaftskolleg zu Berlin, Institute for Advanced Study.

Prof. dr. Björn Wittrock

Björn Wittrock is University Professor at Uppsala University and Principal of the Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study (SCAS), Uppsala. He is a member of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences and chair of the class of Social Sciences in the Academia Europaea, and of the editorial board of its journal *European Review*. Björn Wittrock has worked extensively with research councils, academies, and institutes for advanced study in a number of countries. He was President of the International Institute of Sociology (founded in Paris in 1893) in the years 2005-2013. He has published extensively, in the fields of intellectual history, historical social science, social theory, and civilizational analysis. In 1999, Björn Wittrock was awarded the Torgny Segerstedt Medal. In 2003, he received an honorary doctorate at the University of Tartu. In 2008, he was awarded the Federal Cross of Merit (Bundesverdienstkreuz, 1. Kl) by the President of the Federal Republic of Germany. In 2009, he was awarded "H.M. the King's Medal (8th class) in the ribbon of the Order of the Seraphim" by the King of Sweden for "significant contributions to Swedish social science research". He is an international Honorary Member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Dr. G.P.M. Mourits (secretary)

Bertram Mourits (1969) wrote his dissertation on Dutch poetry of the 1960s at Utrecht University and at the University of California at Berkeley as a Fulbright Scholar. After he got his PhD, he started working in publishing, as an editor in chief in non-fiction and poetry at Atlas Contact. Since 2018, he is head of collections at the Literature Museum (The Hague). He is a freelance publicist, writing about literature and popular music. Since 2006, he has acted as the independent secretary for several KNAW evaluation committees.

2. Program: site visit NIAS

29 November 2017

- 9:00 - 10:15 Meeting with directorate NIAS (Theo Mulder, director a.i., Petry Kievit (policy officer))
- 10:15 - 11:00 Guided tour (OIH and Fellows House – Kloveniersburgwal 23)
- 11:00 - 12:00 Meeting with former fellows/ NIAS fellows Association (Alumni network) (Prof. dr. Philip Spinhoven – chair NFA; Prof. Sarah Durston (neuroscience); Prof. dr. Ken Henkes (demography), Prof. dr. Henk Jan Honing (music) and Dr. N. Akkerman (literature)).
- 12:00 – 12:30 Discussion committee
- 12.30 – 13.30 Lunch
- 13.30 – 14:30 Meeting with the NIAS staff
- 14:30– 15:30 Meeting with Chair of Scientific Advisory Board: Prof. dr. Johan Schot (Sussex)
- 15.30 – 16:30 Discussion committee

30 November

- 9:30 – 10:15 Meeting with the newly appointed director Prof. dr. Jan Willem Duyvendak
- 10:15 - 11:30 Meeting with theme group (title: *Diaspora: migration and the sciences*.
Members:
Prof. dr. Leonard Rutgers (classical archaeology – Utrecht); Prof. Harry Ostrer (genetics – New York); Dr. Tracy Prowse – physical anthropology)
- 11:30 - 12:30 Meeting with current fellows (prof. Dr. Franjo Weissing (theoretical Biology; Dr. Nicolas Trepanier (history); Prof. dr. Joep Leersen (European Studies); Prof. dr. Frederik Swennen (Law); Sanne Blauw – journalist in residence, Dr. Welmoet Boender (Islamic Studies))
- 12:30 – 13:30 Lunch
- 13.30 – 14.30 Financial aspects of NIAS (Dr. Theo Mulder and drs. Yildiz van den Akker, Director Shared Service centre KNAW Humanities Cluster)
- 14:30 – 15:30 Final discussion with directorate NIAS
- 15.30 – 16.00 Final discussion committee
- 16:00 – 16:30 Preliminary conclusions

3. Quantitative data on financing (provided by NIAS)

1. Introduction

The KNAW Humanities Cluster includes the IISH, Meertens Institute and Huygens ING. Its shared service center (SSC) grants services for NIOD and NIAS. The services for NIAS are: human resources, finance & control, IT (hardware/software and services) as well as facilities & support. The shared service center has approximately 50 employees and 35 full time equivalents. Fully dedicated to NIAS are: 0,7 fte for finance & control, 0,4 fte HR, 1,75 fte facilities, 0,8 fte management assistance and 0,5 fte reception. In total 4,15 fte representing €320.000. A management fee of 0,1 fte is charged.

2. 2016-2017

In August 2016, when the relocation of NIAS from Wassenaar to Amsterdam was a fact, the renovation of the building was not finished yet. In October 2016, the SSC took up its new quarters, and the organization structure had to be developed anew. This created a gap in supporting NIAS of 3 months. The extra costs for hiring support personnel, as well as investments in equipment and inventory, influenced the result of 2016 in a negative way. A more stable period began in March 2017.

3. Facts and figures

The lump sum budgeted for 2017 was €1.953.000. The actual lump sum 2017 is slightly higher due to a compensation in wage indexation and a higher compensation for the housing costs.

The lump sum is divided into 3 parts. Housing (KNAW H) , personnel (KNAW P) and other material costs (KNAW M).

Exploitatie Totaal 350 NIAS (bedragen * € 1.000,-)	2017 prognose bij Q3	2017 begroting	2016 realisatie	2017-/-2016 estimated 2017 -/- 2016	2018 begroting	2019 begroting	2020 begroting	2021 begroting
Baten								
Bijdrage KNAW P-deel	1.484	1.484	1.487	-3	1.484	1.484	1.484	1.484
Bijdrage KNAW H-deel	390	203	185	205	438	441	444	444
Bijdrage KNAW M-deel	266	266	266	0	266	266	266	266
Bijdrage KNAW loon- en prijsbijstelling	44	0	41	3				
Totaal Basisfinanciering	2.184	1.953	1.979	205	2.188	2.191	2.194	2.194

The only free disposable lump sum is for personnel and other material costs. This adds up to 1.7 M euro.

Exploitatie Totaal 350 NIAS (bedragen * € 1.000,-)	2017 prognose bij Q3	2017 begroting	2016 realisatie	2017-/-2016 estimated 2017 -/- 2016	2018 begroting	2019 begroting	2020 begroting	2021 begroting
Baten								
Bijdrage KNAW P-deel	1.484	1.484	1.487	-3	1.484	1.484	1.484	1.484
Bijdrage KNAW M-deel	266	266	266	0	266	266	266	266
Bijdrage KNAW loon- en prijsbijstelling	44	0	41	3				
Totaal Basisfinanciering	1.794	1.750	1.794	0	1.750	1.750	1.750	1.750

The external income from special fellowships is approximately 200K euro per annum. Because the costs of salary, housing for fellows and staff increased, whereas the lump sum remained more or less stable it is planned to increase the income from special (sponsored) fellowships and other external income to about 350K euro per annum. A number which has to be achieved within the next four to six years.

The total costs of NIAS estimated Q3 2017 are budgeted on: 2.445M euro (included is 390K euro of Housing costs. This number is fully compensated by the lump sum H part. Without the housing costs the total costs are: €2.055.000. The total income without the H part is 2.016 M euro (222 K euro other income). The result of 2017 is estimated of -€39.000. In 2018 the total income is estimated at 2.083M euro, the total costs at 2.106M euro. The result of 2018 is estimated at -23.000 euro negative.

The total costs of the SSC are approximately: 540K euro (facilities, personnel, IT, support& assistance). These costs are shown in the above mentioned figures.

The ratio between the amount of the lump sum designated to the staff and the fellows is: 27% staff and 73% fellows. The ratio between the costs is: 38% staff and 62% fellows. The ratio is calculated using the indicators: amount of staff/fellows, square meters office, square meters studio's and apartments.

4. Housing and facilities

There is a difference between housing costs and facilities. The KNAW lump sum compensates only the rent of the Oost Indisch Huis (office NIAS) and the studio's at the Kloveniersburgwal. All remaining costs related to housing must be compensated by the lump sum M part or by other income. The apartments for families must also be compensate by the lump sum M part. The total costs of these apartments amount to 170K euro per annum.

5. Private equity

(x € 1.000)	Realisatie 2014	Realisatie 2015	Realisatie 2016	Prognose Q3 2017	MJB 2018	MJB 2019	MJB 2020	MJB 2021
Eigen vermogen (na resultaatverdeling)	1.224	1.102	444	411	350	350	350	350
Totaal baten	2.746	2.133	2.216	2.360	2.521	2.474	2.467	2.467
Weerstandsvermogen (EV/Tot. baten)	45%	52%	20%	17%	14%	14%	14%	14%
Balanstotaal	2.904	2.513	2.248	2.016	1.798	1.716	1.646	1.458
Weerstandsvermogen (EV/Balanstotaal)	42%	44%	20%	20%	19%	20%	21%	24%

The largest decline in the private equity (reserve funds) took place in 2015-2016. A provision has to be formed for covering the costs of unemployment of an employee who was dismissed in 2014. The institutes of the Royal Academy bear the risk of unemployment themselves. The total costs of the provision added up to 500K euro for NIAS. Due to the relocation of the NIAS institute a provision for the assets in Wassenaar has to be formed, which is termed a disinvestment. This added up to €200.000.

The estimated level of the private equity (financial reserve) depends on the (type of) risks that an institute has to cover. The NIAS is dependent on the acquisition of sponsored fellowship in order to be able to reach a positive or close to zero financial end-result every year. The dependence of third parties income up to 13% of the total budget makes the NIAS vulnerable. The KNAW parameter for a required minimum of equity indicates an equity of 250K. For NIAS this is not enough. Because of the dependence of third party income the minimum equity for NIAS should be 26%, i.e. 550K.