

Assessment Report

Academy of Creative and Performing Arts (ACPA)

Peer Review 2012 – 2017

December 2018

Table of contents

Preface	3
1. Introduction	5
1.1 The evaluation	5
1.2 The assessment procedure	5
1.3 Results of the assessment	6
1.4 Quality of the information	7
2 Structure, organisation and mission of ACPA	8
2.1 Introduction	8
2.2 Mission of ACPA	8
2.3 Management and organisation	8
3 Assessment of the research of ACPA.....	10
3.1 Research Academy of Creative and Performing Arts.....	10
3.2 PhD training and education programme	13
3.3 Integrity	15
3.4 Diversity	16
3.5 Recommendations.....	17
Annex 1 Criteria and scores of national protocol SEP.....	19
Annex 2 Terms of Reference ACPA.....	21
Annex 3 Programme Site visit ACPA.....	23
Annex 4 Research data	25
Annex 5 Curricula vitae of the Committee members	26

Preface

This report embodies the findings and recommendations of an international peer review of the Academy of Creative and Performing Arts (ACPA), undertaken on November 13-15, 2018.

Our peer review committee was appointed by the Board of Leiden University.

In conducting its evaluation, the committee made use of the full range of evidence sources available to it. These comprised: the self-assessment report provided by ACPA; a dossier of appendices to this report, including a link to the Research Catalogue provided by ACPA making made available to committee members artistic documentation of work by PhD alumni; staff publications and text-based documents by PhD alumni; further material and links to key documents available through searching the website of Leiden University. The committee's study of these sources was then complemented by two days of meetings with the staff, the PhD candidates of the institute and representatives of the Boards of Leiden University and the University of the Arts The Hague.

The modus operandi adopted for these meetings was designed to maximise their efficiency and was specifically targeted towards the following: issues where further information was felt to be required after perusal of the available documentation; issues identified in the self-assessment report as being of concern to ACPA; issues arising from time to time during the course of an earlier meeting requiring subsequent clarification from a different source. As a result, while the main assessment criteria of research quality, relevance to society and viability, the PhD programmes and issues of research integrity and diversity were each given equal regard overall by the committee, they received different levels of attention during the meetings depending on how fully they were felt to have been covered elsewhere.

This review report is both prospective and retrospective and contains several recommendations to ACPA, the Faculty of Humanities and the Boards of Leiden University and the University of the Arts.

As Chair, I wish to thank my fellow evaluators for their expert and sincere contributions to the discussions and final findings. The work was not only intense, but also socially agreeable and academically rewarding.

As a panel, we should like to thank all members of ACPA, staff and researchers, for their open and constructive participation in the review process.

We hope this report to be the beginning of another successful period of excellent artistic research in the Academy of Creative and Performing Arts.

December 2018

Mag. Dr.phil. Andrea B. Braidt, MLitt
Chair

1. Introduction

1.1 The evaluation

All publicly funded university research in the Netherlands is evaluated at regular intervals in compliance with the national standard evaluation protocol (SEP 2015-2021), as agreed by the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU), the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) and the Netherlands Academy of Sciences (KNAW). The evaluation process, which is applied at the research unit or institute level, consists of a systematic external peer review conducted every six years.

The evaluation system aims to achieve three generic objectives:

- *improvement* in the quality of research through an assessment carried out according to international standards of quality and relevance;
- *improvement* in research management and leadership; and
- *accountability* to the higher management levels of the research organisations and to the funding agencies, government and society at large.

1.2 The assessment procedure

The evaluation procedures followed by the Review Committee were those set out in the NWO/VSNU/KNAW “Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021 for public research organisations”. This protocol entails two main characteristics:

- *Two levels of assessment*: The assessment takes place at two levels of the research organisation, i.e. the level of the graduate school and the level of research groups/institutes;
- *Three main criteria*: The research institutes are assessed on the three assessment criteria, i.e. research quality, relevance to society, and viability.

The review committee was requested to report its findings on the research institute in line with the three main criteria listed above, bearing in mind the protocol’s requirement that these should always be reviewed in relation to the institute’s mission, especially if this mission restricts the institute to operating only for/within a national scientific community.

The committee also bore in mind the requirement of the SEP that its findings should be reported in qualitative terms with a focus on policy and management questions, and that, for the assessment, the verdict should be cast in both qualitative and quantitative terms. In the main text below, the committee has sought to clarify its most important considerations before summarizing its conclusions under each of the three criteria in the form of a single term according to a four-point scale (Annex 1). Checklists and excerpts of the standard evaluation protocol were provided as a tool for assisting in assessment.

The assessment was based on and supported by three main components of evidence:

- A self-assessment report detailing the operation, management, research activities, and SWOT analysis of the institute, written as prescribed in the national standard evaluation protocol;
- An overview of the output of the institute to allow the Committee to examine the quality of the published work;
- Discussions with boards, researchers, PhD students and council, academic staff, research managers, and administrative staff about the work programmes, the aims and the strategy for the future of the research institute and its consisting teams.

The site visit took place during the period of 2018 and comprised a number of components, which can be summarised as follows (see Annex 2 for the full programme and the names of participants):

- Start-off committee meeting on the evening of Tuesday November 13
- Meetings with institute management and Dean of the Faculty
- Meeting with PhD candidates and alumni
- Meeting with APCA staff (full and assistant professors)
- Meeting with Executive Board, University of the Arts The Hague

The Peer Review Committee consisted of:

- Mag. Dr.phil. Andrea Braidt, MLitt, chair, Vice-Rector at the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna (Austria), President of the European League of the Institutes of the Arts (ELIA)
- Dr. Jeremy Cox, former Chief Executive of the Association Européenne des Conservatoires, Académies de Musique et Musikhochschulen (AEC), Belgium
- Prof. Dr. Ken Friedman, Swinburne University of Technology in Melbourne, Australia
- Dr. Frans van Steijn acted as independent secretary to the committee

1.3 Results of the assessment

This report summarises the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the international peer review of the research at ACPA. The review covered the period between 2012 and 2017. The written and oral information permitted good understanding of the research institute. The assessment was rated and weighed according to the rationale explained in Annex 1. The conclusions, as given in Chapter 3 of this report, follow the structure and criteria which are formulated in the Terms of Reference, Annex 2.

1.4 Quality of the information

The information that was made available to the committee consisted of:

- Self-assessment ACPA 2012 - 2017
- The Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021
- The Terms of Reference for the Assessment Committee
- The programme for the site visit
- Short CV's of the committee members and secretary
- Leiden Protocol for Research Assessment 2015-2021
- Artistic Outcome ACPA PhDs 2012 – 2018
- Final Report ACPA 2013
- Assessment report mid-term review research 2016 ACPA
- DocARTES Programme 2017 – 2018
- Handbook DocARTES 2017 – 2018
- Handbook PhDarts 2017 – 2018
- PhDarts Programme 2017 - 2018
- Joint Regulations Leiden-The Hague 2017 – 2018
- Programme Conference-Festival Oct 2018
- Regulations ACPA 16-5-2017
- Research Output Academic Staff Table D3b
- Schedule 22-23 March 2017 Joint Doctoral Session
- Supervisors meeting 2017
- Samenwerkingsovereenkomst DocARTES (in Dutch)

The committee finds the information ample, honest and adequate.

2 Structure, organisation and mission of ACPA

2.1 Introduction

The Academy of Creative and Performing Arts (ACPA) is an institute for research, education and societal outreach based in a partnership between Leiden University and the University of the Arts The Hague. ACPA was established in 2001 as the 'Faculteit der Kunsten' (Faculty of Creative and Performing Arts) at Leiden University. In 2008 the institute was brought under the umbrella of the Faculty of Humanities as one of its seven institutes.

ACPA has a strong foundation in the two faculties of the University of the Arts The Hague: the Royal Academy of Art and the Royal Conservatoire, which together have over 1600 BA and MA students in fine arts, design, music and dance, with all their sub-disciplines. As an institute of Leiden University, it collaborates with other institutes and educational programmes of the Faculty of Humanities and with those in other faculties of the University.

2.2 Mission of ACPA

ACPA offers composers, performing artists, visual artists and (graphic) designers the opportunity to perform research in and through artistic practice.

ACPA also offers education in the arts for Leiden University students, and provides academic electives for students of the University of the Arts The Hague.

2.3 Management and organisation

ACPA is a relatively small institute, led by the Academic Director, Prof. Henk Borgdorff and the Institute Manager, Dr. Rosalien van der Poel. In October 2016 the current Management Team of the institute was installed and the leadership was transferred from Prof. Frans de Ruiter, who from the founding of the 'Faculteit der Kunsten' in 2001 had been the main actor at ACPA. Since 2016 three professors, two of them part-time, and three (part-time) university lecturers have been appointed.

Regular Academic Staff Meetings are organised, where all the professors and university lecturers discuss their work and the research strategy of the institute. Day-to-day policies regarding the institute are discussed and decided upon in regular meetings of ACPA's Management Team with the Board of the Faculty of Humanities and with the Executive Board of the University of the Arts, in both bilateral meetings and biannual joint meetings. The overall strategy and financial arrangements of the collaboration between the two Universities are discussed and decided upon twice a year in meetings of ACPA and Board of the Faculty of Humanities with the Executive Boards of both Universities. Financial transactions

and Human Resource affairs are regulated by the relevant departments in The Hague and Leiden.

3 Assessment of the research of ACPA

3.1 Research Academy of Creative and Performing Arts

Principal Institute	Leiden University, Faculty of Humanities Academy of Creative and Performing Arts (ACPA)
Director	Prof. Henk Borgdorff
Research input tenured staff 2017	2.1 fte (9 pers.)
PhD candidates in 2017	53

Assessment:

Research quality	1 (excellent)
Relevance to society	2 (very good)
Viability	3 (good)

Research quality

In terms of its research quality, ACPA and its associated PhD programmes can confidently be said to be among the most influential contributors worldwide to the highly specialised field of artistic research. Indeed, much of the credit for the establishment and subsequent growth of the field may be attributed to ACPA and those associated with it since its formation in 2001. ACPA staff are widely cited in writings on artistic research and are frequently called upon to address conferences and other gatherings devoted to the subject.

ACPA's unique structure arises from the fact that, in the Netherlands, the Art Universities do not possess degree awarding power for the third cycle; that is to say that it is not possible for such institutions, under their own autonomy, to grant a doctorate or PhD title to creative and performing artists who have proven themselves through a submission equivalent to a doctoral thesis. The committee—whose members come from countries where art universities as autonomous universities do have the degree awarding power for the third cycle (Austria, Sweden, UK)—recognizes that the ACPA model, based on a praiseworthy partnership between Leiden University and the University of the Arts The Hague, serves well to remedy this gap in the Dutch higher education conditions. As an arrangement designed to overcome an obstacle, the ACPA model has actually yielded impressive results. However, the committee feels obliged to make the point that, in the long term, this situation does not offer the best support in terms of the infrastructure needed to conduct artistic PhD research, when compared to international standards.

It is therefore all the more to be commended that the pioneering DocARTES programme and its equally important slightly later counterpart, the PhDArts programme, have grown to provide models for artistic doctorates that are benchmarks for the sector, whether imitated or used as a basis for differentiation. ACPA has brought large numbers of qualified artistic research exponents into the sector, many of whom now hold institutional positions where they, in turn, are training new artistic researchers and generating material that enriches the field. Overall, the impact of ACPA on the field of artistic research has been considerable, and overwhelmingly positive.

While artistic research therefore owes a great deal to ACPA and its pioneering work, neither the unit itself nor the PhD programmes are entirely immune to the same challenges that confront the discipline everywhere. At the core of artistic research is the demand for a dual competence in artistry and scholarship. The worlds of the professional artist and the institutional academic are therefore brought into an unusually intimate conjunction that carries intrinsic tensions when one individual must achieve mastery in both. Moreover, from these already multi-valent origins, artistic research has spread quite naturally into other disciplines, among them philosophy, cognitive science, psychology and sociology. As it continues to grow and proliferate, artistic research can sometimes struggle to match the depth of expertise to be found in each of the individual disciplines with which it interacts. Although some signs of this widespread struggle may be detected from time to time in the research output emanating from ACPA, it continues to be a leader in striving towards a level of maturity that will enable artistic research to engage on equal terms in any and all of these interdisciplinary engagements with other, more established, disciplines.

ACPA's academic leadership is strong and highly influential in artistic research worldwide. ACPA's engagement in the International Society for Artistic Research (SAR), the Journal of Artistic Research (JAR) and the ERC has brought artistic research in Europe forward in many ways. The institute's production is impressive and is driven by a strategy that aims to provide output at the highest possible relevant level. The encouragement of open access publishing is positive.

For the reasons given above, the committee believes the research quality of ACPA to be commensurate with Category 1 of the SEP, denoting work of a world-leading/excellent nature when compared to other units operating in the field of artistic research.

Relevance to society

ACPA rightly considers artistic research not only relevant for the domain of research within the specialised world of academia, but just as much for society, art and culture. ACPA's research includes the role of the arts in society and ACPA

participates in the public debate about the arts and arts policies. A range of collaborations and initiatives has been started. The launching of the pilot Art Research Convergence is a positive example. Also the role of ACPA's Academic Director in the development and promotion of the world-leading open access on-line repository for art research products (The Research Catalogue) serves well for bringing artistic research into the open. The achievements in terms of outreach are substantial for a unit of this size.

This being said, the committee lacked a sense of a fully-developed and concrete strategy for driving the outreach activities of ACPA. They seem more the outcome of the ambitions of individual researchers than coordinated actions taking place in the context of an ACPA-wide strategy. The institute addresses topics that are highly relevant to society, but the research remains sometimes quite inwardly directed, especially in the music-related research. The committee recommends that ACPA formulate an institute-wide policy, drawing on existing good practice, especially in art/design research, with goals and timelines for the coming years.

For the reasons given above, the committee considers the relevance to society of ACPA to be very good.

Viability

Given the financial and other constraints within which the institute operates, the strategy and targets drawn up by ACPA are well-conceived for maintaining and enhancing the quality of research described above. In particular, the creation of five research tracks, plus a sixth to be developed in collaboration with Codarts, is a sensible and welcome step. ACPA's structure and leadership has undergone significant change in recent years. Although the current arrangements are still relatively new, there are already signs of their working well and providing a firm basis for future development. This should give encouragement to Leiden University and the University of the Arts The Hague to invest in ACPA in ways that enable it to achieve its manifest potential.

The heavy dependency of the unit upon the annual completions of PhD theses is a serious threat; ACPA's financial soundness requires a more robust and stabilised funding position. A strategy of development is really difficult to achieve under the current financial situation. The 10-year agreement is very laudable, but the committee feels that concrete strategies to secure finances, such as a target number of completed PhD theses per year, are still under construction. The support from the Faculty of Humanities seems strong, but that hasn't prevented a recently agreed budget cut, albeit that the hope is to accommodate this largely through efficiency savings (such as ceasing the practice of paying for the publishing of candidates' theses) rather than having to apply it to core costs.

Securing money from sources outside the universities proves to be very difficult for various reasons: NWO and European Commission money is almost impossible to acquire in the field of artistic research, a fact that might change with new thinking and rubrics within the European Horizon programme. Moreover, the 2.1 FTE of total staffing means that ACPA members are quite at the limits of their capacities with the work of supervision and conducting their own research/artistic practice; there is simply a very limited space for proposal writing. Although the service offered by Leiden University to support proposal writing is very good, it is generic and not-discipline-specific to artistic research and to the specific needs of artist-researchers. Researchers in the field of artistic research often need different services and tailor-made support; this is as true for ACPA as elsewhere.

With respect to ACPA's infrastructure there is a tension between the logic of locating the practice space within the University of the Arts The Hague and on the other hand wanting to have a physical location at the University of Leiden to reflect the fact that the PhD candidates are registered there and need to have some basis of identification with it. The studio facilities available within the ACPA space in Leiden are really at a disadvantage in this respect compared with for example the Orpheus Institute Ghent. While many of the artists who are Doctoral candidates simply use their own private studio space, this situation can render the ownership of the PhD-work ambiguous.

The committee endorses the plans for establishing an ACPA Laboratory in Leiden for the experimentation and presentation of artistic research, but is not convinced of its feasibility given the present financial conditions. The same may hold true for the hope of acquiring additional staff, desirable as this is given the high workload of current staff. Nevertheless, if the progress of the last two years can be maintained, these concerns may be proven wrong, since over this period ACPA has attained a good mix of highly competent staff and a clear research profile.

For the reasons given above, the committee considers the viability of ACPA to be good.

3.2 PhD training and education programme

PhD training and the support of artistic research are at the core of ACPA's mission. These are carried out on the general level by participating in the Leiden Faculty Graduate School of Humanities, and on the art-specific level in two programmes: in DocARTES for the field of music and in PhDArts for the field of visual arts and design. Through these two programmes, ACPA is a major contributor to the pool of qualified PhDs in artistic research internationally.

Supervision is always carried out by a team in which both the academic and the artistic expertise are represented. The committee agrees this proves to be the method of best choice for this field. Supervisors' training takes place in peer group supervision training: in regular meetings supervisors come together and raise issues of concern, talk about establishing standards and so forth. It might be desirable to include an external moderator in these meetings to maybe detect any blind spots within the supervision practice.

The training programme for the PhD candidates is tailor-made, depending on the needs of the candidates and their research projects. The two PhD programmes are set up as structural programmes, offering the PhD researchers a curriculum (methods, reflections and theoretical expertise) and the opportunity for peer group supervision/cohort building. In addition, PhD researchers make use of the workshop/practice/performance facilities at The University of the Arts The Hague for visual arts and design and the Orpheus Institute for music. All these components are, of course, complemented by the individual supervision time with the supervisor/supervision team. This approach is definitely in line with the Florence Principles and constitutes a model example of a PhD programme in artistic research. The intensity of the six or eight two-day seminars per year that are offered by the programmes appears to be highly inspiring for the PhD candidates. However, they spoke of the challenge of taking everything in and the need to process for some while afterwards, by which time they were dispersed once more. Whilst recognising the logistical restrictions around arranging events of this nature, the committee recommends that ACPA explore possible ways of expanding the number of days available for this part of the curriculum.

Besides the PhD candidates in the two programmes, ACPA also offers an individual track to be able to take on PhD researchers that bring important topics and research approaches into the Institute, but who do not fit (for various reasons) into the structural programmes. These individual PhD tracks, however, are conducted much more in the tradition of a doctoral education *before* the establishment of the Salzburg Recommendations (EUA), following a doctoral father/mother – PhD/researcher model. It is good to see that the individual track PhD researchers are also included and integrated to a certain degree into the structural programmes. Yet, the integration of the individual track researchers into the cohort(s) of the structural programmes could – as a recommendation – be strengthened.

The integration of PhD research into both Leiden University and the University of the Arts The Hague seems sound and solid. The research results are advertised on respective Newsletters, Homepages, etc. The quality of the theses, according to the impressive list of the PhD theses 2012 – 2017, appears to be very high. Although artistic research often is very time-consuming, and despite the innate

challenge of the artistic doctorate, the completion rates of the PhDs are generally good. Most alumni continue their career as professional artists and some obtain positions in art universities or research universities. In the interviews with PhD candidates and alumni, the committee was impressed by the artistic and professional added value of an ACPA doctorate.

Despite the high working load for the professors at ACPA, the intensity of the supervision of PhDs seems very satisfactory.

As was also indicated by ACPA, the Handbooks of DocARTES and PhDArts need to be updated. The committee recommends that this updating should include the provision of appendices (with hyperlinks in electronic versions of the handbooks) to the regulations of the University of Leiden, especially those relating to the appeal committees.

3.3 Integrity

ACPA's integrity policy follows the national principles of the Netherlands Code of Conduct for Academic Practice that are also incorporated in the Leiden University and Humanities Faculty integrity policies. Dedicated PhD courses on integrity are offered by the university.

Insofar as issues such as procedures in the event of complaints /appeals or unacceptable behaviour are also part of the overall framework of research integrity, the documentation and availability of these appear to be somewhat lacking – especially given that the complex inter-institutional structure of ACPA and its programmes means that accountability may easily be lost when the responsible agency within the structure may not always be clear.

It may be advisable to integrate outside experts to committees and councils on every level. Selection committees in particular profit to a great deal if a scholar from outside the universities (involved institutes) is part of the committee- not only where an additional expert opinion is needed for a particular project, but also for including an outside perspective to the procedure, the culture of discussion, etc. This is quite common in other universities and experience has been good with such a procedure.

The ethical check of all research that is announced as of 2018 in the Humanities Faculty will hopefully involve an Ethics Committee shortly. Given the distinctive nature of artistic research, ACPA should consider having its own arrangement to monitor the ethical aspects of research and research proposals in the institute.

3.4 Diversity

An ACPA-specific strategy for strengthening gender equality seems absent, but the institute expresses explicitly its commitment to a diverse and inclusive academic community, following Leiden University's award-winning diversity strategy. The subject of an open and welcoming working environment is often discussed in ACPA's office staff and academic staff meetings. The composition of the staff is such that ACPA meets the university-wide targets for the numbers of female full professors.

But more may be done; ACPA's ambitions in this respect can be brought to a higher level. It is crucial to achieve an equality of gender in selection commissions as well as in examinations committees (the admission, 'qualifying hurdle', and promotion committees). If this is too much of a burden on the female staff (a small number of women need to sit on every committee), strategies to counter this effect exist elsewhere and should be implemented.

In the curriculum, diversity and a commitment to criticality seem strong values upheld by both faculty members and PhD researchers. The PhD programmes were frequently referred to during the site visit as 'safe spaces' which is reassuring in terms that the PhD researchers have the possibility to raise all issues needed for the development of their projects and also in terms for personal professional development.

3.5 Recommendations

In the assessment above, the committee has made the following recommendations:

1. The committee recommends that ACPA formulate an institute-wide policy on outreach and relevance to society, drawing on existing good practice, especially in art/design research, with goals and timelines for the coming years.
2. Given the potential for development identified by the committee, it urges Leiden University and the University of the Arts The Hague to invest in ACPA (financially and in terms of infrastructure) in ways that enable the institute to achieve its manifest potential.
3. The committee endorses the desirability of establishing an ACPA Laboratory in Leiden for experimentation and presentation of artistic research and advises Leiden University to continue to search for ways of accessing the resources to realize these plans.
4. The committee advises ACPA to seek tailor-made support for grant applications in artistic research above the good support provided by the Faculty of Humanities.
5. The committee recommends the inclusion of an external moderator in the meetings of the peer group supervision training.
6. The committee feels that the integration of the individual track researchers into the cohort(s) of the structural programmes may be strengthened.
7. The Handbooks of DocARTES and PhDArts need to be updated. This should include the provision of appendices (with hyperlinks in electronic versions of the handbooks) to the regulations of the University of Leiden, especially those relating to the appeal committees.
8. The committee advises ACPA to integrate outside experts to committees, including selection committees, and councils on every level.
9. The committee advises ACPA to consider to have its own arrangement to monitor the ethical aspects of research and research proposals in the institute.

10. The committee advises ACPA to expand the number of days available for research training from the current 12/16 days per year.
11. With respect to diversity, the committee feels that ACPA's ambitions can be brought to a higher level. It is crucial to ascertain equality of gender in selection commissions as well as in examinations committees (the admission, 'qualifying hurdle', and promotion committees).

Annex 1 Criteria and scores of national protocol SEP

Criterion 1: Research quality

The committee assesses the quality of the institute's research and the contribution that research makes to the body of scientific knowledge. The committee also assesses the scale of the institute's research results (scientific publications, instruments and infrastructure developed by the group, and other contributions to science). The following elements are to be considered in assessing this criterion:

- scientific quality
- productivity to the scientific community (in relation to the volume of the tenured scientific staff)
- the academic reputation of the group
- the strategy to provide the output at the highest relevant level possible

Criterion 2: Relevance to society

The committee assesses the quality, scale and relevance of contributions targeting specific economic, social, or cultural target groups, of advisory reports for policy, of contributions to public debates, and so on. The point is to assess contributions in areas that the institute has itself designated as target areas. The following elements—if applicable—are to be considered in assessing this criterion:

- a narrative in which the group demonstrates its relevance for society
- research products for societal target groups such as: professional publications and outreach to the general public, other research output to society
- use of research products by societal groups such as patents, licences, training courses
- projects in cooperation with societal partners (European Union, *Topsectoren*, international funds)
- contract research (including consultancies), also co-publications and use of facilities
- present jobs of alumni
- demonstrable marks of recognition by societal groups such as demonstrated by advisory reports for the government
- media exposure as presentations on radio / TV, invited opinion articles etc.
- membership societal advisory boards

Criterion 3: Viability

The committee assesses the strategy that the institute intends to pursue in the years ahead and the extent to which it is capable of meeting its targets in research and society during this period. It also considers the governance and

leadership skills of the institute's management. The following elements are to be considered in assessing this criterion:

- leadership
- (scientific) visibility and recognition
- research vision and strength of the research lines
- innovative strength
- strategic choices and decisions
- composition of the group (expertise, people)
- acquisition capacity

The meaning of the scores for the three main assessment criteria:

Score	Meaning	Research quality	Relevance to society	Viability
1	Excellent / world leading	One of the few most influential research groups in the world in its particular field	An outstanding contribution to society	Excellently equipped for the future
2	Very good	Very good, internationally recognized research	A very good contribution to society	Very well equipped for the future
3	Good	Good research	Makes a good contribution to society	Makes responsible strategic decisions and is therefore well equipped for the future
4	Unsatisfactory	Does not achieve satisfactory results in its field	Does not make a satisfactory contribution to society	Not adequately equipped for the future

Annex 2 Terms of Reference ACPA

Terms of reference Assessment Committee Academy of Creative and Performing Arts

The board of Leiden University hereby issues the following Terms of Reference to the assessment committee of the Academy of Creative and Performing Arts chaired by Mag. dr. Andrea Braidt.

Assessment

You are being asked to assess the quality and relevance to society of the research conducted by the Academy of Creative and Performing Arts (research unit) between 2012 and 2017 as well as its strategic targets and the extent to which it is equipped to achieve them. You should do so by judging the unit's performance on the three Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) assessment criteria:

- Research quality
- Relevance to society
- Viability

Please take into account current international trends and developments in science and society in your analysis.

For a description of the criteria, see Section 2 of the SEP. Please provide a written assessment on each of the three criteria and assign the research unit to a particular category (1,2,3 or 4) in each case, in accordance with the SEP guidelines. Please also provide recommendations for improvement.

In the SEP protocol, indicators of research quality explicitly include qualitative output such as instruments and infrastructure developed by the research unit.

We would like your report to provide a qualitative assessment of the research unit as a whole in relation to its strategic targets and to the governance and leadership skills of its management. Please also make recommendations concerning these two subjects.

In accordance with the SEP, please also reflect on the following three aspects in your report:

- PhD programme
- Research integrity
- Diversity

It is expected that two additional questions are included into the protocol. We ask you to pay special attention to:

- The collaboration in ACPA between the University of the Arts in The Hague (a 'hogeschool' without PhD degree awarding power) and Leiden University is unique in the Dutch context. How do you assess this collaboration and its base within the Faculty of Humanities?
- ACPA PhD trajectories and final submissions are characterized by the intertwinement of artistic work and written work. What is your assessment of that relationship in the doctoral programmes and in (the assessment of) the final outcome of the PhD research projects?

Documentation

The necessary documentation will be available on a secure website no later than 20 September 2018. The documents will include at least the following;

- Self-evaluation report of the above mentioned research unit plus Combined appendices prescribed by the SEP format;
- The Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021;
- These Terms of Reference for the Assessment Committee;
- The programme for the site visit;
- Short CV's of the committee members and secretary;
- Leiden Protocol for Research Assessment 2015-2021.

Site visit

The site visit at the Academy of Creative and Performing Arts will take place on 14 and 15 November 2018. During this site visit the committee will have interviews with the management team and researchers of the institute. The coordinator of the assessment process will contact you about logistical matters no later than two months prior to the site visit.

Statement of impartiality and confidentiality

Before embarking on your assessment work, you will be asked to sign a statement of impartiality. In this statement, you declare that you have no direct relationship or connection with the Academy of Creative and Performing Arts.

Assessment report

We ask you to report your findings in an assessment report drawn up in accordance with the SEP guidelines and format. You must send the draft report to the Academy of Creative and Performing Arts no more than nine weeks after the site visit. The institute will check the report for factual inaccuracies; if such inaccuracies are detected, you will see that they are corrected. You will then send (the corrected version of) the assessment report to the board of Leiden University.

Annex 3 Programme Site visit ACPA

Arrival 13 November 2018, Golden Tulip Hotel

18.00 Start-off meeting committee

20.00 Dinner committee only (with an introduction by Prof. dr. Henk Borgdorff – Academic Director)
[Restaurant In Den Doofpot (IDD), Leiden]

Day 1 14 November, Academy Building, room of Humanities

9.00 Meeting with Institute Management and Dean Faculty of Humanities
Prof. Dr. Mark Rutgers (Dean), Prof. Dr. Henk Borgdorff, Dr. Rosalien van der Poel (Institute Manager)

10.30 Meeting with PhD candidates and alumni Hans Scholten, Joost Grootens, Laila Neumann, Heloisa Amaral, Marlon Titre

11.30 Break

11.45 Meeting with ACPA staff (full and assistant professors) Dr. Jed Wentz, Prof. dr. Marcel Cobussen, Prof. dr. Janneke Wesseling (director of PhDArts), Dr. Alice Twemlow, Dr. Anna Scott,

13.00 Lunch (committee only)

14.00 Committee meeting

15.00 Meeting with Executive Board University of the Arts The Hague and Executive Board Leiden University (represented by Dean Faculty of Humanities) Marieke Schoenmakers (Director KABK), Henk van der Meulen (Director Royal Conservatory), Prof. dr. Mark Rutgers

16.00 Travel to Royal Academy of Art in The Hague

16.30 Tour of the Royal Academy of Art

19.00 Dinner (committee only) [Restaurant De Klok, Leiden]

Day 2 15 November, Academy Building, room of Humanities

9.00 Committee meeting

11.00 Meeting with Institute Management (for last questions/clarifications)

11.30 Presentation of preliminary findings to the Institute and Faculty Management

Annex 4 Research data

a. Composition of the ACPA Institute (fte / #)

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Scientific staff (fte)	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.8	2.1
Support staff (fte)	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.8	1.0	1.3
Total research staff	1.7	1.9	2.1	2.1	2.8	3.4
PhD candidates (# intake)	10	14	17	21	13	8

b. Financing structure (x € 1000)

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
<i>Funding:</i>						
Leiden University	230	383	593	607	700	573
U. of the Arts	585	414	231	308	260	460
Total funding	815	797	824	915	960	1.033
<i>Expenditure (k€)</i>						
Personnel costs	500	480	510	590	625	700
Other costs	315	317	314	325	310	333
Total expenditure	815	797	824	915	960	1.033

c. Research Output

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Refereed articles	1	5	1	2	0	2
Non-refereed papers	-	-	-	-	-	-
Books	4	2	1	0	0	3
Book chapters	7	7	9	4	4	3
Conference papers	9	5	16	8	13	5
PhD theses	5	6	7	5	9	6
PhD theses / artistic performances	5	6	7	5	9	6
Professional publications	0	0	0	1	3	0
Publ. for general public	1	0	1	0	0	3
Other (research) output	16	9	23	19	22	26
Total publications	48	40	65	44	60	54

Annex 5 Curricula vitae of the Committee members

Mag. Dr. Andrea B. Braidt MLitt (chair) is Vice-Rector for Art and Research at the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna since 2011 and President of ELIA European League of the Institutes of the Arts. As a researcher with degrees in film studies and comparative literature her research focus and publication lies on narratology, genre theory and gender/queer studies. International fellowships and appointments brought her to the USA (UC Berkeley), Canada (University of Toronto) and Budapest where she was guest professor at CEU Central European University. From 2004-2011 she was Senior Scientist at the TFM Department for Theatre, Film, and Media Studies at Vienna University, leading numerous research projects in arts based research, organising international conferences, teaching extensively. She has been member of the board of the Association of Media Studies GfM e.V., and is founding member and acting president of the Austrian Association for Gender Studies.

The Vice-Rectorate for Art and Research, which was newly established with Braidt's appointment at the Academy, is responsible for stimulating research activity especially in the field of arts based research, for supporting the doctoral programs at the Academy, for conference and publication activity and for national and international co-operations and networks.

Andrea Braidt has been an active member of ELIA's SHARE-Network, has hosted the third EUFRAD Conference in Vienna in 2013 and has been appointed head to the Artistic Research Working Group. She has been on the Representative Board of ELIA (2014-2016). Other network activities include EARN, EUA and European Forum Alpbach.

Dr. Jeremy Cox. After a wide and varied career in higher music education, Jeremy Cox is now devoting himself to research and writing. Jeremy is the former Chief Executive of the Association Européenne des Conservatoires, Académies de Musique et Musikhochschulen (AEC). He became the AEC's Chief Executive in January 2011. Prior to that, he had more than ten years' experience as Dean of the Royal College of Music in London, with overall responsibility for learning, teaching and research in that institution.

Jeremy read Music at Oxford University and completed his Doctorate there in 1986. His specialist field is the songs of Francis Poulenc and he has a book in preparation on this subject. While at Oxford, he sang in the Chapel Choir of New College and subsequently performed with a number of specialist chamber choirs, including the 'Clerkes of Oxenford'. Alongside his work in a range of Music departments and institutions across the UK, including three years in Scotland, he

pursued an active career as a singer and conductor and occasionally turned his hand to composition, mainly for voice and chamber ensembles.

Jeremy has been closely involved in European developments in higher music education since the start of the Bologna Process and was the chief architect of the AEC's 'Polifonia' Learning Outcomes that are now widely used as reference points across the European higher music education sector. He has written AEC guides on Curriculum Design & Development and on Admissions & Assessment, and has worked as an expert advisor for the AEC and for the Tuning Process in Europe and Australia.

Prof. Dr. Ken Friedman is Chair Professor of Design Innovation Studies at the Tongji University College of Design and Innovation in Shanghai, China, and Editor-in-Chief of *She Ji. The Journal of Design, Economics, and Innovation*, a journal published by Tongji University Press and Elsevier. He served as Dean of the Faculty of Design at Swinburne University of Technology in Melbourne, Australia. He was University Distinguished Professor and now Professor Emeritus. He was earlier Professor of Leadership and Strategic Design at the Norwegian School of Management.

Friedman works at the intersection of three fields: design, management, and art. He has developed international research networks and conferences in design research. He is an editorial board member of *Design Studies*, *International Journal of Design*, *Design and Culture*, *Visible Language*, and the *International Journal of Design Creativity and Innovation*. Friedman is Fellow of the Design Research Society and a member of the executive board of The Interaction Design Foundation.

Ken Friedman is also a practicing artist and designer, active in the international laboratory of art, design, and music known as Fluxus. He had his first solo exhibition in New York in 1966. His work is represented in the Museum of Modern Art, the Tate Gallery, The Getty Institute, The Hood Museum of Art, and other museums and galleries around the world. The University of Iowa is the official repository of his papers.

Dr. Frans van Steijn (secretary) studied physics (BSc) at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and philosophy (MA) at the University of Amsterdam. He received a PhD at the UvA on a thesis "The Universities in Society; a Study of part-time professors in the Netherlands"(1990). Since 1996 Frans was senior advisor at Vereniging van Universiteiten (VSNU) the Association of Universities in the Netherlands. He was Secretary to the Board and Secretary to the Rector's Conference. His expert fields are quality assurance, research policy and research integrity.

In September 2014 he retired from VSNU and established an independent office for consultancy and project management, specialized in quality assurance in the universities. In that capacity Frans van Steijn assisted the review committees of the National Experimental Plant Sciences Graduate School, the Leiden University Teacher Training Institute, Tilburg Law School, the Institutional Audit of Utrecht University and three Institutes of the KNAW Humanities Cluster (Meertens, IISG and Huygens ING).