

Faculty of Law Funding Policy Framework

Adopted by the Faculty Board on 7 November 2023

Table of Contents

<u>INTRODUCTION.....</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>BASIC TENETS.....</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>HOW DO WE ORGANISE THINGS?.....</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>TALENT DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK FOR VENI AND ERC STARTING GRANTS.....</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>TALENT DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK FOR CONSORTIUM GRANTS.....</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>TALENT DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK FOR EDUCATION INNOVATION GRANTS.....</u>	<u>11</u>
<u>STRENGTHS AND OPPORTUNITIES–MID-CAREER AND SENIOR LEVEL.....</u>	<u>12</u>

Introduction

This funding strategy is a framework for developing talent within the Faculty of Law in a way that 1) helps individuals meet their career goals 2) aids the faculty in achieving its desired academic and societal impact via external funding (both for research and applied work), and 3) organises and deploys faculty resources in an effective, judicious manner. Our Faculty is characterized by a curiosity-driven approach to seeking funding. Obtaining funding is encouraged where it fits the areas of excellence of our researchers and teachers, contributes to the professional development of the respective individuals and/or teams, and fosters academic and societal impact.

The Faculty of Law funding strategy takes shape in a broader context that is characterized by several trends:

- 1) the need to demonstrate that research has societal impact,
- 2) the rising importance of transparent, open science,
- 3) the acknowledgement that diverse academic careers should be cultivated, in line with Recognition and Rewards, and
- 4) opportunities that arise from a push to centralize research support for the whole university, and develop a funding strategy for UM.

Also, the Faculty of Law's recent growth requires an explicit articulation of philosophy and practices around research funding at the Faculty now and foreseen for the future.

This funding strategy is developed specifically for the Faculty of Law, which differs from other faculties and fields at UM in regards to its culture, income streams, educational commitments, and funding opportunities. We still intend to do some more fact-finding around two issues in order to further develop the framework: 1) How are academic staff in general making career decisions post-pandemic? 2) What do other faculties of law in the Netherlands do in regards to research funding strategy, development of research talent, and incentivizing grant writing activity? As we find out more information, we can adapt aspects of the strategy accordingly.

Basic tenets

- 1) Writing grants for **research and educational funding is valued** by the Faculty of Law.
- 2) However, **we do not require that** researchers and teachers acquire funding for promotion, and we do not wish to set faculty-wide targets for submissions or acquired funds.
- 3) We rely on encouraging **bottom-up talent and skill development** to maintain and further expand a successful funding culture in our faculty. Learning from ones own and others' successes and failures is an important aspect of building a funding culture and to improve our chances in being successful. We have developed four frameworks for this process, which are included in this document. These are mechanisms for identifying staff with potential, to advise them in building their CV, and to provide adequate training and support. This is fully in line with Recognition and Rewards. To guide this development, we also depend on strategic directions from department heads and research institute directors.
- 4) Ambitions of writing grant applications for specific funding schemes should be discussed with line managers and department heads. Where appropriate, plans of submitting specific grant applications will be included in personal development plans.
- 5) We support and encourage **three types of grant and tender writers**:
 - a) researchers applying for personal awards (e.g., NWO talent programme, ERC, SWOL)
 - b) researchers participating in consortium grants, tenders, and collaborative contract research (e.g., NWA-ORC, Horizon Europe, Interreg)
 - c) teachers interested in educational innovation (e.g., Comenius)

Note: we are not privileging some funders/grants or career paths over others. Rather, it is meant to acknowledge the existence of distinct sets of skills, mindsets, and processes particular to each type of funding that Law researchers undertake. These include contract research and tenders, which are in relevant parts of this document.

Components of bottom-up approach: career level x grant type

	early career	mid career	late career
personal grant	trainings; incentives; “talent development”; support	incentives; support; targeted training (if needed)	incentives; support
collaborative grant	incentives; “talent development”; trainings someday	incentives; support; targeted training (if needed)	incentives; support
education grant	to be developed	to be developed	to be developed

- 6) We aspire to follow the **principles for successful academic units** that achieve high academic impact with external funding, as identified by experts with the European Association of Research Managers and Administrators (EARMA):
- a) Common will to work strategically towards a common ambition;
 - b) External funding as a means to increase academic impact;
 - c) An academic leadership with a will to lead their peers;
 - d) Mutual confidence between academic & support staff;
 - e) Support and academic staff are working as partners, jointly agreeing on the tasks to be performed and sharing mutual expectations on how they are carried out;
 - f) Focus on the relationship between individual careers and the common good; and
 - g) Full cost budgeting.

How do we organise things?

1. **Describe the process.** A description of the steps involved in submitting a grant application, as well as the relevant parties involved, exist in this document which is available on the intranet : <https://employee.maastrichtuniversity.nl/en/research/research-law/administration-process-guidance-for-grants>.
2. **Build a culture.** We build a grant-writing, grant-seeking culture via regular events (such as campfires), newsletters, and learning opportunities (such as trainings and peer sessions on experiences with specific grants). The emphasis lies in having those with more experience and expertise in external funding share relevant knowledge and advice with those who are developing their capacity to acquire funding for research or education projects. We connect to relevant activities in the university as a whole and contribute to the university's goals, while promoting our own faculty's interests. This links to #3, #4, and #5 below.
3. **Identify and cultivate talent.** With the help of institute directors and department heads, we identify people who will be ready in 1, 2, and 3 years to write competitive grants. (See the frameworks below.) Often these will be people who have chosen the research elective in their R&R profile in the case of research grant, or the teaching elective for educational grants. Those individuals will be offered opportunities for further training (both internally and via external vendors), for internal grant reviews, and for active roles in campfires and peer sessions. These opportunities are not limited to early career researchers.
4. **Communicate.** We will improve the internal and external communications around grant and tender activity. Most importantly, we want multiple stakeholder audiences (both internal and external to the university) to appreciate our expertise and societal relevance. Internally, we want to celebrate the successes and appreciate the efforts of our academic and support staff; we also want to show that failure is a normal part of the game. Another important element of this communications element is that the funding strategy itself, including its basic tenets, are regularly presented, referenced, and offered for public comment.
5. **Incentivise grant writers.** Writing a grant represents a significant investment of time and intellectual efforts, often at the expense of other tasks and/or a healthy work-life balance. We aim to incentivise grant writers to make this investment and to enable them to reap the rewards of this investment even if the application is not successful, through these measures:
 - Departments enable staff members to get teaching reduction (e.g., reduced tutorial load) **in order to write** a NWO Talent programme application or ERC grant application. The researchers will have foreseen the writing of a grant proposal in their personal development plan, and the funding advisor will advise on the competitiveness of such a proposal. Applications for other funders can be decided

case by case. Staff members planning to write such a grant proposal coordinate well in advance with department heads on how to realize the teaching reduction. Such agreements regarding the planning of teaching reduction can also be included in the personal development plan. There is no guarantee that this reduction in teaching responsibilities will coincide with the grant deadlines themselves.

- Individuals who reach the final stage of a selection procedure but are unsuccessful can apply for *either* up to EUR 5000 on their PAO account or a teaching reduction. The goal is to enable the individual to translate the already invested time and efforts into **follow-on opportunities**, such as developing a new grant proposal, turn the grant application into a publication, or carry out part of the project already. Such applications for follow-on opportunities need to be coordinated with the department head, in case the staff member wishes to receive reduced teaching tasks. Those eligible for applying for the incentive are:
 - Individuals who write a Veni, Vidi, ERC Starting or Consolidator grant and reach the final stage of the interview yet are not selected
 - Individuals who lead a work package in or coordinate a Horizon Europe application that receives a final score of 14.5 or higher but which is not successful, or a NWA-ORC or KIC submission that goes to the interview but is not successful
 - For other funding schemes, individuals who have gone through a multi-stage application that includes an interview, and applicants have progressed until the interview stage but are not successful. In all other cases, people should ask the Vice-Dean for Research and the funding advisor about their eligibility.

The application for follow-on opportunities consists of a one-page document that proposes next steps, shows how those next steps require time/money, and justifies those next steps. It also states that the head of department has agreed to this application. The decision will be made by the Vice-Dean for Research.

- Additionally, the Faculty offers a range of support services to aid grant writers and their submissions (see #7 below).

development resources x grant type in situations of negative advice

	personal application	coordinator of consortium grant	work package leader in consortium grant
personal grant	In a two-stage application process, someone who is unsuccessful after the interview stage can apply for up to €5000 PAO or reduced teaching responsibilities. For personal grants without an interview stage, this will be decided case by case.	not applicable	not applicable
collaborative grants and tenders	not applicable	<i>Horizon Europe:</i> if the score is 14.5 or higher and not funded, then the individual can apply for to €5000 in their PAO or reduced teaching responsibilities. <i>Other funding mechanisms:</i> If the project progresses to the interview stage and no further, the same development resources are available.	<i>Horizon Europe:</i> if the score is 14.5 or higher and not funded, then the applicant is eligible for €5000 PAO or reduced teaching responsibilities. <i>Other funding mechanisms:</i> if the project gets to the interview stage and no further, then the same development resources are available. All other instances are decided on a case-by-case basis.
education grant	to be developed	to be developed	to be developed

6. **Encourage review committee work and sharing important insights.** In addition to writing grants, another key way to participate in grant writing is to serve on external and internal review committees. This helps to build and sustain a grant writing culture as well. Academic staff at FdR have served as evaluators for the ERC, Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions, the NWO's Talent Programme, SWOL, and other competitions, and they have served on internal committees, including mock interviews, for candidates in the social sciences and humanities. We consider this work and the sharing of insights with our community to be important aspects of academic citizenship. The funding advisor gathers these insights.
7. **Support grant writers pre- and post-award.** For individual researchers, the faculty provides:
- training & coaching
 - strategic advising
 - coordination with other UM faculties, including trainings
 - editorial support on proposals and supporting documents
 - administrative and project management support, based on agreements made between support and academic staff
 - budget preparation and financial consulting
 - data management support for projects and proposals
 - advising on Open Science practices
 - public relations and communication support (we are recruiting a person for this job)
 - other logistics (e.g., mock interview preparation)
 - post-award management services for successful applications.

- The faculty also provides limited seed funding for projects via the Research Fund (the policy document for this is available on the intranet). There is also funding for trainings and workshops (with external vendors), for graphic designers (to develop figures for grant submissions), and Dutch language editors. Expenditures on graphics and editing are capped at €1000 per project.
8. **Support tender writers and others doing contract research.** When tenders are coordinated by a Faculty of Law researcher, the faculty provides budget support (both pre- and post-award) as well as administrative support, based on agreements made between support and academic staff.
 9. Improve financial and **project tracking** in a comprehensive way that provides strategic information and allows us to evaluate the impacts of this framework (as below).
 10. **Evaluate the process.** We will formally evaluate the entire funding process as well as individual projects. Did everyone get what they needed? What can we learn to improve things for the next time? These evaluations will be conducted by the funding advisor. The questions to be asked in each evaluation are here:
<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ovbbmmmICEJ-8bVlzU6vH9wmzTQFMEMIVtvm8d3kKQk/edit>

Talent development framework for Veni and ERC Starting grants

Young scholars can be identified with this framework to determine whether they are 1) ready to submit for the next deadline, because they will already have competitive achievements or 2) ready to be recruited to develop their talents further that will enable them to submit competitively in 2 or 3 years.

This list of indicators is meant to serve as a guideline and basis to discuss the strengths and opportunities of candidates with a wish to apply for a Veni or ERC Starting grant. Candidates do not have to fulfil all indicators in order to be competitive. However, the more aspects they fulfil, the higher their chances of success.

Traditionally, these determinations were made by inspecting the standard CV and counting publications and other activities. Now, determinations are made on the basis of qualitative indicators, not quantitative, and they must include a broader range of characteristics. This framework lines up with the review criteria for the Veni and ERC Starting and for what has been learned about who might be a competitive candidate. It also lines up with Faculty of Law policy and incentives.

1. Do they show signs of academic leadership? (Proposing and leading publication projects; organising conferences; etc.)
2. Do they display evidence of intellectual independence? (Writing and publishing apart from their supervisor or research group; writing with collaborators at other universities; proposing projects that they devised themselves)
3. Have they received external recognition of the quality of their research? (Dissertation prizes; other awards or prizes for papers, presentations, or books) – This is very important for the Veni.
4. Do they always have works in the pipeline, and do they appear to be seeking out opportunities? (This is a metric of productivity, and important for the Veni. The Veni asks for 10 key outputs, and the recommendation is to list 10. So if someone doesn't have 10 right now, could they have 10 quality outputs in the near future?)
5. Do they have a drive toward innovative perspectives, methodologies, and/or impact assessment? Do they want to do research that truly makes a breakthrough? (This is particularly important for the ERC.) Do they bring research and teaching together in a novel way? Are they creative, and how does that creativity manifest?
6. Do they have a particularly timely research project and/or compelling personal background?

7. Are they able and innovative writers? (This means they will be writing and publishing independently, and also that they can meet deadlines.)
8. Do they seem to be able project managers? (This means they display attributes that will be required from a project manager.)
9. Are they coachable? (This means they express an interest in acquiring better skills at academic leadership, intellectual independence, project management, and proposal writing.)
10. Are they good academic citizens? (Serving on committees, teaching, reviewing, etc. are all critical for the Veni profile.)
11. Have they taken advantage of internal seed funding opportunities? (SWOL, Faculty of Law's Research Fund)

Talent development framework for consortium grants

This is a framework for talent selection and development for consortium/collaborative grants. Such grants might go to Horizon Europe, Erasmus, DG Justice, NWO, or other funders. They are usually collaborations between people at different universities, though they can sometimes involve collaborations in different faculties at UM and sometimes within the Faculty of Law.

Over the course of an academic career, researchers may have opportunities to participate in such a consortium or to develop a proposal for a consortium. Such opportunities arise in numerous Horizon calls where someone with a legal perspective is needed, a SSH (social sciences and humanities) representative is required or where the call requires a legally-focussed consortium overall. In order to take advantage of those opportunities, early career researchers need some things:

1. information about consortia
2. the skills necessary for participation in the consortia
3. a certain mindset of teamwork and collaboration that is different from that for a personal/individual grant.

Information about these traits would become apparent from annual appraisal meetings as well as people's research plans, in which they describe their vision and their pathway to realising it.

Note: Participating in a consortium grant doesn't mean a person won't also pursue personal grants. However, knowing how to participate in and guide consortium grants is a particular set of skills that, for some people, can ensure academic employment.

1. Do they show signs of academic leadership? (Proposing and leading publication projects; organising conferences; etc.)
2. Do they have an established or growing academic network? Is it international? (This means they have worked closely together on projects, and/or have published as a group.)
3. Do they have project management skills, and/or are they willing to be trained in project management?
4. Are they good at setting boundaries and deadlines, and holding others accountable for their contributions?
5. Are they able and innovative writers? (This means they will be writing and publishing independently, and also that they can meet deadlines. It also means they can re-write what others produce.)

6. Are they willing to attend trainings for writing Horizon Europe grants? (These are offered multiple times a year by the European Commission, the Dutch Enterprise Agency (RVO), other organisations, and many vendors.)

7. Are they coachable? (This means they express an interest in acquiring better skills at academic leadership, intellectual independence, project management, and proposal writing.)

8. Do they see a future for themselves also as a leader of or contributor to group projects?

Talent development framework for education innovation grants

We also aim to help expert teachers write grants around education innovation. We define "education innovation" in two ways: 1) developing new courses or course content, and 2) innovating teaching methods and the delivery of course material. Such grants include, but are not limited to, the Jean Monnet Modules/Chairs, the UNESCO Chairs, the Comenius Fellowships, and other programs from the NRO.

For 1) we would want to know the following:

1. Are they recognised as experts based on their research experience in the area they want to develop courses for?
2. Do they bring their current research (and that of others) to bear on their course activities, and/or have discussions about how to do this?
3. Do they have experience developing course content and other materials?

For 2) above, we would want to know the following attributes of a potential candidate:

1. Does the person have the number of years of teaching experience in higher education to match the eligibility requirements of the grant?
2. Do they have ambitions to develop their potential as a teacher?
3. Do they have a drive toward innovation, as demonstrated by developing new materials or bringing new perspectives? Do they discuss alternative approaches to teaching certain material?
4. Have they indicated a desire to be involved in educational research in their personal development plans/
5. Are they interested in working with educational scientists and in related areas? Are they familiar with educational research?
6. Are they interested in the work and activities organized by various institutes and working groups on educational research and development (e.g., EdLAB, Department of Educational Research and Development (ERD) at SBE, MILE at LAW, CPD events on the faculty- and university-levels)?
7. Do they teach in areas covered by the funder's themes? E.g., in 2023, the Comenius themes are "education forms of the future," "diversity and inclusion," "connecting to the labor market," and an open theme.

Strengths and Opportunities—Mid-career and Senior Level

This is a document listing the strengths and opportunities that are relevant for mid-career and senior level people when it comes to producing competitive personal and collaborative grants. This is based on experience with reviewer comments, reviewing, reports from colleagues who have served as reviewers, and many other sources. The goal is not to make people feel inadequate but to encourage those who have some of the characteristics to apply.

Separate documents list the qualities that make junior academic staff/early career researcher competitive. Many of the characteristics overlap in the two groups, but there are several differences:

1. Mid-level and senior people tend to have stronger knowledge about their strengths and a clearer vision for their future as researchers or teachers, both of which are based on experience. Still, they may need specific types of coaching and support.
2. They have a deeper professional network that they know how to use for complementing their own skills and generating opportunities. Younger researchers often seek to develop strengths across the board for themselves individually, but rather than developing skills in themselves, more senior researchers look to collaborate with people who already have those skills.
3. Finally, mid-level and senior academics were trained and matured in a pre-DORA world, one in which publications and grants were the primary determinants of researcher quality. Now, however, the range and diversity of determinants has broadened considerably, which may be detrimental to the grant aspirations of more mature academics.

As a researcher recently said in the ERC magazine,

Researchers of my age, in middle adulthood, form part of a “sandwich” generation. Up until recently, we were building our CVs on the traditional indicators....At the same time, we have generated output on the “new” research assessment dimensions, displaying so-called societal impact or policy impact. If you are looking at the traditional excellence indicators, then some of us won’t have enough to show, because we spent part of our time on other outputs. Whereas if we are only evaluated under the “new” research assessment dimensions, then we may not score that highly either. It could be that we are penalised by both types of evaluation.

<https://erc.europa.eu/news-events/magazine-article/researchers-experience-narrative-CV>

In order to pursue consortium grants competitively, researchers would ideally have some or all of the following characteristics:

1. They will have demonstrated academic leadership (proposing and leading publication projects; organising conferences; etc.).
2. They will have an established, international academic network that has published together or done other projects.
3. They will have published on the topic of the call (and ideally have done so with their consortium).
4. They may have demonstrated project management skills, including familiarity with reporting requirements from the funder and familiarity with the necessary digital platforms (including the EU portal but also SurfDrive and Teams for collecting project documents).
5. They will have familiarity with constructing a budget, aligning their project structure with the budget, and aligning the process and products of the research with the budget.
6. They may be good at setting boundaries and deadlines, and holding others accountable for their contributions.
7. They will be able writers and editors.
8. They may be willing to attend trainings about writing Horizon Europe grants, which are offered multiple times a year by the European Commission, the Dutch Enterprise Agency (RVO), other organisations, and many vendors.

For tender writers, all of the above apply; in addition, they should possess some or all of the following characteristics:

1. Tenders tend to have short deadlines and involve many partners, so people who plan to submit a tender ideally should have resources, such as tools for digital collaboration, prepared in advance.

In order to pursue personal grants (Vidi, Vici, and ERC Consolidator and Advanced awards) competitively, researchers would ideally have some or all of the following characteristics:

1. They have a drive toward innovation. This appears in the content of their research and in how they do the research, but it may also appear in how they incorporate it into teaching and seek other pathways to societal impact. (This innovativeness is particularly important for the ERC grants, which seek to reward 'high-risk, high-gain' research.)
2. They have received external recognition of the quality of their research. (Examples: Prizes; other awards or prizes for papers, presentations, or books; previous grant awards; nominations for awards)

3. They may have a wealth of positive commentary and reviews from reviewers, editors, students, and even media reports. (Note: These are invaluable additions for the Vidi and Vici pre-proposals, because they are evidence of the high positive regard by colleagues and peers.)
4. Ideally, they have a demonstrated track record of (distinguished) academic leadership. (Examples: Editing volumes; serving as journal editors; organising conferences and workshops; developing curricula; organising outreach and dissemination activities).
5. Ideally, they have a demonstrated track record of (distinguished) academic citizenship and have made contributions to their community and the field. (Examples: serving as journal reviewers; serving as grant reviewers for Horizon, Marie Curie, NWO, ERC, or other funders; internal committee work; serving as panel chairs).
6. They have supervised PhD candidates.
7. They have undertaken dissemination to non-academic audiences (examples: media appearances; blogs; innovation around increasing public understanding of science), have published open access.
8. They may have participated in efforts to increase diversity and inclusion within their departments, faculty, subfield, professional organisation, etc.