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Chapter 1 General information
Chapter 1 General information

According to national agreements the Board of the University of Groningen is responsible for organizing adequate, thorough, independent assessments of all research conducted at the University of Groningen. The main objectives of the assessment by means of the Standard Evaluation Protocol are improvement and accountability. The evaluations follow the national Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009–2015 (SEP). The aim of the SEP is to provide common guidelines for the evaluation and improvement of research and research policy, based on expert assessment. Part of the protocol is that the research is evaluated by an external commission of peers every six years.

The Board of the University (College van Bestuur) has invited a Peer Review Committee of three to evaluate the research in the institute GIA in the period 2004–2009. Three main tasks of the research institute and its research programs are to be assessed: the production of results relevant to the scientific community, the production of results relevant to society, and the training of PhD-students. The PRC based its evaluation on the SEP (www.knaw.nl/sep). There were no additional protocol or Terms of References supplied for the review (SEP article 4.4).

The PRC consisted of:
Prof. dr. M. Bell, University of Reading, chairman
Prof. dr. N. Broadbent, Arctic Studies Centre, Smithsonian Institution
Prof. dr. J. Poblome, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.
Dr. S.F. Brouwer-Keij MBA from the Office of the University of Groningen was executive secretary of the PRC.
Chapter 2: Review of the Groningen Institute of Archaeology

When judging the quality of research, members of the peer review committee must base their assessment on the following information:

- the self-evaluation report and accompanying documentation
- possible additional information provided at the request of the peer review committee
- interviews, lectures and talks conducted within the framework of the assessment (site-visit).

Prior to the site visit the PRC members received a set of key publications and the self-evaluation document. The key publications were sent out to the committee in hardcopy three weeks prior to the site visit. Additionally a list of all publications was supplied. The PRC requested and obtained some final reports of NWO projects. At the request of the PRC some additional information was supplied on the number of students, the teaching load and the student staff ratio. That information only became available after the site visit.

The site visit took place from November 7 up till the 9th; the full programme is presented in Appendix 1. During the site visit the PRC met with the faculty board and the institute’s director. The PRC had interviews with representatives of the three research groups, a number of PhD’s and the technical staff. The PRC visited the three locations where GIA researchers are located and made a short visit to the Zoological and Botanic Laboratories and the Laboratory for Conservation & Material Studies.

The PRC read the previous review of GIA Research 1998-2003 with interest (Roberts et al 2006). A number of the key recommendations of that review have clearly resulted in positive developments: there has been a significant increase in PhD numbers, the appointment of some younger staff has addressed the ageing profile which the last review identified, and archaeological theory now has greater emphasis. The PRC gained the impression that the Arctic Centre is now more integrated into GIA and research in the northern Netherlands is being strongly reinvigorated. There were other notable areas, however, where recommendations of the previous review (particularly in Section 3.6) have not yet led to the hoped for developments. Foremost of these is that the somewhat anomalous position of the bioarchaeological group between the three chair-led groupings has not been resolved (Roberts et al 2006, 3.10c). The last review also recommended an appointment in palynology which has not taken place. It also identified the potential for greater collaboration with the Centre for Isotope Research; there clearly is collaboration but scope for more. The previous review also recommended greater emphasis on publication in international academic journals. The PRC recognised some improvement here but there is still some way to go.

Good support appears to be available at University, or Faculty, Level to support staff preparing major funding applications by buying out teaching for a period and this has contributed to the increased success in funding applications.

In addition to its research activities GIA also carries out significant programmes of undergraduate and masters teaching. It had an annual intake between 2007 and 2011 of between 30 and 39 per year with total undergraduate student numbers of between 117-129 per year. In addition there has been a significantly increased cohort of 1 year masters students from 18 in 2007 to 36 in 2010 and a Research Masters jointly taught with Art History with between 24 and 31 students per year. Thus the total number of BA plus Masters students has been between 159 and 174 per year with staff:student ratios between 19.5:1 and 22.4:1. The PRC heard that increased student numbers had put pressure on staff time and research. The staff: student ratio appears, however, to be similar to some comparable departments.

Table 1: Research staff at institutional level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured staff</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenured staff</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD students</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total research staff</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support staff</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total staff</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Self Study highlighted the pressures which have been created by increasing the numbers of externally funded research projects, increased non-tenured staff (up from 3.1 fte to 6) and PhD students (up from 8.7 to 13.6 fte) in the context of a reduced tenured staff: 6 fte in 2004 5.5 in 2009. These numbers demonstrate significant growth and success over the review period. Whilst the PRC can identify issues which in an ideal world would have been tackled during the review period, the pressures of significant growth and reduced tenured staff go a long way to explain why progress, whilst substantial in many areas, has been less marked in others.

The PRC appreciated the interesting programme of the site-visit and the enthusiastic staff of the GIA. The committee is grateful for the valuable input from the staff and research students and the facilities provided by the university especially the secretary, Dr Fennegien Brouwer.
Chapter 3 Evaluation of the Institute

The Groningen Institute of Archaeology (GIA) is a research institute within the Faculty of Arts of the University of Groningen and is responsible for all archaeological research within the university. Research in the Arctic Centre has a broader multi-disciplinary base and is carried out by the archaeologists, biologists, ecologists, geographers and historians participating in the centre in close co-operation.

Professor Reinder Reinders headed the institute from April 2002 till his retirement in April 2006 when he was succeeded as director by Professor Daan Raemaekers. In 2009 the research staff totalled 25.7 fte of which 5.5 are tenured staff. In addition to the research staff the institute had 8.7 fte support staff in 2009.

GIA is based in 3 separate buildings: the core facilities, including the faunal reference collections, are housed in Poststraat 6; botanical and materials laboratories and reference collections are housed nearby in an old building at Broerstraat 9; the Arctic Centre is situated 1km away at A-weg 30. Greater integration of the activities of GIA would clearly be facilitated if the three sections could in the future be brought together in one building. This proposal has been made before and the university is encouraged to give careful consideration to the best future arrangements for housing GIA.

In the period under review GIA research was organised in five groups.

Table 2. Research groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Research group</th>
<th>Chair(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northwest Europe: Stone Age Archaeology</td>
<td>Raemaekers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Northwest Europe: Archaeology of Later Prehistory and Protohistory</td>
<td>Reinders (-2006) Raemaekers (2006-to date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mediterranean Archaeology</td>
<td>Attema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Arctic Archaeology</td>
<td>Hacquebord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Science-based archaeology</td>
<td>Cappers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The self evaluation document supplied some information on the five groups but mainly on the three chairs (leerstoeligroepen) as listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prehistory and protohistory</td>
<td>Raemaekers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical and Mediterranean Archaeology</td>
<td>Attema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctic and Antarctic Studies</td>
<td>Hacquebord</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In accordance with the SEP, the quality, productivity, relevance, vitality and feasibility of the institute as a whole were assessed by the PRC. The numerical assessment can be summarized as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>very good, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>very good, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>very good, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitality</td>
<td>very good, 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The resources are evaluated as excellent and the organisation as good; on average the quality of the institute was evaluated as very good (4). Since the establishment by van Giffen the Biological Archaeological Centre has been well known. The GIA institute has an impressive record in obtaining grants from the National Research Council (NWO) in the review period. There would appear to be scope for increasing the amount of European funding which was a recommendation of the last review.

Three Professors by special appointment are allocated to GIA: A. van Holk (Maritime Archaeology), H. Groenendijk (public archaeology) and A. van Gijn (material studies). The last represents a reciprocal arrangement whereby R. Cappers at GIA has a corresponding appointment at Leiden. This arrangement broadens the expertise available at both universities. A fourth special appointment is proposed in terp archaeology, an important area of current research activity and of great potential.

The PRC was impressed with the facilities of the institute and reference collections (eg plant remains, macrofossils and faunal remains) that are well used and very well maintained. The collections were only briefly examined but our impression is that GIA may well have among the best reference collections maintained for archaeological purposes in Europe. The facilities and particularly outstanding reference collections, the product of investment over decades, did not really get the emphasis they deserved.
in the Self Study Document. The number and quality of the technical staff is very good. There are good levels of support for graphics in the field and publication illustration, GIS, survey and publication preparation, all of which are essential to maintaining publication output. A single member of technical staff is responsible for archaeological artifact conservation and materials analysis (including pottery and metals). Whilst important to support field projects, a single staff member covering these aspects must place limitations on the forms of analysis undertaken and the number of projects which can be supported.

Our impression was that the microscope, computing, GIS and conventional survey facilities are good although the PRC did not have time to look at these in detail. There have been notable developments in GIS capability made possible by a research appointment on an ecological project in the Arctic Centre where methodological developments have benefited other projects. The PRC also heard that research had recently benefited from investment in 3-D scanners. As regards future investment in survey the PRC mentioned that differential GPS is now much more affordable and would link in with the investment in GIS to support the wide range of field projects underway.

There is impressive evidence of important international partnerships with Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, work in Spitsbergen, Italy and Egypt. Even so, there would appear to be scope for increasing the amount of European funding, which was a recommendation of the last review. In the same way, the PRC advises GIA to invest energy in applications for national and international projects based on collaboration with other departments and institutes, which should make the core qualities of GIA better networked and more visible internationally. The PRC also detected a potential in associating GIA better with Groningen University wide research aims, reflecting national and international scientific concerns, such as the field of sustainable earth, for instance.

Time available during the visit did not allow the PRC to evaluate the library but we received no adverse comment during our visit about the contribution of this resource to research. If experience elsewhere is a guide this suggests that the library is a good resource. In the context of the many field research projects run by GIA and the increasing demands of heritage policy, the PRC was told of plans to further professionalize and optimize digital archiving and this was seen as a wise and sensible development. Nevertheless, the PRC would like to advise GIA to consider digital data management as a central concern, possibly representing an area of growth in project applications.

**PhD training**

The PRC much appreciated meeting a group of PhD students. If the PhD students met are anything to go by the future of Dutch Archaeology will be in safe hands. The PhD community, which has grown significantly since the last Review, clearly represents a major asset for GIA. Currently there are 50 PhD students. Each of the research groups has between 6 and 12 PhD students, the highest number being in the Arctic Centre. Science-based Archaeology has just 3 current PhD students.

The PhD students were enthusiastic about GIA and their research is often linked into major GIA research projects with all the benefits that brings of working within a larger project team. The PRC heard that PhD students were attracted to Groningen by the opportunities to participate in fieldwork and in some cases by the multi-disciplinary approach, especially in the Arctic Centre.

The PRC is worried, however, by the PhD completion rates, an issue also identified in the last review. Apparently the average time for a PhD is 6 years of which 4 are funded. 11 PhDs have been completed over this 6 year review period. The PRC heard that some financial support is now available to help PhD students who have jobs to devote a final concentrated period to completing their thesis. There are also significant financial incentives to Institutes to encourage thesis completion. These two factors should bring about a marked improvement in completion rates.

There could also be benefits in sharing good practice between research groups. In particular the Arctic Group was identified by students for examples of good practice in terms of discussion of progressing thesis work and group feedback during thesis writing stages. This is particularly impressive given the varied interdisciplinary research in this group. The students themselves expressed the need for more structure and compulsory aspects. More systematic and professional attention of the staff could be given to advising students in writing of chapters and papers and training of generic skills such as presentation of results.
Formal meetings, more regular than the present annual review, and clear milestones with an agreed timetable for chapter submission have improved submission rates elsewhere.

It was notable that much PhD research involves carrying out excavations and other fieldwork, often as part of wider GIA projects. This provides students with a good professional training but presumably creates significant additional demands in terms of fund raising and field supervision. The PRC wondered if more could be done with the reanalysis and reinterpretation of old collections, or publishing sites not adequately published. In general there could be benefits in developing a policy for supporting more data analytical PhDs, instead of work based on original data generation. The Odyssee project is doing exactly this for Single Grave research and the PRC impression was that planned future work on terps may also include bringing some past work to publication.

Another strategy to consider in helping to develop the careers of PhD student is encouraging them to publish papers (preferably in peer reviewed journals) during the later stages of their PhD research. This may already happen but our impression was that it is perhaps less common than in some other countries.

The new graduate school of the faculty is still in development, having only come into formal existence at the beginning of this academic year. This involves equal weighted elements from faculty, subject specific and university-wide training elements. The national PhD training provided by ARCHON, having had budgetary difficulties, has been less active in recent years. The PRC did not review the Archon training provision. In the context of the new Faculty and University based training it is important that adequate training provision is maintained for students doing science topics. The PRC understands that appropriate training is available to them by taking courses in other faculties but how well these arrangements work for archaeological scientists needs to be monitored.

It is much to the credit of the Faculty of Arts that enhanced provision has been made to help with the significant costs associated with Archaeology students PhD fieldwork travel and training. This frequently involves distant travel, and extended stays sometimes in remote and difficult to access areas.

**Societal relevance**

On the aspect of societal relevance the institute was evaluated as very good. It makes a major contribution to archaeology and heritage management, particularly in the Northern Netherlands but also more widely, for instance in Italy. In fact its work informs heritage management in many areas of Europe and beyond. The work of the Arctic Centre makes an internationally important contribution to heritage and wildlife management of fragile Arctic ecosystems including such internationally important topics as bird populations, fish stocks and whaling. The work of the biological archaeologists contributes to an understanding of the past history and ecology of plant and animal species and this is of relevance in nature conservation.

**Vitality and feasibility of GIA activities are evaluated as very good (4).**

**Relationship to the commercial sector**

The PRC learnt of the rapid development in the commercial archaeological sector in the Netherlands which has followed the Valletta (Malta) Treaty. One of the positive effects of this has been that many GIA graduates obtain employment in the commercial sector. Originally an archaeological company (ARC) was developed within Groningen University. Subsequently that has become an independent company. The Odyssee project represents an exciting collaboration between 2 universities and 5 commercial firms with the objective of bringing old excavations of Single Grave sites to publication. Midlaren was also a very important commercial project.

The impression gained by the PRC was that subsequent to the move of ARC, GIA may not have fully resolved its strategy in relation to the developing commercial sector, understandably because of other competing pressures on the time of the relatively small tenured staff, created for instance by grant winning success.

A number of GIA staff and PhD students have worked in the commercial sector and there are some PhD projects based on links to commercial companies. The impression gained by the PRC is that there is significant potential for further development of relationships with the commercial sector.
GIA has outstanding expertise in field archaeology, analytical facilities and reference collections which would enhance the activities of commercial companies and could generate income for GIA.

What the PRC suggests is taking a fresh look at relationships with the commercial sector and how they might be developed. Given the useful perspective we had from PhD students on this topic it would be good to involve them in the discussion.
Chapter 4 Evaluation of the Research Programme

Description
The Groningen Institute of Archaeology (GIA) was founded in 1995 to unite all archaeological research of the university. It includes the research of the Arctic Centre which is not solely archeological.

The self evaluation document presented data on the total staff and productivity and data for three separate groups (Table 3).

Table 3. Three research groups and size in 2009 (research fte’s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>2009 Tenured staff</th>
<th>2009 Total research staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prehistory and protohistory</td>
<td>Raemaekers</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical and Mediterranean</td>
<td>Attema</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>Hacquebord</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In accordance with the SEP, the quality, productivity, relevance and vitality and feasibility of the research programme were assessed by the PRC. The numerical assessment can be summarized as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>very good, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>very good, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>very good, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitality</td>
<td>very good, 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General remarks
Thirteen major projects can be found in the self evaluation study. These are at different stage and scales. The nine key publications that the committee received covered a range of types of publication. Two were monographs representing the final reports on internationally important projects at Midlaren and Oldenholtwolde Hamburgian site. Other particularly important projects represented by papers include Swifterbant, Italy and the Levant, survey projects in Italy and Arctic research, especially at Spitsbergen. Some publications were progress reports on ongoing projects (eg burial dating in the Aegean) or papers providing a synthesis of aspects of wider research (eg Spitzbergen). The progress reports and syntheses are not easy to evaluate in terms of the international significance of the wider project as a whole. One of the nine was about a historic rather than archeological subject. The most significant and substantial monograph was in Dutch with English summaries only. The PRC was not fully capable to evaluate those latter two papers. For future reviews we would recommend submitting the strongest publications internationally for tenured staff and others, rather than a selection which is representative of the range of types of publication.

The productivity varies from year to year but in general has increased. With respect to the outputs, an impressive 574 publications are reported in the review period. In 2004-7 only between 2 and 4 papers were published in Peer Reviewed Journals; this increased to 7 in 2008 and 2009. The growth in the number of peer reviewed papers was identified as a priority in the last review and is encouraging. Even so, the proportion of peer reviewed papers is small: 4% of publications for the review period. This means that some of the research of GIA is not being published where it will achieve the greatest international impact. There is a case for refocusing publication strategy on a smaller number of higher impact peer reviewed international journals.

Reviewing the size of the three groups and comparing their productivity is difficult as the groups are very different in nature and vary in the ratio of tenured/total staff.

The PRC appreciated the meetings with the three research groups and visits to the different locations.
Chapter 4 Evaluation of the Research Programme

Chapter 4.1 Research Group 1 and 2
Pre and Protohistory of Northwest Europe

Key publications
Johansen, L and Stapert, D 2004 Oldeholtwolde. A Hamburgian family encampment around a hearth Lisse: Balkema 229pp

Staffing
There was some reduction of staffing, tenured staff down from 3.4 to 2.6, non-tenured up from 1 to 1.3. PhD students have increased from 2.7 to 4.7 and research staff from 7.1 to 8.6.

The publications of this group were the most substantial and highest standard internationally. The two volume Midlaren report represents a major achievement. This was a commercially funded project in advance of housing development from 2003-4 published with impressive speed to the highest standards in 2008. The report considers landscape development since the Pleistocene and a succession of excavated settlements from the Bronze Age to Medieval. The project also deserves a synthesis article in a journal to make its results more widely known. The Swifterbant paper in a major journal represents an important reassessment of the question of wetland agriculture and the transition to farming. The wider Swifterbant project is of considerable international significance. It is notable that both Midlaren and Swifterbant draw significantly on both the social and scientific strands of research at GIA. The Oldeholtwolde monograph results from a collaboration on the Analithic project with the University of Copenhagen. It represent a extremely meticulous study which is widely relevant to an understanding of lithic distributions, activity areas and structures widely.

Productivity
The total number of publications is high at 158 and the total of 19 monographs impressive. Book chapters and non-refereed journals make up 76% of the total and there are only 11 papers in refereed journals. Rapid publication of Midlaren is an outstanding achievement.

Relevance
The work of this group is highly relevant to heritage management in the Netherlands and GIA plays a particularly important role in this field in the Northern Netherlands and beyond. This is the group which could benefit most from clarification and possible development of a relationship with the commercial sector.

Vitality
This was the group which the PRC felt had the clearest sense of forward momentum. Four staff have retired over the period. These have been replaced by two new tenured staff one (H. Peeters) in prehistory and one (S. Arnoldussen) in proto-history. The PRC heard about exciting new research developments, for instance in relation to the drowned archaeology of the North Sea (which links to research initiatives in the UK), and a most promising new phase of investigation of terps. The non-tenured staff are also a valuable asset to the group which is for instance clear in the research grants. J. Nicolay being particularly impressive managing a research income of over E1m.

Table 4. Funding and expenditure at institutional level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding:</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct funding</td>
<td>160.400</td>
<td>160.400</td>
<td>153.000</td>
<td>153.000</td>
<td>153.000</td>
<td>153.000</td>
<td>932.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct funding for PhD</td>
<td>6.900</td>
<td>5.600</td>
<td>6.300</td>
<td>5.300</td>
<td>5.300</td>
<td>23.400</td>
<td>52.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total direct funding</td>
<td>167.300</td>
<td>166.000</td>
<td>159.300</td>
<td>158.300</td>
<td>158.300</td>
<td>176.400</td>
<td>985.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research funding</td>
<td>898.700</td>
<td>679.100</td>
<td>857.000</td>
<td>868.900</td>
<td>15.000</td>
<td>230.000</td>
<td>3.366.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155.500</td>
<td>208.000</td>
<td>180.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>38.300</td>
<td>43.300</td>
<td>21.200</td>
<td>69.800</td>
<td>14.700</td>
<td>50.300</td>
<td>237.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.104.300</td>
<td>888.400</td>
<td>1.193.000</td>
<td>1.123.000</td>
<td>368.000</td>
<td>456.700</td>
<td>5.133.400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 4.2 Research Group 3
Mediterranean Archaeology

Key publications

General
It appeared that two projects were missing from the self study, the excavation of the Francavilla villa and survey in the Ukraine.

Quality
The group of Attema is internationally recognized and visible. The holding of two prestigious VIDI fellows in the review period is testimony to academic strength. Groningen’s research tradition in the Mediterranean is based on long-standing, developed and well-managed engagements, mostly at the regional level. From its integrated archaeological approach, the group makes important contributions to the international debate on regional surveys, ancient landscapes and deep-time perspectives of societal evolution. Typical for the group is their very responsible approach towards the sites, regions and archaeological material, under their investigation. In comparison with the other GIA research groups and based on the information made available to the PRC, the committee judged the Mediterranean unit to display somewhat less innovative power, and making less use of the full potential of GIA.

The Italian regions paper is a synthesis of long-term survey results and a typical example of the group’s strength. Their sustainable engagement with the studied regions allow a balanced understanding of deep-time developments, creating a very solid base for approaching the tricky issue of meaningful inter-regional comparison. The concept of ‘Regional pathways to complexity’ has strong analytical value and is of high international relevance.

The Italy and the Levant paper is a substantial, carefully argued contribution to later protohistoric chronology. The radiocarbon paper evaluates four radiocarbon dates; it is a short progress report on one aspect of a longer term project. The wider project may well be important but the rather inconclusive paper selected does not demonstrate this. The PRC found it difficult to place the latter paper in the larger scheme of the Mediterranean group and wondered why this paper was put forward as a key publication, both for the authors in question and the group as a whole. A different approach towards selecting key publications seems advisable in the case of the Mediterranean group.

The recently published ‘Regional Pathways to Complexity’ volume (Amsterdam University Press 2010) is an excellent example of what the group represents as a research unit within GIA and internationally although ‘in press’ at the time of the site visit and thus postdating the review period.

The number of academic publications is good. However, the intrinsic quality of the research warrants more publications in a wider range of peer reviewed journals, beyond options available at Groningen itself or in the Dutch classical archaeological world, such as Pharos and Babesch. This aspect of restricted publication policy, together with a heavy focus on papers in proceedings or dedicated volumes, means that the real potential of the group remains underexploited internationally, staying too much below the radar. In general, the Mediterranean Archaeology group is recommended to be a bit more ambitious. The papers in proceedings and dedicated volumes display excellent quality and focus of research, which could easily be transformed into contributions to peer reviewed journals.

Productivity

Relevance
The PRC concluded that the Mediterranean research group was somewhat isolated in self-assessment exercise, and that this condition is possibly linked to the particularities of the research agendas of both the Mediterranean group and GIA. The Mediterranean group has a strong and valuable tradition, but considering the new developments in the group the PRC finds it the right time to reconsider its best practices within the structure of GIA.
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Vitality
In 2010, 2 new major projects have been funded. The group was able to attract new, young and successful staff in the review period. The initiative to develop an integrated approach to digitally archiving past and ongoing achievements is laudable. These are very positive signs of the leadership of the group, in competition with similar groups in the Netherlands. Such incentives, together with the sound research tradition of the group, and the strengths of GIA should represent a promising potential to develop the international role of the Mediterranean group.

Chapter 4.3 Research Group 4
Arctic Archaeology

Key publications

General
The Arctic Centre is an interdisciplinary working group in which GIA participates. Its research is not purely archaeological but includes biology, history and geography. This review concentrated on the archaeological research. The Centre receives some funding from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to represent the Netherlands in Arctic Studies. The Centre also has a Foundation which raises funds from lectures and exhibitions. All this indicates a high and successful public profile and a unit with a high impact for its research. The two PRC members who were not previously so aware of it, were surprised and impressed by the exciting interdisciplinary work of the Arctic Centre and the way it combined archaeology with other fields. The PRC did not feel able to assess the historical research of Veluwenkamp and the grants he obtained. That research, at least in terms of the papers presented, was historical and apparently outside the remit of GIA.

Archaeological research appears recently to have focused on the last few centuries when European societies have had a particularly dramatic impact on Arctic environments, e.g. Hacquebord and Avango (2009). Research topics include large scale exploitation of Arctic environments for fishing, whaling and mining. The ecological research is not specifically evaluated in this review, but aspects of it on bird, fish and whale populations have clear links to archaeological and palaeoenvironmental questions concerning the exploitation of marine resources, long term climate change and pollution history. Thus the Arctic Centre is a much better fit within the remit of GIA than might have been expected. That fit could be much stronger if there was a clear strategy for the development of science in GIA.

The Arctic Centre has clearly been very successfully led by Prof Louwrens Hacquebord. The total staff of the AC group more than doubled in the review period due to success in obtaining research grants for PhDs and Postdocs. He retires in 2012 and the PRC was told that a continuation of the Chair has been agreed. A replacement needs to be able to continue the success in communication, international profile and interdisciplinary research which has been established. Appointment of a strong successor is obviously central to the continued success of the Arctic Centre and potentially to the role of science within GIA.

Quality
Research at the Arctic Centre is unique and important, both for The Netherlands and internationally. The Polar Regions are virtual laboratories for global change as well as adaptation and human impacts on the environment. This circumstance calls for high-quality interdisciplinary research and Arctic Centre is well positioned to continue this commitment. The Arctic Centre has maintained a high level of quality in its research across a broad range of fields. Publication levels should be maintained but with an increasing emphasis on internationally peer-reviewed journals.

Productivity
In terms of grants, staff increases and impact the Centre scores very highly. It is recommended that more broad-based international journals be pursued to achieve the greatest impacts of this research.
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Relevance
The Arctic Centre participates in and initiates various activities for the general public and participates in public debates. The research has many implications for the future management of Arctic environments in terms of both heritage and nature conservation and will contribute to both public policy and international political agendas.

Vitality
Doubling in size over the review period and with a group of enthusiastic multi-disciplinary graduate students, the vitality of the Arctic Centre appears excellent.

Chapter 4.4 Science Based Archaeology
This was not submitted as a formal group and the publications from this group have been assessed under the other groups. It is therefore not possible to access the Science group under the same criteria of Quality, Productivity, Relevance and Vitality as the other groups. The PRC was not able to interview the coordinator of Science-Based Archaeology Dr Cappers who was on fieldwork in Egypt during the visit. What can be said is that, despite staff reductions and continued lack of clarity about the position of this group, quality remains high. Productivity seems to be good but would be better focused on major GIA led projects. Relevance to all areas of GIA activity and Dutch Archaeology is very high and there seems to be reasonable vitality although decisions on the role of archaeological science represents a very substantial challenge facing GIA and the university.

Since the establishment in 1920 of the Biologisch Archaeologisch Instituut (BAI) by van Giffen, Groningen has been internationally recognised for its contribution to palaeoenvironmental science. In 1988 the former BAI became part of the GIA within the Faculty of Arts. Since then the number of science tenured positions has declined and this is the only group where major retirements from tenured positions have not been replaced. This, together with ambiguity about the status of this group, raises the question as to whether science is being adequately prioritised at GIA. A further tenured staff retirement is due in 2012. No non-tenured staff were listed under science based archaeology and only 3 PhD students were listed.

Tables 2 showing the structure of research groups demonstrates that the position of science-based archaeology is anomalous. The last review identified that Ecological Archaeology and Methodology was defined in the plans for the future as some sort of non-group and that remains its status on p8 of the present Self Study. The anomaly does not appear to have been resolved. A diagram in the Self Study document (p8) shows Ecological Archaeology and Methodology in the position of a service group at the centre of four chair led research groups. Several of those interviewed from a number of research groups were unhappy about this diagram and felt it did not really reflect the research structure within GIA. Whilst such a structure might represent a logical arrangement for a small archaeology department with relatively modest scientific activity and aspirations, the PRC was not convinced that it is the appropriate long term structure for Groningen.

The fact that the self assessment document focused on the research of the three chair-led groupings may have led to an under emphasis on some aspects of Science research and strategy within GIA. An example of this is that during the review period GIA published The Digital Seed Atlas of the Netherlands (Cappers et al 2006) and the Digital Atlas of Economic Plants (Cappers et al 2009). These digital and printed publications were made possible by the outstanding Groningen reference collections which are the product of investment, perhaps over decades, perhaps almost a century. The Atlases represent major GIA led collaborations with the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut. However, this collaboration and these publications are not flagged in the Self Study document as major achievements of the review period. As illustrated atlases they are not conventional research publications, they have, none the less, benefited palaeobotanical researchers worldwide.

Another area of scientific research which has been of great importance to Groningen for many years is isotope research, particularly radiocarbon dating where the research of J. Lanting (retired 2008) was important in chronology building in Holland and many other areas (eg Ireland). Radiocarbon dating remains as important today as it was in the twentieth century. The self study document notes (p18) that collaboration with the radiocarbon laboratory has been adversely affected as a result of charging for dates since 2006 which costs GIA c. £5,000 per year. It would be unfortunate if these new arrangements led to reduced use of an outstanding university resource. The PRC learnt that because of waiting lists some GIA radiocarbon dating
is now done in the USA and Poland. There would seem to be scope for renewed collaboration with the Centre for Isotope Research in ESRIG. The PRC heard during the visit of interesting isotopic research on early animal diets which is relevant to wide current international research interest in questions of palaeodiet and human migration using stable isotopes.

Archaeological Science has shrunk at Groningen since 1988 at a time when many of the most successful competitor archaeology departments have strengthened archaeological science. Key factors in the PRC recommendation that consideration should be given to reversing this trend are: (i) Groningen's outstanding historical, and continuing, contribution to biological archaeology, (ii) the excellent reference collections and facilities, (iii) the geographical position in an area where biological investigations are central to much archaeological research (eg terps, peat sites, and many others) (iii) the potential for major collaborations in isotope research (with ESRIG) (iv) interdisciplinary ecological research is a strong feature of the Arctic Centre. With these strengths at Groningen it does not seem appropriate to position Ecological Archaeology in terms of a set of methodologies acting to serve other research groups. It would seem more appropriate to position it as a distinctive area of archaeological research with its own research agendas and approaches with appropriate research leadership able to attract funding and research students at the highest level internationally.

The central issue for GIA and the university to address remains as it was at the time of the last 1998-2003 review: does the university wish to maintain its internationally competitive position in archaeological science? If it does, then the PRC advises that steps should be taken as soon as possible. Without steps now, it is likely that by the time of the next review the investment of generations will have been dissipated.

Chapter 4.5 Future strategy
With respect to the upcoming retirements (research and support staff) the PRC was pleased to hear from the Dean that the faculty intention is to replace these. The Arctic Chair is an appointment of key strategic importance. The most important strategic issue is identifying the future direction of archaeological science as was the case at the time of the last review. The PRC recommends evaluating the size of the institute and the number and range of (PhD) projects. Growth should not be a goal on its own but should be linked to specific objectives.

The PRC was told that GIA hoped to apply for one of the Rosalind Franklin Fellowships which the university has established for fast tenure track appointments of exceptionally able female researchers. These have tended to be 5 year research appointments leading to a tenured position. This was mentioned to the PRC as a possible strategy to enhance the research leadership of archaeological science and perhaps palynology, thus filling gaps which have existed since the retirement of Professor Bottema in 2002. Clearly such an appointment would be a most welcome development in increasing new blood in GIA. Two points should be considered in relation to this strategy (i) resolving uncertainty about the future of science at GIA should not rely on whether a Franklin bid succeeds (ii) consideration needs to be given to whether a fast track appointment can provide effective research leadership quickly enough to reinvigorate scientific activity in GIA. If an appointment does prove possible, consideration should be given to the strongest research scientist from a worldwide field appropriate in a Groningen context, rather than to a specialist in one particular field of analytical need in which candidates might not be strong enough to compete with other Franklin candidates.

Over this review period there have been major and impressive developments outlined in the above report, some responding to issues in the last assessment, others responding to other agendas and opportunities and the vision of a new young director and other recently appointed staff. The achievements of the review period demonstrate that GIA has very capable leadership.

Now that many important changes have taken place the institute should take time to develop more ‘blue skies’ strategic objectives particularly in relation to its science role and relationship with the commercial sector. The Self Study document does not fully convey a clear vision for the longer term strategic development of GIA. It was also surprising not to see any obvious references in the Self Study to ways in which the development of GIA could contribute to university wide or national strategic objectives. The PRC being from other universities in other countries can only guess at what these might be, but the type of topic might...
include sustainability, alternative energy, food and energy security, climate change, global warming, pollution history, human diversity and social inclusion and the relationship between heritage and nature conservation. Each of these topics is relevant in some degree to GIA research, the more so because of the relationship to the Arctic Centre and the capability in palaeoenvironmental science.

The PRC is convinced that the future is bright for GIA. The institute has successfully attracted highly able young scholars in the review period and they are developing exciting teaching and research projects. There have been major successes in grant winning. The group of very enthusiastic and talented PhDs is an important asset. GIA should focus more on flagship internationally important projects published in peer reviewed journals and final monographs.
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# Program of the site visit

## 2010 Peer Review Site Visit

**Assessment of Research Quality 2004 - 2009**

Groningen Institute of Archaeology

Faculty of Arts, University of Groningen

November 7-9, 2010

### Sunday November 7

**Starting diner**

**PRC members**

- Martin Bell (chair)
- Noel Broadbent and Jeroen Poblome
- Fennegien Brouwer-Keij (secretary to the PRC committee)

**Faculty Board members**

- Gerry Wakker (dean)
- Kees de Bot (vice-dean)
- Daan Raemaekers (Director GIA)
- Heidi van den Heuve-Disler (research policy advisor)

### Monday November 8 (Host Louwrens Hacquebord)

9.00  **Formal opening of GIA site visit**

PRC meeting with the Faculty Board

**Faculty Board members**

- Gerry Wakker
- Kees de Bot
- Egon Dietrich (Treasurer)
- Guido Gündel (student member)
- Rita Landeweerd (secretary)
- Louwrens Hacquebord, professor
- Heidi van den Heuve-Disler, senior lecturer Greek Archaeology (apology)

10.00 **Committee meeting**

11.00 **Meeting with Ph.D.'s from the three groups**

- Tymon de Haas
- Iepie Aalders
- Sandra Beckerman
- Prof. dr. L. Hacquebord
- Inger Woltinge
- Geertje Klein Goldewijk
- Tekke Terpstra
- Sarah Willemsen
- Ulf Gustafsson
- Mans Schepers

13.00 **Lunch**

14.00 **Meeting with technical personnel**

- Siebe Boersma, drawing room
- Erwin Bolhuis, drawing room
- Frits Steenhuisen, GIS
- Daphne Maring, publication support
- Luuk Tol, financial manager
- Prof. dr. L. Hacquebord

15.00 **Meeting with staff Arctic Centre at the Artic Centre**

- Louwrens Hacquebord, professor
- Maarten Loonen, post doc
- Dag Avango, post doc (apology)

17.00 **Committee meeting**

### Tuesday November 9 (Host Daan Raemaekers)

9.00 **Tour of lab facilities**

(botany, zoology, conservation) in Poststraat 6

9.30 **Meeting with staff Classical and Mediterranean Archaeology**

- Peter Attema, professor
- Marjan Galestin, lecturer Roman Archaeology
- Martijn van Leusen, lecturer Landscape Archaeology
- Bert Nijboer, lecturer Italian Archaeology
- Sofia Voutsaki, senior lecturer Greek Archaeology (apology)

11.30 **Meeting with staff Prehistory and Protohistory of northwestern Europe**

- Daan Raemaekers, professor
- Stijn Arnoldussen, lecturer Late Prehistory
- Johan Nicolay, post doc
- Annet Nieuwhof, lecturer Roman and mediaeval period
- Hans Peeters, lecturer Early Prehistory
- Wietse Prummel, senior lecturer Archaeozoology

13.30 **Lunch with director Raemaekers**

14.30 **Committee meeting**

16.30 **Oral report to Board of Faculty and GIA members**

17.30 **Formal closure of the site visit**
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Appendix 2 PRC members

The board of the university is responsible for the selection of the chair and further configuration of the external evaluation committee. The faculty and the unit to be evaluated were invited to suggest committee members. The selection procedure for chair and members ensured the competence, expertise, impartiality and independence of the evaluation committee as a whole. At the start of the site visit the PRC members signed a standard Competence and independence of peer review committee members form. According to the University of Groningen protocol for research evaluations.

www.rug.nl/corporate/onderzoek/kwaliteitszorg

The PRC for the evaluation of GIA in 2010 consisted of three members and an executive secretary, their c.v.’s are listed below.

Brief cv’s

Prof. dr. M. Bell, BSc, PhD, FSA, FBA, chair
Bell holds the Chair of Archaeological Science and is head of the Archaeology Department at the Reading University in the UK. He obtained his PhD on valley sediments as evidence of prehistoric land-use from London University in 1981. He worked from 1980-83 as a researcher at Bristol University, Geography Department. From 1983-1997 he was Lecturer, then Senior Lecturer, in Archaeology at the University of Wales, Lampeter. He moved to Reading in 1997 and was given a personal chair in 2002. He teaches Geoarchaeology and Coastal and Maritime Archaeology. Books include Late Quaternary Environmental Change (with M.J.C. Walker), Past and Present Soil Erosion (ed with J. Boardman 1992), Prehistoric Intertidal Archaeology (2000), Prehistoric Coastal Communities (2007). His research interests focus on the archaeology of intertidal and estuarine environments in prehistory, particularly recently Mesolithic wetland sites. He also has research interests in experimental archaeology, both heritage sites and earthworks, and molluscan analysis in archaeology.

Prof. dr. N. Broadbent, BA, M.A, PhD
Broadbent is a senior researcher at the Arctic Studies Center, Department of Anthropology, Smithsonian Institution, in Washington, DC, USA. Prior to this he was Reader in Archaeology at Uppsala University, Director of the Center for Arctic Cultural Research, Chair of the Department of Archaeology and Saami Studies, both at Umeå University, and Director of the Arctic Social Sciences Program at the National Science Foundation in Washington, D.C. He has carried out field work North America, Africa, Scandinavia, Spitsbergen (Svalbard) and Antarctica. His research interests include prehistoric and historic archaeology, indigenous archaeology, interdisciplinary methods and research ethics. His most recent book is Lapps and Labyrinths. Saami Prehistory, Colonization and Resilience (2010), Smithsonian Scholarly Studies Press.

Prof. dr. J. Poblome
Prof. dr. J. Poblome holds a chair at the research unit of Archaeology of the Katholieke Universiteit Leuven. He coordinates teaching on Classical Archaeology and material culture studies. He collaborates with Leiden University on the Boeotia Survey Project in Greece, while his main research activities are focused on ancient Sagalassos in Turkey, in the function of Field Director. He directs the ICRATES project on inventorying crafts and trade in the Roman East. Poblome co-founded and co-edits FACTA. A Journal of Roman Material Culture Studies.

Dr. S.F. Brouwer-Keij MBA, executive secretary
Brouwer is policy advisor for research and valorisation at University of Groningen central offices (Bureau).

www.rug.nl/staff/s.f.brouwer-keij
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Competence and independence of peer review committee members

1. Members of the peer review committee must base their assessment primarily on:
   > the 'specific peer review protocol' adopted by the Executive Board of the University

2. When judging the quality of research, members of the peer review committee must base their assessment on the following information:
   > the self-evaluation report and accompanying documentation
   > possible additional information provided at the request of the peer review committee
   > interviews, lectures and talks conducted within the framework of the assessment

3. Members of the peer review committee must meet the generally accepted quality demands within scientific research, including:
   > competence and professionalism
   > independence and objectivity
   > care and consistency
   > transparency and impartiality

4. Members of the peer review committee may not have any personal, scientific, financial or any other potential conflicts of interest when participating in the research assessment of Groningen Institute of Archaeology (GIA) of the Faculty of Arts and are therefore both qualified and competent to carry out their task as independent assessors.

5. Members of the peer review committee must report any potential conflicts of interest in the assessment procedure to the chairman of the review committee.

I declare that I have read the above and that I will comply with it to the best of my ability.

Name: ______________________
Place and date: ______________________
Signature: ______________________