# Description of the Procedure followed for the CLARIAH call for Research Pilots.

## 1. Call

The call text was prepared by the executive board and discussed in the CLARIAH board meeting of May 11th, 2016.  It was essentially approved, provided some changes would be made. A new version was produced and approved by the board via e-mail end of May 2016/ beginning of June 2016.

The call was opened and the call text was published on the CLARIAH web site on September 5th, 2016, together with a description of CLARIAH components.

An information session on the call was held on Thursday September 22, 2016, in Utrecht. The questions raised there and questions raised via e-mail were (together with their answers) turned into a Frequently Asked Question section on the web site.

## 2. Submissions

The submission deadline was set to Monday November 7, 2016 13:00hrs CET. 28 proposals were submitted through the CLARIAH website. All were declared admissible after a brief check for formal compliance.

A small subcommittee of the board selected 5 reviewers for each proposal, with the purpose to obtain reviews by at least 3 independent reviewers for each proposal. The selection of the reviewers was based in part on the suggestions of the submitters (who could suggest reviewers) and in part on the basis of the knowledge and expertise of the subcommittee members. With the members Lex Heerma van Voss (social-economic history), Julia Noordegraaf (media studies) and Jan Odijk (linguistics) the three CLARIAH core disciplines were well covered.

Each of the selected reviewers was invited, and if they refused to act as reviewer, a new candidate was selected and invited.  We did not manage to actually get at least 3 reviews for each proposal (many reviewers who committed to make a review did not do so in the end): 7 submissions were reviewed only by two reviewers. The number of submissions by number of reviews is given in the following table:

| # reviews | #submissions |
|---:|---:|
| 2 | 7 |
| 3 | 9 |
| 4 | 11 |
| 5 | 1 |

Most reviewers reviewed only a single paper, a few did 2 or even 3. In total we invited 97 reviewers who committed to making 108 reviews. We received 90 reviews.

The reviewers were sent the call, and were instructed to carry out the evaluation in accordance with the evaluation criteria specified in the call. They submitted their reviews via the Easychair system[1], which explicitly required a score (and optionally comments) on each aspect of the call's evaluation criteria. Two reviewers did not submit their reviews through Easychair. Their reviews consisted of comments only.

The comments of the reviewers were sent to the submitters on Monday January 9th, 2017, in accordance with the timetable for this call. The rebuttals were submitted ultimately on Sunday January 15th, 2017 and sent to the ad-hoc evaluation committee on Monday January 16th, 2017.

# 3. Ranking

An initial ranking was made based on the review scores. It was calculated on the basis of the triple (average score, average weighted score[2], number of reviews)[3]. This, together with the rebuttal forms the input for the ad-hoc evaluation committee: they consider whether the score assigned to a proposal should be altered on the basis of the rebuttal.

The ad-hoc evaluation committee was composed in September/October 2016 and consists of the following members:

Daniel Biltereyst (Ghent University, BE) -- Film and Media Studies

Steven Krauwer (UU, CLARIN ERIC, NL) – (computational) linguistics, research infrastructures, CLARIN

Paul Lambert (Stirling University, UK ) - Sociology/Social Politics & Criminology

Jan Lucassen (formerly IISH and VU, NL) - social economic history

Stefan Schmunk ( University of Göttingen, DE; DARIAH-DE ) R&D into information architectures, DARIAH

They clearly qualify as independent national and international experts. Their independence is shown either by their foreign country affiliation or by the fact that they are retired (Steven Krauwer and Jan Lucassen).

---

[1] https://easychair.org/conferences/?conf=clariahrp1
[2] The sum of the final scores of each reviewer normalized to the range [1..5] multiplied by the reviewer's confidence, divided by the sum of the confidence values
[3] Sorted from high to low first on the first element of the triple, then on the second, then on the third.

This committee met on February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017 in Amsterdam to discuss their findings and make the final ranking. All members were present except Jan Lucassen, who provided his input in advance in writing. His input was taken into consideration during the committee meeting. Jan Odijk, CLARIAH director, attended this meeting too.

Project Secretary Arwin van der Zwan checked the budgets of each submitted project and noticed that many made a wrong (usually too high) budget. We added in the ranking a corrected budget for each project, so that it can be taken into consideration in determining how many of the projects will be financed. For some projects the proposed budget was so unclear that an alternative budget could not be created. If these projects are awarded funding, the budget should be clarified and if needed revised.

## 4. Resulting ranking

The reviews without scores were interpreted by the ad-hoc evaluation committee and assigned an overall score. These were taken into account in determining the ranking. Two reviews were submitted by the reviewers after the (extended) deadline. They were not sent to the submitters, and the submitters could not respond to these reviews. The ad-hoc evaluation committee decided not to take these reviews into account. They may still be sent to the submitters after the decision process, because they might contribute to an improvement of the project.

The ad-hoc committee observed that many proposals are of high quality and deserve funding. It recommends the CLARIAH Board to fund as many proposals as possible of the top 19 proposals on the ranking. It therefore also recommends the board to consider increasing the budget reserved for the Call for Research Pilots, so that as many of the top 19 proposals as possible can be funded.

The proposals below rank 19 are not eligible for funding, according to the committee.

The committee also recommends to require from each project that they pay a lot of attention to dissemination and reach-out, so that the work being done and the results obtained gets widely known in the humanities research community and with the policy makers who decide on funding for successor projects. Various forms of dissemination and reach-out can be considered, including organizing workshops, active participation in conferences, demos, as well as via social and traditional media.

The ranking resulting from the committee meeting is as indicated in Appendix A.

## 5. Distribution

If we consider all submissions we see the following distribution over the CLARIAH core disciplines

| Row Labels | Count of Paper Id |
|---|---|
| linguistics | 7 |
| media studies | 8 |
| other | 5 |
| social-economic history | 8 |
| **Grand Total** | **28** |

And the following distribution over affiliations:

| Row Labels | Count of Paper Id |
|---|---|
| EUR | 1 |
| HI | 2 |
| IISH | 3 |
| MI & RUN | 1 |
| MU | 1 |
| NIOD | 1 |
| OU & EUR | 1 |
| RUG | 4 |
| RUN | 3 |
| UU | 4 |
| UvA | 2 |
| UvT | 1 |
| VU | 4 |
| **Grand Total** | **28** |

If we only consider the top 12 submissions, the ones that are the most likely to be awarded funding, then we see the following distribution over the CLARIAH core disciplines

| Row Labels | Count of Paper Id |
|---|---|
| linguistics | 2 |
| media studies | 5 |
| other | 1 |
| social-economic history | 4 |
| **Grand Total** | **12** |

Since the project labeled 'other' has an important (computational) linguistic component ,this seems a reasonable balance over the CLARIAH core disciplines.

And the following distribution over affiliations:

| Row Labels | Count of Paper Id |
|---|---|
| HI | 1 |
| IISH | 2 |
| OU & EUR | 1 |
| RUG | 2 |
| RUN | 2 |
| UU | 2 |
| UvA | 1 |
| VU | 1 |
| **Grand Total** | **12** |

Which also seems well-balanced.

If the board would decide to fund more projects, the next ranking project is of the category 'other', and the subsequent three next best ranking projects are spread across the three core disciplines which would mean that each of the core disciplines gets an additional project.

# 6. Next steps

Each of the submissions will be notified whether their proposal has been awarded funding or not.

The PIs of the projects that are awarded funding will be contacted to discuss the project details, especially finalize the budget, starting date, duration, a list of deliverables and milestones etc. that together will be part of a 'toezeggingsbrief' (commitment letter) from CLARIAH. This letter will be signed by CLARIAH after each of the partners in the project has signed it, so that this letter also functions as a minimal consortium agreement among the partners. After the signing of this letter, the project can start. The `toezeggingsbrief' also describes what the project should do in terms of reporting financially and scientifically. The CLARIAH Board will do close follow-up of the projects, to monitor progress, any proposed changes of the project, dissemination and outreach activities,   and to advise and assist them if that would be needed.

# Appendix A: Ranking

Abbreviations for disciplines: ling= linguistics; mst = media studies; oth = other; seh= social economic history.

| Principal Investigator | Affiliation | Short Title | Discipline | Long Title | Rank |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jelle van Lottum | HI | HUMIGEC | seh | Human capital, immigration and the early modern Dutch economy: job mobility of native and immigrant | 1 |
| Rombert Stapel | IISH | OpenGazAm | seh | Linked Open Data Gazetteers of the Americas | 2 |
| Rob Lenders | RUN | SERPENS | oth | Contextual search and analysis of pest and nuisance species through time in the KB newspaper collect | 3 |
| Toine Pieters | UU | DReAM | mst | (Debate Research Across Media) Cross media research of public debates on drugs and regulation | 4 |
| Marcel Broersma | RUG | ReSpoNs | mst | Remediation in Sports News | 5 |
| Christian Olesen | UvA | MIMEHIST | mst | Annotating EYE's Jean Desmet Collection: Towards Mixed Media Analysis in Digital Media History | 6 |
| Wido van Peursen | VU | LinkSyr | ling | Linking Syriac Data | 7 |
| Gerrit Bloothooft | UU | NAMES | ling | Dutch corpus of person name variants | 8 |
| Karin Hofmeester | IISH | DB:CCC | seh | Diamonds in Borneo: Commodities as Concepts in Context | 9 |
| Cornelis Willem van Galen | RUN | CoDoSiS | seh | Combining Data on slavery in Surinam | 10 |
| Susan Aasman | RUG | M&M | mst | Me and Myself: Tracing first person in documentary history in AV-collections | 11 |
| Susan Hogervorst | OU & EUR | CrossEWT | mst | Cross-Medial Analysis of WW2 Eyewitness Testimonies | 12 |
| Nico Randeraad | MU | 2TBI | oth | 2wards a Transnational Biographical Infrastructure | 13 |
| Richard Zijdeman | IISH | HHuCap | seh | The History of Human Capital | 14 |
| Wilbert Spooren | RUN | ACAD | ling | Automatic Coherence Analysis of Dutch | 15 |
| Sabrina Sauer | VU | NarDis | mst | Narrativizing Disruption: How exploratory search can support media researchers to interpret 'disrupt' | 16 |
| Jelke Bloem | UvA | SOVC | ling | Style and the Ordering of Verb Clusters | 17 |
| Jack Hoeksema | RUG | SPOD | ling | Syntactic Profiler of Dutch | 18 |
| Ortal-Paz Saar | UU | FIJI | oth | Funerary Inscriptions of Jews from Italy | 19 |
| Marijke van Faassen | HI | NoLeaks | oth | No Privacy Leaks. Creating a global migrant heritage resources without leaking privacy. | 20 |
| Nicoline van der Sijs | MI & RUN | SEED | ling | SEmantic query Expansion for historic Dutch | 21 |
| Willemien Sanders | UU | PrAWN | mst | Producing a Web Narrative | 22 |
| Reinhilde Sennema | EUR | REPOCIT | seh | Reconstructing the Port City: Testing Speech-to-Text and Location Facet Search in AVResearcherXL thr | 23 |
| Chiel van den Akker | VU | SHAM | mst | Studying Historical Awareness Through Media | 24 |
| Tom Koole | RUG | CAVA | oth | Crowds as action annotators of social interaction video | 25 |
| Paul Vogt | UvT | JAS-MINE | ling | Mining the JASMIN-CGN Corpus in OpenSoNaR+ | 26 |
| Dienke Hondius | VU | MS_NL | seh | Mapping Slavery NL – linking datasets on slave-ownership in the Netherlands | 27 |
| Edwin Klijn | NIOD | STREWN | seh | STRatification Extracted from World War II groups in the Netherlands | 28 |

# Appendix B: Short Reports on the submissions

The proposal applicants already received the comments from the external reviewers and were able to respond to these comments. The reports here briefly summarize the major considerations of the evaluation committee who took into account the reviews and the rebuttals by the proposal submitters.

The reports are sorted here by their IDs in the Easychair system.

**1 NAMES** This project uses existing databases, applies standards and will create a corpus of name variants. It will greatly contribute to the CLARIAH infrastructure, and also to the wider community that has to carry out OCR to digitize data. Some reviewers have doubts about the quality of the resources based on the IMPACT project but the committee believes this is not a strong objection. The results will be reusable in many domains. The committee recommends funding this project.

**2 HUMIGEC** The reviewers are very positive and the committee agrees with the reviewers that this is an excellent proposal.

**3 SPOD** This project proposes to make available predefined queries for linguistic constructions. The reviewers are relatively positive though not very enthusiastic. It is not clear to the committee how the queries are actually constructed; this remains a bit vague in the proposal and rebuttal. The project is also very narrowly focused.

**4 ACAD** This project proposes a tool for linguistic research in the domain of discourse analysis, in particular causal relationships and subjectivity. Despite the fact that the title may be misleading, as one reviewer remarks (it mentions 'automatic' though the actual analysis will be done manually), the proposed activities and results are nevertheless useful. The project, however, is not very generic and it is not clear how it can be generalized to other domains. It is also unlikely to produce a nice showcase, but it surely will provide a good example of what one can do with the tool.

**5 STREWN** The committee believes that the overall low ranking of this project by the reviewers is fully deserved. The long rebuttal does not change this very much. The committee stresses two points in particular: the historical question as it stands is primitive and certainly not well formulated. It is very unclear to what extent the datasets per subgroup are representative and to what extent religion, political conviction or social life plays a role. It is also totally unclear what the qualities and specific contents of the 10 subsets are. Before answers to these (and other) questions are given, a project as proposed here should not be started.

**6 DReAM** The reviewers are very positive about this proposal, and the committee follows the reviewers' recommendations.

**7 MS_NL** This project has three negative and highly critical reviews and two very positive. The committee follows the negative reviews and ascribes the positive appreciation of the other reviewers to the obviously positive valorization effects they expect from this project. The application is insufficiently worked out. It is not clear why specifically these databases have to be linked and how precisely this will

be done. The rebuttal mentions the names of the plantation owners as the main link between databases, but does not address all the other problems, and the new element of raw materials produced only adds to the unclarity.

**8 SEED** This project describes very well what the applicants want to do and in terms of infrastructure development it is state of the art. However, the research aspects are completely unclear, as clearly described by one of the reviewers. Neither the proposal nor the rebuttal explains how the integration of the existing ontologies is to be carried out and the answer mentioning synonymy is, according to the committee, unsatisfactory. It is absolutely unclear how the synonymy relations are going to be established.

**9 SERPENS** The reviewers are generally positive. The only outlier is a reviewer who questions whether newspapers are the right source. The committee believes that this is not a very important objection. The committee believes that the approach taken here is easily generalizable to other domains, and therefore believes the project deserves a high ranking.

**10 NoLeaks** This project combines migration and privacy and is part of a larger project. One of the reviewers was afraid that part of the plan is not funded, but the applicants confirm that the whole project is funded thanks to matching by Huygens ING and the National Archive. The research questions stated are actually research questions of the larger project, not the research questions that will be addressed in this project.

**11 M&M** The committee is less positive about this proposal than the reviewers, and therefore lowers its rank. The questions posed by the reviewers are shared by the committee, especially about the relevance and the feasibility: it seems that the tool used is not appropriate for achieving the intended results. A high degree of subjectivity is involved, since annotating is done without a clearly defined category system. This lowers the potential for reusability of the approach and methods.

**12 LinkSyr** Though this is a good proposal that has been evaluated positively by the reviewers, the committee thinks it has a narrow focus and will not easily serve as a nice showcase. However, the committee follows the reviewers and believes that the project deserves funding.

**13 JAS-MINE** Though this project explicitly mentions research questions, these are not going to be addressed in the project at all. The project will just add an additional speech corpus to the OpenSONAR+ interface, which is a laudable goal but not one that fits well in the call for Research Pilots.

**14 CAVA** Though the goal of this project, to explore the use of crowds for the action annotation of social interaction video, is highly appreciated, it is not explained at all how this is going to be implemented, and the work plan is underspecified, to put it mildly.

**15 MIMEHIST** The reviewers are mostly very positive about this proposal, except for one. The committee believes it is an interesting and strong proposal that deserves funding.

**16 SHAM** Even though the basic idea behind this proposal is highly valued both by the reviewers and the committee, the reviewers are very critical of this proposal: e.g., it is unclear about the implementation and why and how crowd-sourcing is going to be used instead of other means (deemed crucial by one of the reviewers). The response in the rebuttal to this issue is not very clear and therefore not convincing.

**17 ReSpoNs** All reviewers are positive and it is an interesting project for longitudinal studies across media. The reviewers are positive, though there are questions about the domain (why sports and not e.g. politics), the uniqueness of this project and the selection of the newspapers. The committee believes that the rebuttal addresses these comments adequately.

**18 PrAWN** The relevance of the topics dealt with in this project are unclear and remain unclear in the rebuttal. It is not clear at all how this project can contribute to CLARIAH. It also seems to create new functionality (to generate `narratives' for presenting research results) rather than test existing functionality, which makes the proposal less suited for this call. And finally, it is totally unclear how the applicants intend to create the narrative builder.

**19 NarDis** The original proposal raised many question among the reviewers. Many of them have been answered in the (very long) rebuttal, but several remain unanswered, e.g. about the '1000 twentieth century objects of the Tropenmuseum', whether the text browsing and bookmarking functionalities have indeed become available, and what justifies focusing on 'disruptive events', and who defines their disruptive nature? In short, the applicants have taken the opportunity to remedy part of the issues from their original proposal in the rebuttal, but still failed to clarify a number of essential issues.

**20 SOVC** This is a sound though not very exciting project: the topic of verb cluster variations has been investigated intensively, and it is not clear in what way this project is innovative. Furthermore, the reviewers rightly point out that the 'processing complexity', which plays a crucial role in the project is not well-defined or operationalized, and the rebuttal by the applicants to this objection is insufficiently convincing.

**21 HHuCap** The reviewers, although generally positive, were critical and have raised many questions. Many if not all points raised have adequately addressed in the rebuttal, so the committee proposed a slightly higher ranking than the one derived from the reviews. It is very positive that the KB (National Library of the Netherlands) is included in this project.

**22 FIJI** Though the committee likes the proposal very much, the scores by some expert reviewers are low. The committee disagrees with one of the reviewers who states that the problems around Right-to-Left writing systems have already been solved, but other objections, such as that the database dealt with is relatively small, and, that, according to one reviewer, there are insufficient data for a specific period to address the relevant research questions remain valid. The committee warns the applicants that the acronym chosen for the project has bad meanings/connotations in Germany.

**23 CrossEWT** Though the committee likes this proposal because of its cross-medial, comparative and integrative aspects, the rebuttal by the applicants to the comments by the reviewers is unsatisfactory. One of the reviewers suggests that the dataset is insufficient to address the research problem, and the

applicants seem to acknowledge this in their rebuttal. The committee furthermore recommends the applicants to consider a more generic thesaurus and to take into account what others have used for these purposes. @@Linking Foundation??@@

**24 DB:CCC** Though this project has a very narrow focus, the committee is positive about it. It is useful but not so original (a similar project has been done in the UK). The comments by reviewer 4 should have been addressed better.

**25 CoDoSiS** The reviewers are mostly positive and the committee agrees. The rebuttal confirms that the relevant data are available, a matter one of the reviewers questioned. Some reviewers are afraid that the project might be overambitious, but the committee believes this is not really a problem.

[Confidential] The committee considered recommending cooperation between this project and project 7 MS-NL in case both would be awarded funding, since both deal with slavery. However, the committee considers 7 MS_NL not eligible for funding, so the issue did not really arise]

**26 OpenGazAm** This proposal will contribute very useful functionality to the CLARIAH infrastructure but is less strong on the research questions it will address.

**27 REPOCIT** As pointed out by many reviewers, there are many problems with the connection between the historical questions posed by the applicants and the proposed method. Other, more conventional sources and methods are available and should be used. This is true even if the applicant would restrict the scope to the period 1945-1960 (as suggested by one of the reviewers) and to the questions of how the reconstruction was represented in certain media: which selection of the diverse materials available? Which methods may be applied most profitably. The rebuttal has no real answers to these questions, and it seems that this proposal is not mature yet.

**28 2TBI** The reviewers asked the applicants of this project what they were going to do about the gap between the two periods covered (19th century and part of the 20th century). This matter has not been satisfactorily answered, according to the committee. The committee also warns that in other, comparable projects much more time was needed than planned in this project. The additional funding from Flanders does not compensate for this.