

RESEARCH REVIEW

FACULTY OF LAW

2009 - 2015

MAASTRICHT UNIVERSITY

MARCH 2017

Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities (QANU)
Catharijnesingel 56
PO Box 8035
3503 RA Utrecht
The Netherlands

Phone: +31 (0) 30 230 3100
E-mail: support@qanu.nl
Internet: www.qanu.nl

Project number: Q0626
© 2017 QANU

Text and numerical material from this publication may be reproduced in print, by photocopying or by any other means with the permission of QANU if the source is mentioned.

REPORT ON THE RESEARCH REVIEW OF THE FACULTY OF LAW AT MAASTRICHT UNIVERSITY

Contents

1. Foreword committee chair	5
2. The review committee and the procedures	7
Scope of the review.....	7
Composition of the committee	7
Independence.....	7
Data provided to the committee.....	8
Procedures followed by the committee.....	8
3. General Remarks	9
4. Research Review Faculty of Law at Maastricht University.....	11
4.1. Organisation	11
4.2. Research quality	13
4.3. Relevance to society	15
4.4. Viability	16
4.5. PhD programme	17
4.6. Research integrity policy.....	18
4.7. Conclusions.....	19
5. Recommendations	21
Appendices	23
Appendix 1: Explanation of the SEP criteria and categories.....	25
Appendix 2: Curricula vitae of the committee members	26
Appendix 3: Programme of the site visit	28
Appendix 4: Quantitative data	31

1. FOREWORD COMMITTEE CHAIR

This report presents a review and assessment of research undertaken at the Faculty of Law of the University of Maastricht. The committee expresses its gratitude to the faculty for the cordiality, openness and cooperation it experienced during its work.

The substance of the review and assessment is contained mainly in chapter 4 of this report, after a description of the work and procedure of the committee (chapter 2) and some general remarks about the review process (chapter 3).

Readers may be tempted to look immediately at the judgmental conclusions. However, this time each Faculty of Law in the Netherlands has been assessed by a different committee, and the mandates of the committees differ from faculty to faculty. It is therefore no longer possible to read this report for the Maastricht Faculty of Law as part of a "national beauty contest".

The significance of the exercise is that universities and faculties observe transparency and accountability, and periodically take time to reflect on their own work and achievements in the field of research – an exercise that extends beyond this report only, to which, as external peers, the committee hopes to contribute through its report and recommendations.

Leonard F.M. Besselink, chair

2. THE REVIEW COMMITTEE AND THE PROCEDURES

SCOPE OF THE REVIEW

The review committee was asked to perform a review of research in the Faculty of Law at Maastricht University. Although the faculty itself was singled out as the research unit under review, the committee was asked also to take the quality of the six underlying departments into consideration in its assessment of the faculty as such. To this end, each department provided a selection of key publications and narratives for the self-evaluation report. The Ius Commune Research School, which is coordinated by the Faculty of Law of Maastricht University, is not part of the current review and will be reviewed by a separate committee in 2017.

In accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021 (SEP) for research reviews in the Netherlands, the committee's tasks were to assess the quality, the relevance to society and the viability of the scientific research at the research unit as well as the strategic targets and the extent to which the unit is equipped to achieve them. Furthermore, a qualitative review of the PhD training programme, research integrity policy and diversity was part of the committee's assignment.

The Board of Maastricht University asked the committee in the Terms of Reference (ToR) to pay special attention to (1) research programming and management, and (2) talent development policy (scouting and recruitment, incentives, facilities, etc.). Moreover, the committee was asked to provide a qualitative assessment of the Faculty of Law in relation to its strategic targets and to the governance and leadership skills of its management. Insofar as the committee is capable of assessing these aspects, they will be discussed in the paragraphs on the SEP criteria 'quality' and 'relevance'.

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE

The composition of the committee was as follows:

- Prof. L.F.M. (Leonard) Besselink (chair), professor of Constitutional Law at the University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands;
- Prof. C.H. (Chrisje) Brants-Langeraar, emeritus professor of criminal law and criminal procedure at the Willem Pompe Institute for Criminal Law and Criminology, Utrecht University, the Netherlands, and professor of law at Northumbria University, United Kingdom;
- Prof. E. (Eva) Brems, professor of Human Rights Law at Ghent University, Belgium;
- Prof. H. (Heike) Jochum, professor of Finance and Tax Law at Universität Osnabrück, Germany;
- Prof. U. (Ulla) Neergaard, professor in EU Law at the University of Copenhagen, Denmark;
- Prof. L.C.A. (Leon) Verstappen, professor of Private Law at the University of Groningen, the Netherlands.

The Curricula vitae of the committee members are included in Appendix 2.

The committee was supported by Dr Floor Meijer, who acted as secretary on behalf of QANU.

INDEPENDENCE

All members of the committee signed a statement of independence to safeguard that they would assess the quality of the Faculty of Law of Maastricht University in an unbiased and independent manner. The committee observes that the current decentralised manner of research assessment has almost inevitably as a consequence that committee members tend to have some connection or previous acquaintance with the faculty they are assessing. Any existing personal or professional relationships between committee members and the research unit(s) under review were reported and discussed in the first committee meeting. The committee concluded that there were no unacceptable relations or dependencies and that there was no specific risk in terms of bias or undue influence.

DATA PROVIDED TO THE COMMITTEE

The committee received the self-evaluation report of the unit under review, including most of the information required by the SEP. The committee also received the following documents:

- *Disciplineprotocol evaluatie rechtswetenschappelijk onderzoek 2016*;
- Terms of Reference Research Assessment 2009-2015 Faculty of Law Maastricht University
- SEP 2015-2021;
- Key publications for the six departments.

Prior to and during the site visit the committee requested and received additional information on staff teaching commitment, PhD enrolment and success rates by department and HR policies.

PROCEDURES FOLLOWED BY THE COMMITTEE

The committee proceeded according to the SEP. Before the site visit, all committee members independently formulated a preliminary assessment of the unit under review based on the written information that was provided.

The final review is based not only on documentation provided by the research unit, but also includes information gathered during the interviews with management and representatives of the research unit. The interviews took place on 10-11 November (see the schedule in Appendix 3) in Maastricht.

Preceding the interviews, the committee was briefed by QANU about research reviews according to the SEP. Also, the committee discussed the preliminary assessments, phrased a number of questions and agreed upon procedural matters and aspects of the review. After the interviews, the committee discussed its findings and comments in order to allow the chair to present the preliminary findings.

After the site visit, chair and secretary drafted a first version of the review report, which was commented upon and complemented by all committee members. The draft report was then presented to the research unit for factual corrections and comments. In close consultation with chair and other committee members, the comments were reviewed to draft the final report. The final report was presented to the Board of Maastricht University and to the management of the research unit.

The committee used the criteria and categories of the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021. For more information see Appendix 1.

3. GENERAL REMARKS

The review that was undertaken has certain new aspects compared to earlier research reviews in the discipline of Law. The Standard Evaluation Protocol has undergone some changes, but also the review procedure has been “decentralised” in the sense that each faculty is assessed by a separate committee appointed by the Board of the University to which that faculty belongs, instead of the earlier practice of having one committee reviewing all Faculties of Law in the Netherlands.

This procedure was agreed upon by the Deans of the Faculties of Law in a *Disciplineprotocol evaluatie rechtswetenschappelijk onderzoek 2016* (Assessment Protocol Research in the Discipline of Law 2016, hereinafter: Discipline Protocol). This protocol contains some more general points and a set of specific points on the review process. Unfortunately, this protocol has not been made available in English so that non-Dutch reading committee members could not take notice of the details of this protocol.

In the Discipline Protocol, it was agreed that each Faculty of Law could choose to be reviewed at the level of either the entire faculty, at the level of the various research programmes or institutes within the faculty, or at both levels. This arrangement necessarily implies that the reviews cannot be made fully comparable across the various faculties that are participating. A positive consequence is that the review exercise loses its character of a contest between faculties, which was a perhaps unintended consequence of earlier research review exercises.

The Maastricht Faculty of Law chose not to use the table with output indicators (Table D1) of the SEP, as it felt that the format of that table was too constraining, and instead presented the matter in a more narrative and descriptive manner. This means that there is little reliance on hard data. To a certain extent this is understandable in the absence of agreement amongst Faculties of Law, national research schools and institutes on detailed quality indicators and their meaning for legal research, or certain fields of legal research. The Discipline Protocol does, nevertheless, provide a set of relevant indicators that might be put to good use by the Faculty.

Not using this table has increased the risk of conflating indicators like professional reputation (a quality indicator) with actual use of research output by either peers or societal actors respectively (a relevance indicator), also in cases in which they can actually be distinguished, which may result in an overly impressionistic self-assessment. This risk has materialised in particular with regard to the aspect of societal relevance of research. The committee has dealt with this in its assessment in section 4.3 below.

4. RESEARCH REVIEW FACULTY OF LAW AT MAASTRICHT UNIVERSITY

4.1. Organisation

The Faculty of Law is one of six Faculties of Maastricht University (MU). Founded in 1981, it is one of the youngest Law Faculties in the Netherlands. Currently, the faculty has around 2800 students and 250 staff members. Research staff numbers have fluctuated somewhat throughout the review period. As a result of financial issues the faculty reached a low point of 99 research staff members in 2012, but these numbers have since increased to 114 in 2015. In that same year there were 44 resident PhD candidates.

Maastricht University has the most international faculty of law in the Netherlands in terms of the composition of the student population and staff: 45% of students and 49% of academic staff is of foreign origin. In line with its international profile, the faculty's research focuses on the study of the role of law in an increasingly globalised society. This ties in with the university-wide research spearhead "Europe and a Globalising World". The faculty aims increasingly for intra-disciplinary (understood as research bridging sub-disciplines of law), multidisciplinary (understood as research from a variety of legal and non-legal disciplines) and interdisciplinary (understood as research that combines and bridges various legal and non-legal disciplines) research.

The research infrastructure of the Faculty of Law is multi-layered. The Faculty Board, which includes the vice-dean of research, is responsible for developing research policies. In its efforts it is aided by the Science Committee, which is the main advisory organ that consists of full professors with a very good track record in research.

In the current situation, six rather unequally sized departments (or: *capaciteitsgroepen*) form the organisational hubs for both teaching and research:

- Criminal Law and Criminology;
- Foundations and Methods of Law;
- International and European Law;
- Private Law;
- Public Law;
- Tax Law.

Research funding, both direct and external, is administered at the level of the departments, which factually employ the research staff. Research and HRM policies are developed by the Faculty Board, but implemented at the level of the departments.

Research initiatives, however, are mostly developed at the level of seven faculty research institutes, which were created to strengthen the research profile of various research groups in specific areas of the law:

- Maastricht Centre for Human Rights (MCfHR);
- Maastricht European Private Law Institute (M-EPLI);
- Institute for Globalisation and International Regulation (IGIR);
- Maastricht Centre for European Law (MCEL);
- Montesquieu Institute (MI);
- Institute for Corporate Law, Governance and Innovation Policies (ICGI);
- Institute for Transnational Legal Research (METRO).

In some cases these faculty research institutes are linked to one specific department (i.e. IGIR, ICGI), but more often researchers of various departments contribute to a certain institute. Tax Law is the only department without direct ties to a faculty institute.

The faculty is involved in two national research schools: *Ius Commune*, which is administered and coordinated by the MU Faculty of Law, and the School of Human Rights Research, which has been administered and coordinated by Utrecht University, but will no longer exist after 1 July 2017, except as an informal network.

Researchers also participate in a number of interfaculty institutes such as the Institute for Transnational and Euregional cross border cooperation and mobility (ITEM), the Maastricht Centre for Citizenship, Migration and Development (MACIMIDE) and the Maastricht Centre for Arts and Culture, Conservation and Heritage (MACCH). Such cross-faculty cooperation is thought to support the development towards interdisciplinary research. Finally, there is also cooperation with other Faculties of Law within and outside of the Netherlands.

The research strategy of the Faculty of Law has traditionally relied on a bottom-up approach, with the Faculty Board playing a stimulating and facilitating role rather than a directing one. This applies not only to research management and quality assurance of research, but also to research programming. Research efforts were commonly developed at the grassroots level, either in research institutes or national research schools. Especially *Ius Commune* has been agenda-setting in past decades. In the documentation this is described as a "two-track policy". The committee notes that over the review period there has been a shift of emphasis in this policy in favour of the local level. Increasingly, faculty and interfaculty research institutes play a pivotal role in setting the research agenda.

This trend will continue in the coming period. Central to the strategy for the future is a new faculty-wide research programme for the 2016-2021-period: "Integration of and interaction between legal orders". This comprehensive research programme, which was conceived in close cooperation with the research staff and approved in the summer of 2016, aims to create a clearer research profile and further increase visibility of the research conducted at the faculty, while encouraging more collaboration between researchers and allowing for more intra- and interdisciplinary research. It is also hoped that the faculty research programme will strengthen the faculty's funding and recruiting power. Backed by the new research programme, the faculty intends to organise more faculty-wide research activities. The Faculty Board grants the possibility that – in due course – the new research strategy will have organisational implications for the position of departments, institutes and centres.

An important objective of the faculty is to increase revenue from external funding in order to further improve its viability. The faculty's HRM policy is tailored to this effect. Applying for grants is specifically part of the employment conditions for newly recruited staff. Existing staff members are encouraged to acquire external funds and PhD students by an incentive system. Recruiting is done on the basis of teaching and research needs. Vacancies are advertised both nationally and internationally, and filled in an open procedure. At the same time, the faculty also actively explores the academic market for talented candidates that could help to further improve the quality of research. An important criterion for both recruitment and promotion of existing staff is, reportedly, that the candidate fits the faculty's international and increasingly interdisciplinary research profile. Typically the faculty has two to three directly funded PhD positions per year, although this practice was abolished for a number of years due to financial reasons. To fill these positions, the faculty actively scouts for talent within its master's and honours programmes.

For the outsider, the complexities of the organisational structure of the faculty create the impression of what *prima facie* looks like a labyrinth of institutes programmes and structures inside and outside the faculty. Since the mid-term review, significant steps have been taken in the clarification and consolidation of the organisational structure as regards research, by abolishing the research clusters and acknowledging the centrality of the departments as organisational hubs. Importantly, the complex structures that surround the departments perhaps may confuse the outsider, but this does not take away the fact that they work in practice and everybody is satisfied with them.

Having become better acquainted with the faculty, the committee finds that it has put in place an overall solid and relatively elaborate organisational structure for research, research management policies and research support, with a central role for the vice-dean for research, a Science Committee based on personal merit, a policy adviser and project manager, and conference support.

The Science Committee has an important role to play in guaranteeing the quality of research, particularly by employed and self-funded resident PhD candidates, but also more generally.

4.2. Research quality

Research profile and programming

The faculty prides itself on an international and increasingly intra-, multi-, and interdisciplinary research profile which “distinguishes it from other faculties of law in the Netherlands”. This is also why the faculty has not identified a benchmark institute. In order to foster multi- and interdisciplinary research, which involves non-legal disciplines with different methodologies from those of legal research, more attention is paid to methodology, as evidenced by the appointment of two methodologists. Also, Maastricht took the initiative for the recently established ELSi network (Empirical Legal Studies initiative).

The committee finds that the Maastricht Faculty of Law is exceptional in its international classroom and large number of foreign academic staff. It notes, however, that the previously unique profile has become a general one in the sense that all law faculties now claim to have a focus on internationalisation and Europeanisation. Most other Faculties of Law have by now a similar ambition, and are taking steps to strengthen multi- or interdisciplinary research. In reality – also in Maastricht – only a small part of the current research output can be said to be truly multi- or interdisciplinary in nature.

As was mentioned before, research programming has traditionally been a bottom-up affair in Maastricht. Research themes and lines were identified at the level of national research schools and faculty institutes rather than at the level of the Faculty Board. The new faculty research programme’s main objectives are, as was explained during the site visit, to increase coherence and visibility, and not to exclude certain lines of research in favour of others. The creation of the research programme was described as a group effort, in which all researchers were given the chance to contribute. Department representatives that the committee spoke with confirmed that the four pillars of the new research programme (global justice; institutional transformations; globalising markets; cross-border cooperation and mobility) are suitable encompassing themes for their research.

The committee nevertheless points out that there is a certain tension between the bottom-up approach and the introduction of a new faculty research programme. The lack of a central programme may carry the risk of fragmentation, but its existence may risk undermining what is broadly felt to be the greatest strength of the faculty, its bottom-up culture. Apart from tending to add layers of bureaucracy - which poses a risk for the quality of the research environment - centralisation may, moreover, smother innovative ideas that may not immediately fit with the research programme. The committee expresses the hope, therefore, that the combination of the bottom-up culture with a faculty-wide research programme might achieve that the latter integrates rather than imposes itself, that it fosters rather than represses, and that it steers rather than commands.

Yet another consequence of the introduction of a faculty research programme may be that some research presently engaged in may not fit the new programme, which during the interviews was estimated at some 10 percent. This need not be problematic when it concerns high quality research. It may even have to be stimulated with a view to the need for high quality, research driven teaching of those parts of the curriculum that are not geared towards the research profile but are more exclusively nationally oriented, such as required courses within the *effectus civilis* programme that qualifies for entrance to the bar, courts and public prosecution.

Output

Output numbers suggest that book chapters (1.055 in total) were the most important category of publications during the review period, followed by refereed articles (771 in total). A general trend is that the average annual number of books per research fte seems to be decreasing during the second half of the review period, while the number of PhD defences is going up.

Output depends necessarily on the time available to staff to engage in research. For part of the review period research time and teaching time were out of balance, due to financial reductions which were at the expense of research. For a number of years the teaching burden of staff members has been particularly high. Due to the financial troubles, in 2012 the percentage of the appointment allotted to research had to be decreased from 40% to 30%. As a result the

research capacity fell from 33.4 fte in 2012 to 30.2 fte in 2014 and there was a drop in publications. As soon as finances allowed it, research time was increased to 35%, which is the present level.

From the quantitative material, however, the committee has established that 35% research time is in practice never achieved (cf. table A.2, appendix 4). During the interviews the research staff confirmed that there is a discrepancy between paper reality and the actual time that they can devote to research.

The Faculty of Law stresses that it values quality above quantity. Reportedly, this has led to significant changes in the publication strategy. At the beginning of the review period, academic staff members with 35% research time were expected to complete two to three journal articles or book chapters per year. With the decrease of research time in 2012 this was adjusted to an average of two publications per year. More recently, the focus has shifted away from quantitative parameters. The guiding principle in the new strategy is that every researcher aims to publish in the best outlets available. In this context, it is now recognised that the legal publication culture is diverse and international "peer reviewed" journals should therefore not be the only target. As a general rule, staff members at the level of assistant professor and above are expected to compile the most important insights from their academic research in a contribution to a peer-reviewed journal or book, or to a journal or book series that is held in high regard in the discipline on average once every three years.

Practice is, however, more intractable. During the site visit, the committee learned that agreements on publication criteria seem to vary from person to person, with early career researchers reporting that predominantly quantitative criteria still apply to them, which reportedly leads to "safe" research choices, so as to avoid the risks of original, creative, innovative, multi- and interdisciplinary research.

As to assessing and monitoring the quality of academic research, in its report the faculty expresses the view that the input – that is the originality, creativity and innovation that is shown by researchers or research groups when launching new projects and placing them on the agenda – should also be examined in addition to the output. The central question in that respect is whether researchers or research groups have stuck to the beaten track with their research or if they have been able to tap into new themes that foster and initiate academic debate.

Monitoring of research quality mainly takes place within the annual appraisals of individual staff members and is first and foremost the responsibility of the researcher, the relevant line manager and the head of the department.

The committee supports the change from quantitative to more substantive qualitative criteria. It finds it desirable for the faculty to further reflect on the relation between quantitative and substantive qualitative criteria. In the absence of an agreed definition of what a "peer reviewed" journal is – which may vary between sub-disciplinary areas – or what is meant with "held in high regard" (by whom and by what standard?), it is difficult to assess in practice what the output criteria mean.

In this context, it is somewhat unclear how the manner of assessment of what the faculty refers to as the qualitative "input" (originality, creativity and innovation) that needs to be taken into account when assessing the quality of the output, combines with the objective of publishing in "peer reviewed" journals and books. During the site visit it became clear that a great deal is left to the discretion and the sense of quality of individual line-managers and respective heads of department.

In the absence of explicit quality indicators in combination with the bottom-up approach where it is up to line-managers and respective heads of departments to assess the quality of the research efforts of their staff, there is a risk of subjectivity, resulting in an uneven application of standards across the faculty and arbitrariness. Given the very different prominence of respective departments, the committee is not surprised that the quality of research varies somewhat within and between departments. That said, the committee established that the quality of the academic key publications it studied was generally speaking very good.

The overall very good academic quality of the many members of the research staff is borne out by the marks of recognition from peers. Several MU researchers received awards and prizes for their research achievements, among which the German Thesis Award, the Modderman prize and the European Academic Tax Thesis Award, while others are members of the Royal Academy and other international bodies of scholars, or achieved successes with competitive ERC or NWO grants. UM researchers were also invited to deliver keynote lectures and serve on international PhD committees. Some staff members are part of editorial boards and advisory boards of important international and national law journals (such as the *European Constitutional Law Review* and the *Nederlands Juristenblad*).

External funding

Income from competitive funding sources (NWO, ERC, EU) could be seen as an indicator for the scientific quality of the research. The faculty has been quite successful in attracting external funding, and concrete steps are taken to do even better notwithstanding increasingly more competitive circumstances. The figures presented by MU show that the share of research grants in the annual budget is modest (cf. table on funding and expenditure in appendix 4). In absolute terms, funding received from NWO was higher in 2014-2015 than in the preceding years. Whether the same is true for ERC grants cannot be deduced from the quantitative material, as these grants are not administrated as research grants, but rather as "contract research". According to the self-evaluation report, competition for EU grants is becoming "tougher than ever", as witnessed by the fact that the faculty's success rate for FP7 applications was higher than for its successor Horizon2020.

Benchmarks

The committee has noticed an overall lack of identification of clear and measurable benchmarks that the Maastricht Faculty of Law sets itself. This is not only the case with regard to the formulation of future ambitions, but also for application of research quality benchmarks.

4.3. Relevance to society

The Faculty of Law recognises the importance of disseminating research findings outside the academic community, interacting with societal stakeholders and translating academic findings into policy and practice. After the midterm evaluation of 2012, the faculty has taken the first step towards building the necessary support structure by appointing a "valorisation scout", who, together with the grant adviser, organises seminars and advises research groups in order to increase awareness.

Under the relevant University Regulation, PhD dissertations must have a five-page addendum (which is not part of the dissertation) on valorisation, in which answers must be provided on the question what the societal relevance of the research results are (i.e. in addition to the scientific relevance); to whom, apart from the academic community, are your research results of interest and why; into which concrete products, services, processes, activities or commercial activities will the results be translated and shaped; to what degree can your results be called innovative in respect of the existing range of products, services, processes, activities and commercial activities; and how will a plan or plans for valorisation be shaped. During the site visit, it was mentioned that this is considered an obligation with a certain nuisance value, particularly for purely academic and theoretical research. It may be abandoned if the faculty deans of Maastricht University so decide.

Other than that, staff members are reportedly encouraged to produce different types of output, not just refereed journal articles, and to share their academic knowledge through lectures and discussion meetings.

Income from contract research could be seen as an indicator for societal relevance. According to the self-evaluation report, the faculty has been successful in acquiring research contracts, notably government tenders. The exact degree of success, however, cannot be deduced with any precision from the quantitative material because of the way of administrating external funding: the category "contract research" in table C.2 (cf. Appendix 4) includes not just research contracts with private or public parties and EU funding, but also ERC grants.

The SWOT analysis concedes that "the faculty's research is still somewhat invisible to the non-academic environment". The faculty also acknowledges that social media are not yet fully exploited as a means of disseminating research findings.

The committee points out that, in general, much legal research has an inherent societal relevance. Many publications produced in Faculties of Law have been oriented not only to academic forums, but also – or, for certain types of publications like case notes, even mainly – to the forum of legal professionals. This applies to Maastricht University as elsewhere. In the manner that the societal relevance dimension of research is presented in the self-assessment report, mostly, societal relevance is societal relevance *ex post facto*.

The committee would suggest that the questions that now need to be addressed in the compulsory addendum to PhD-theses, which were mentioned above, might be streamlined into the regular activities of the research staff generally. This may also serve as a manner of attracting contract research.

Yet, the committee has found very good examples of academic work that has articulated specific activities that enhance the societal relevance of academic legal research, or are specifically aimed thereat, apart from the appointment of a “valorisation scout”. From among several others the committee mentions the cooperation in certain activities surrounding the TEFAF (The European Fine Art Fair) by the Maastricht Centre for Arts and Culture, Conservation and Heritage (MACCH), the work of members of the Maastricht Centre for Human Rights on the agenda setting Maastricht Principles on the Extraterritorial Obligations of States in the Area of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which constitutes a document on which human rights NGOs increasingly base their advocacy and case work, and participation by members of various departments in the Institute for Transnational and Euregional crossborder cooperation and mobility (ITEM), which specifically targets cross-border mobility and cooperation issues, and also provides practical and legal advice.

4.4. Viability

Despite the financial troubles that plagued the faculty for part of the review period, the current viability seems very good. After a dip in 2012-2014, staff numbers have now recovered. Also, PhD numbers are very high, largely due to a (growing) group of non-resident PhD students, who are either on foreign scholarships or self-funded (see also section 4.5 below).

A particular strength of the MU Faculty of Law is the diverse composition of the student population and staff. Especially at student and PhD level, there is a good mix of nationalities, not just from the EU but also from non-EU countries. For the staff as a whole, the gender balance is very good (53% women). While MU does not compare unfavourably to other Dutch universities, the proportion of women is considerably lower at the full professor level (24% women). The committee is not aware of any faculty policies to address the issue of underrepresentation of women at professorial level and given the quite significant differences finds it desirable to develop one.

The viability of the international and European oriented research profile will not be affected for the time being, and the same applies for the stated aim of developing a more multi- and interdisciplinary profile. The committee remarks that the first of these two aspects is no longer as unique as it was when the faculty was established. The same holds true for the second aspect, which has been more recently articulated and still needs to be developed further in practice. The committee again notices that – apart from the appointment of two part-time methodologists – no specific targets have been formulated in this regard.

Not only the quality but also the viability of research is affected by the time allotted to it. As was already mentioned, for a number of years the teaching burden of staff members has been particularly high. Redressing the balance should not remain a stated intention but become a reality. The committee was pleased to learn that, now that the financial situation is once again healthy, the faculty is looking into the possibility of making arrangements for research sabbaticals.

The faculty relies mainly on direct funding and is aiming to increase the level of external funding. According to the self-evaluation report, it is in a good position to do so because of its presence in intra- and interdisciplinary networks, which should positively influence the success rate in (inter)national competitions.

The faculty provides support for grant applications by means of its grant adviser and financial manager. During the review period, funding applications have been actively stimulated by a combination of requirements in job profiles and incentives.

For staff members in tenure track positions it is now customary that promotion to a higher rank partly depends on their fundraising endeavours. The committee established that the precise nature of such requirements is not always clear to those involved, in particular for early career researchers, who felt they were saddled with supposedly uniform but unrealistic requirements that were not tailored to their particular situation and qualifications.

To encourage tenured staff to apply for grants, the faculty has introduced a bonus system for successful applications: applicants of research projects above €10,000 receive a bonus of 5% of the contract's value (with a maximum of €10,000) that can be spent on research activities. It is not yet common practice to provide seed money to grant applicants, as was recommended during the midterm review. However, the self-evaluation report mentions that a revision of the incentives schemes might be forthcoming. During the site visit, the vice-dean of research indicated that as of 2014 there are means available (€30.000 per year) to exempt junior staff temporarily from teaching duties in order for them to write a grant application. Such exemptions have to be put forward to the Faculty Board by the head of department. There are also financial incentives for acquiring external PhD candidates. For each completed external PhD project, the supervisor receives a bonus of €10.000 that can be spent on research.

The committee finds the financial incentives have increased since the mid-term review but are still quite modest. They resemble a bonus rather than a real incentive.

4.5. PhD programme

The Faculty of Law hosts four different types of PhD students: PhD students with full employment status, resident PhD students on a scholarship, non-resident PhD students on a scholarship and external, self-funded PhD students. The first two types of students are physically present at the faculty, while the last two are not.

External PhD students make up more than half of the PhD population. In 2015, 40 new PhD students were registered: 11 employees, 2 resident scholarship students, 4 non-resident students and 23 external students. At the end of 2015, a total of 219 PhD students were registered at the Maastricht Graduate School of Law. The departments of International and European Law and Private Law host the majority of PhD students. Tax Law and Foundations and Methods have very few PhD students.

Employed PhD students are usually graduates of one of MU's master's programmes who have also completed the honour's research track (as there is no two-year research master's programme). They are appointed for a period of four years and teaching duties make up 20% of their appointment). Scholarship PhDs typically have a scholarship from a foreign government (e.g. China, Indonesia, Brazil, Chile) and do not teach.

Recruitment of external PhDs takes place through a permanent call for proposals on the website of the Graduate School, combined with a very broad spectrum of activities aimed at attracting PhDs internationally. Whereas the Science Committee selects resident PhD students, the intended supervisors themselves select non-resident students. Quality control of new external research projects is left entirely to the supervisor. Only when non-resident students have demonstrated their capacity to complete their projects are they formally registered by the Graduate School. Usually this happens two years after the start of their project.

At the start of the appointment of resident PhD students, a tailor-made training and supervision plan (TSP) is drawn up. This plan contains all agreements on supervision, training, planning, research related activities, assessment and progress interviews. Since 2014, the general rule is that at least two supervisors are involved in resident PhD projects, including a full professor, ("promoter") and a second ("everyday") supervisor. All resident PhD projects are assessed after one year with a go/no-go decision. Subsequently there are annual assessment and progress interviews.

In the case of dissatisfaction, grievances or disputes, PhD students can turn to a confidential adviser, of which use is made with a certain frequency. Two PhD representatives serve the interests of PhD students by attending the meetings of the Science Committee. The representatives also take the lead in organising social and academic events.

As part of the TSP, students take courses at the Graduate School that focus on generic legal research skills. The Graduate School was established in 2009 and its training programme was still in development during the review period. Following the midterm review, the Graduate School has been restructured. In 2015, two new training courses (including a seminar on research ethics) were introduced. Resident PhD students also take courses outside of their own faculty or university, for example at a national research school. There is a budget for employed students to attend conferences. For directly funded PhD students this amounts to €2500 for four years. For students with NWO funding this is €10.000 for the duration of the project.

Over the review period, a total of 120 PhD theses were completed, with a peak of 27 defended theses in 2015. This means that the quantitative target of 15-20 doctorates per year that was set by the University Board was met in most years of the review period. There are no reliable data on PhD success rates over time, as the faculty has failed to correct its figures for part time appointments, illness, maternity leaves etc. The general impression is that resident students take longer than four years to complete their projects. As can be expected, lead times are even higher for non-resident students. PhD students typically complete a monograph. Article-based dissertations are allowed and considered in appropriate cases, but not popular amongst students and their supervisors.

It is common that employed PhD students are offered a position at the faculty upon completion. More than half (54%) of PhD employees who completed their projects in 2014-2016 stayed at MU, most of them (80%) as assistant professors. Some figures submitted to the committee suggest that 100% of those who wish to pursue an academic career remain at MU.

Those graduates that leave the faculty appear not to pursue academic careers but typically end up in the profit- and non-profit sector – which is in line with the situation at other Faculties of Law and is a sign that a doctoral degree is appreciated on the non-academic labour market. While these figures show that employed PhD students have good prospects at the faculty, the PhD students and early career researchers with whom the committee spoke mentioned that they experienced quite a bit of uncertainty in the final phase of their projects and would have appreciated more open communication on future career perspectives.

4.6. Research integrity policy

Like the other Dutch universities, Maastricht University adheres to the Netherlands Code of Conduct for Academic Practice (VSNU 2012), which provides guidelines on ethical attitude and behaviour for academic staff, and on the proper handling and storage of information and data. On top of this Code of Conduct the faculty has developed its own policy, which puts particular emphasis on increasing awareness of responsible academic practice and integrity and on creating the necessary facilities for compliance with the Code of Conduct.

The open part of the faculty website – in principle the easiest accessible source – seems to provide neither links to that Code, nor significant information on the procedures within the faculty or university in cases of behaviour that is suspected to be at variance with norms of research integrity or ethical behaviour.

The faculty has not developed its own set of rules or best practices with regard to matters like fraud and plagiarism, authorship and co-authorship that complement the national standards and university regulations as they are sometimes found in other faculties (e.g. rules, principles or procedures regarding the prevention of fraud and plagiarism, types of fraud and plagiarism, rules of conduct to prevent fraud and plagiarism, on authorship, authorship for research groups, order of authors, acknowledgements, accessibility to interview transcripts, etc.).

The self-evaluation report holds that research integrity should be much more than a formality or a paper reality. It highlights the importance of an open research culture, in which there is sufficient discussion about good and responsible academic practice within (and outside) the faculty. The faculty reportedly promotes this discussion by organising debates on themes that are vital to the conduct of academic legal research. The starting point of such debates is trust in the faculty's employees. The goal is to discuss the dilemmas that employees face and the most appropriate way to deal with them.

Education is used as a tool to stress the importance of proper academic behaviour from an early stage on. Research integrity is discussed in courses at the bachelor's, master's and PhD level. Under the present University of Maastricht Regulation governing the attainment of

doctoral degrees (2013, at Art. 4), at the start of the project, PhD candidates must make a written declaration that they commit to the principles of sound academic research, namely honesty and scrupulousness, meticulousness, reliability, verifiability, impartiality, independence and responsibility. Under the same Regulation, PhD dissertations must comply not only with the Netherlands Code of Conduct and Memorandum on Academic Integrity of the KNAW, NWO and VSNU, but also with “with the code of conduct applying to professional activities in the relevant academic field” (Art. 6).

The faculty has established an Ethical Committee, which functions as the centre of expertise on ethical issues. Increasingly, the Ethical Committee is asked to review European grant applications and the design of PhD projects that will include empirical data.

With a view to the transparency, integrity, reliability and replicability of research, data storage and management is becoming increasingly important, as the faculty wishes to engage in multi- and interdisciplinary research. A procedure for the management and storage of research data has been set up. Currently, the procedure and software is being tested by a small group of users. The aim is to fully implement the procedure in 2017.

So far two cases of violations of codes of ethics and integrity have been dealt with in the faculty.

4.7. Conclusions

The committee has been asked to take the faculty as the unit to be assessed, as opposed to an assessment of the respective research units or programmes, or of these units and programmes together with the faculty. This means that the committee’s judgements concern the overall situation of research and its organisation in the faculty, as presented in the documentation and during the site visit. This also means that differences between departments – some of which have members of the highest international quality and reputation – are evened out in the generality of the requested assessment.

The quality of the research engaged in at the Maastricht Faculty of Law is judged to be very good, notwithstanding differences among and within departments.

The relevance of research to society is more difficult to judge as the narratives presented by the respective departments do not systematically employ the output indicators suggested in the Discipline Protocol by the deans of the Faculties of Law – though these are not binding. The use, or conscious and reasoned setting aside, of these somewhat more differentiated indicators of this protocol might have stimulated a more articulated reflection on the societal relevance of research. Also, using such indicators would have helped to distinguish research that serves purely academic objectives from research that may have direct or indirect societal relevance. Nevertheless, some very good examples of societally relevant research were presented in the documentation.

Even though the research profile of the Faculty of Law was unique when the faculty was established, and this is no longer the case, the viability remains very good, given the remaining importance and relevance of its central theme.

As to the research organisation and policies of the faculty, the bottom-up approach has been highly successful, but seems to have prevented the faculty from setting benchmarks for the future, thus tending to make policies reactive rather than proactive.

Research in the Faculty of Law is mainly based on direct government funding that is channelled through the university. Apart from the influence a faculty can have over the distribution mechanisms at university level, this means funding parameters are relatively stable, but these generally tend to be unfavourable for research in Faculties of Law.

As compared to the situation at the time of the mid-term review, progress has been made in creating incentives at grass-roots level to stimulate attracting external research funding, which has become both more important and more difficult to attract.

Departments play a pivotal role in translating faculty research policies and guidelines to the work floor. This makes it desirable from the point of view of effectiveness that all departments are sufficiently represented in the bodies which formulate such faculty policies. This

representational aspect needs to be balanced against the need to have the best qualified persons in charge in faculty fora. The main advisory body in the field of research is the so-called Science Committee, which is composed of the most highly experienced research staff. It has an important role to play in guaranteeing the quality of research, particularly by employed and self-funded resident PhD candidates, who quantitatively account for a larger part of monograph size research output. Its composition – as with other managerial positions in the faculty – is its strength, but this should not lead to the impossibility of unrepresented departments to have any say on research policies.

The faculty is highly successfully engaged in a broad spectrum of activities to attract talented PhD-candidates, both within the faculty and internationally. It is to be regretted that PhD-candidates are not administered so as to provide an accurate picture regarding their success rate over time, notwithstanding an explicit recommendation to this effect in the Mid-Term Review Report.

The bottom-up policy culture combined with the desire to strengthen faculty research policies requires effective communication practices between faculty, departmental and grassroots levels. There is an absence of well-articulated and transparent research quality output indicators, resulting in considerable confusion at the work floor and divergent practices among departments, in which quality assessment is primarily based on the sense of quality of individual heads of department. The committee considers this a weakness that should be addressed.

Overview of quantitative assessment

Research quality:	very good (2)
Relevance to society:	very good (2)
Viability:	very good (2)

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

The main recommendations that are contained in and follow from the earlier sections in this report are as follows:

Review procedure

- Make all relevant protocols which are supposed to determine the work of an international review committee available in English, including such documents as the Mid-Term Review Report and Discipline Protocol.

Profile and programming

- Set concrete targets and articulate a strategy to achieve the objectives to be achieved, in short: set a benchmark against which to measure one's own achievements.
- Be aware that the research profile of the Maastricht Faculty of Law is no longer unique in the Netherlands, and consider the consequences of this for attracting research staff of various kinds, projects and funding.
- Develop views as to the organisational consequences of the new faculty research programme in particular for the relation between institutes and departments and the manner in which they can be aligned to faculty policies.

Output

- Continue the efforts to redress the unbalance between teaching and research standards for staff introduced for financial reasons in 2012 (from 40/60 prior to 2012 to 30/60 thereafter, at the moment ostensibly set at 35/65). Monitor the actual extent to which this standard and balance is achieved in practice.
- The stated objective of prioritising quality over quantity and the consequences of this for possibilities of early career staff to tenured positions need to be reconsidered, spelled out and communicated in a consistent manner across all departments.
- If quality should prevail over quantity in practice, one should abandon quantitative standards that can lead to the avoidance of original, creative, innovative, multi- or interdisciplinary research.
- In the absence of national consensus among faculties of law, its stated objective of prioritising quality over quantity, and the implicit rejection of some of the quality indicators of the Discipline Protocol, the Maastricht Faculty of Law should develop its own clear criteria and apply them consistently across departments (see also the recommendation of the Mid-Term Review Report, p. 15) lest arbitrariness and bias enter into the quality assessment cycle of departments.

Relevance to society

- The faculty should mainstream attention paid to societal relevance, and develop a clear set of criteria, indicators or standards against which to assess this, thus possibly also liberating purely academic research from the necessity to live up to societal relevance standards with which it cannot comply.
- While abolition of the compulsory five-page addendum (which is not part of the dissertation) on valorisation to PhD-theses seems to be under consideration, the series of questions that need to be addressed in it at present, merit consideration in the streamlining of societal relevance of other research than PhD-research.
- As contract research might at times be a good indicator of societal relevance, the committee strongly recommends differentiation between contract research and ERC-grants in the faculty's financial reporting.

PhD programme

- Given the importance of doctoral research within the research programmes and its share in the research output of the faculty, it cannot afford not to administer the progress made in a reliable and transparent manner that takes into account part-time appointments and various kinds of leaves of absence as has been the case for too long now (see also the recommendation in the Mid-Term Review Report, p. 18-19).
- The quality standards the Science Committee guarantees by being involved in PhD projects should also extend to non-resident PhD projects.
- Mainstream the discussion of career prospects at MU or elsewhere with supervisors or at faculty, departmental or institute level.

Research integrity policy

- The faculty may consider developing its own standards of scholarly integrity appropriate to the legal discipline (e.g. rules on principles or procedures regarding the prevention of fraud and plagiarism, types of fraud and plagiarism, rules of conduct to prevent fraud and plagiarism, authorship and co-authorship, authorship for research groups, order of authors, acknowledgements, accessibility to interview transcripts and other data, etc.), supplementing those set nationally to which, for instance, the University Regulation on doctoral degrees refer.

General organisational points, management and leadership

- A collegiate style of management in combination with a bottom-up research culture should not lead to unduly fragmented research management. If policies are set at faculty level – assuming that they are the result of sufficiently representative input from departments and, where relevant, institutes, and in close cooperation with the Science Committee – these should be effectively communicated and consistently applied throughout the faculty and each of its departments.
- Financial incentives for attracting external research funds should be made more robust in order to function as real incentives rather than as a mere bonus.

Recruitment policy

- Although the overall gender balance among faculty staff is satisfactory, in light of the quite significant unbalance that still exists at the level of full professors, the committee repeats the recommendation of the Mid-Term Review Report to develop faculty policies to address the issue of underrepresentation of women at that level.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: EXPLANATION OF THE SEP CRITERIA AND CATEGORIES

There are three criteria that have to be assessed.

- **Research quality:**
 - Level of excellence in the international field;
 - Quality and Scientific relevance of research;
 - Contribution to body of scientific knowledge;
 - Academic reputation;
 - Scale of the unit's research results (scientific publications, instruments and infrastructure developed and other contributions).

- **Relevance to society:**
 - quality, scale and relevance of contributions targeting specific economic, social or cultural target groups;
 - advisory reports for policy;
 - contributions to public debates.

The point is to assess contributions in areas that the research unit has itself designated as target areas.

- **Viability:**
 - the strategy that the research unit 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;
 - the governance and leadership skills of the research unit's management.

Category	Meaning	Research quality	Relevance to society	Viability
1	World leading/excellent	The unit has been shown to be one of the most influential research groups in the world in its particular field.	The unit makes an outstanding contribution to society	The unit is excellently equipped for the future
2	Very good	The unit conducts very good, internationally recognised research	The unit makes a very good contribution to society	The unit is very well equipped for the future
3	Good	The unit conducts good research	The unit makes a good contribution to society	The unit makes responsible strategic decisions and is therefore well equipped for the future
4	Unsatisfactory	The unit does not achieve satisfactory results in its field	The unit does not make a satisfactory contribution to society	The unit is not adequately equipped for the future

APPENDIX 2: CURRICULA VITAE OF THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Leonard Besselink (chair) is Professor of Constitutional Law, Head of the Department of Public Law, and member of the Amsterdam Centre for European Law and Governance at the University of Amsterdam. He studied at the University of Leiden (Netherlands) and the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies (Bologna Center). He holds a doctorate in social and political sciences of the European University Institute, Florence (Italy), and is a member of the Royal Dutch Society of Sciences and Humanities. He has been involved with research assessment exercises of faculties and research institutes in the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark and Finland.

Chrisje Brants-Langeraar has been professor of criminal law at Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK since October 2013. Prior to her appointment at Northumbria, professor Brants, who is both a lawyer and a criminologist, held the chair of criminal law and criminal procedure at the multidisciplinary Willem Pompe Institute for Criminal Law and Criminology, Utrecht University between 1997 and 2013. In an administrative capacity she was, over the years, also coordinator of international research and teaching and then director of the Willem Pompe Institute, vice-dean for research and then dean of the Faculty of Law, Utrecht University. Her academic interests and expertise include (Methodology of) comparative criminal justice, Criminology and criminal law and the methodology of multidisciplinary research, Fundamental rights and criminal law, International criminal law.

Eva Brems studied law at the universities of Namur (candidat, 1989), Leuven (licenciaat 1992) and Harvard (LL.M. 1995). She obtained her Ph.D. from Leuven University in 1999. After one year as a lecturer at Maastricht University, she joined the Ghent University Law School in October 2000, as its first professor of Human Rights Law. At Ghent University, prof. Brems founded the Human Rights Centre. Prof. Brems publishes widely in many areas of domestic, European, international and comparative human rights law. Among her most important research projects are an ERC Starting Grant (2009-2014) on 'Strengthening the European Court of Human Rights: More Accountability through Better Legal Reasoning) and a BELSPO-funded Inter-University Attraction Pole project 'The global challenge of human rights integration: toward a users' perspective' (2012-2017). **Heike Jochum** became professor of tax law with a focus on German and European tax law at the University of Osnabrück after receiving her postdoctoral lecturing qualification in 2004 at the Universität des Saarlandes. She has been Head of the Institute for Finance and Tax Law since 2006, as well as responsible for the LLM program in taxation at the University of Osnabrück. Mrs. Jochum has published numerous articles in various scientific journals. She is a member of the IFA and of the European Association of Tax Law Professors (EATLP). In 2010, she was chosen as Dean of the Law Faculty at Osnabrück. Together with distinguished scholars from the University of Tilburg she founded the German-Dutch research center on taxation of cross-border issues in 2012. Moreover in cooperation with Peking University and the South-West University of Chongqing she founded the Sino-German Summer School on Taxation.

Ulla Neergaard has been a professor at the Faculty of Law at the University of Copenhagen since 2009, first in EU Market Law and then in EU Law. Before that she was among others Professor of Competition Law at the Copenhagen Business School. Ulla Neergaard has been appointed as an "expert member" to several boards/committees (among others the Danish Council of Competition and the Danish Energy Regulatory Authority). At present she is deputy member of the Appeals Permission Board which holds a central role in the Danish court system. She was the President of the International Federation for European Law (FIDE) from 2013-14 and organised the FIDE-Congress in 2014 in cooperation with among others the Court of Justice of the European Union. She is at present among others the President of the Danish Association for European Law. She has published widely in various areas of EU Law. She has e.g. been involved in the following larger research projects: "Blurring Boundaries: EU Law and the Danish Welfare State" and "Towards a European Legal Method: Synthesis or Fragmentation". She is at present involved in the following research projects: "Legal Issues of Services of General Interest", "All Rights Reserved? Barriers towards EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP" ("FP7-project") and "The Choice for Europe since Maastricht – Member States' Preferences for Economic and Fiscal Integration" ("Horizon 2020 project"). Ulla Neergaard holds a PhD from the European University Institute, Florence (1998). She is responsible of many of the EU-law courses (BA and MA) at the Faculty of Law at the University of Copenhagen, which mainly focus

on the internal market. She has recently been appointed member of the editorial board of the EU law journal based in Sweden, *Europarättsligt Tidsskrift*, and of the Advisory Board of the leading journal, *Common Market Law Review*. Together with three other professors, all situated in different EU-countries, she edits the book series, *Legal Issues of Services of General Interest*, at Springer/Asser Press. The academic year 2015-16 was spent at the Faculty of Law/St. John's College, University of Oxford, with Professor Paul Craig as her so-called sponsor.

Leon Verstappen studied Dutch Law and Dutch Notary Law (1983-1989) at the Radboud University Nijmegen, defending his thesis on 'Transition of property' in 1996 and earning his PhD in law. He practiced law as a notary for a decade, and in 1998 became a full professor of private law, with a focus on notarial law, at the Department for Private and Notarial Law of the Law Faculty, University of Groningen. He is editor of several journals and book series, such as: *Weekblad voor Privaatrecht, Notariaat en Registratie*, *Tijdschrift Familie & Recht*, the NILG book series, *Vastgoed, Omgeving en Recht*, *Familie & Recht* and the 'Praktijkhandboeken voor het Notariaat'. Professor Verstappen has served in the past as Dean of the Law Faculty and as Academic Director of the Groningen Centre for Law and Governance. He was one of the founding fathers and first board members of the Netherlands Institute for Law and Governance. Among other positions, he is Deputy Judge at the Court of Appeals of The Hague and Associate and Counsellor of Hekkelman lawyers and notaries in Arnhem and Nijmegen (the Netherlands). He has initiated/co-founded a number of (inter)national initiatives and networks, such as: Groningen Centre for Law and Governance, Netherlands Institute for Law and Governance, International Alliance on Land Tenure and Administration (IALTA), Foundation The Land Portal, Expropriation Expert Group, Dutch-Belgium Research Community on Family & Law.

APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

Wednesday 9 November 2016

18.00 – 18.45 Faculty Board and
Chairs of
Departments:
drinks

19:00 Dinner

Thursday 10 November 2016

9.00 – 10.15	Faculty Board: welcome and introduction	Prof. dr. Rianne Letschert (rector magnificus) Prof. mr. Hildegard Schneider (dean) Prof. dr. Hans Nelen (vice-dean research) Prof. mr. Anselm Kamperman Sanders (Vice-dean of valorisation and internationalisation) Marlies van Dongen (managing director, via skype)
10.15 – 11.00	Department International and European Law	Prof. dr. Monica Claes (European and Comparative Constitutional Law, chair) Prof. dr. Fons Coomans (UNESCO Chair in Human Rights and Peace) Prof. mr. Anselm Kamperman Sanders (European and International Intellectual Property law) Prof. dr. Jure Vidmar (Public International Law) Prof. dr. Bruno de Witte (Property Law)
11.00 – 11.15	Internal discussion	
11.15 – 12.00	Department Private Law and METRO	Prof. dr. Jan Smits (European Private Law, chair) Dr. Bram Akkermans (Associate Professor European Private Law) Prof. dr. Michael Faure (Comparative and International Environmental Law) Prof. dr. Mieke Olaerts (Comparative Company Law)
12.00 – 12.15	Internal discussion	
12.15 – 12.45	Department Public Law	Prof. mr. Aalt Willem Heringa (Comparative Constitutional and Administrative Law) Prof. mr. Jacobine van den Brink (European and National Administrative Law) Dr. Miriam Kullmann (Assistant Professor Labour Law) Dr. Sander Jansen (Associate Professor Constitutional and Administrative Law)
12.45 – 13.00	Internal discussion	
13.00 – 14.00	Lunch	
14.00 – 14.30	Department Criminal Law and Criminology	Prof. mr. André Klip (International Criminal Law and Criminal Procedure, chair) Prof. dr. Hans Nelen (Criminology) Dr. Robert Horselenberg (Assistant professor Forensic Psychology) Dr. Johannes Keiler (Assistant professor Comparative and European Criminal Law)
14.30 – 14.45	Internal discussion	

14.45 – 15.15	Department Tax Law	Prof. mr. Raymond Luja (Comparative Tax Law, chair) Dr. Marjon Weerepas (Associate professor Income and Wage Tax (non-profit)/Social Security/Inheritance Tax) Bastiaan Didden (PhD candidate)
15.15 – 15.45	Department Foundations and Methods of Law	Prof. mr. Jaap Hage (Legal Theory) Dr. Bram van Hofstraeten (Associate professor Legal History) Dr. Pim Oosterhuis (Assistant professor Comparative Legal History)
15.45 – 16.00	Internal discussion	
16.00 – 16.30	Early-career researchers	Dr. Anna Beckers (Assistant professor Comparative and European private law) Dr. Sascha Hardt (Assistant professor Comparative constitutional law) Dr. Alexander Hoogenboom (Researcher and scientific coordinator ITEM) Dr. Christina Peristeridou (Assistant professor European Criminal Law) Dr. Marcel Schaper (assistant professor Tax Law) Dr. Antonia Waltermann (assistant professor Legal Philosophy)
16.30 – 17.30	Open consultation and internal discussion	

Friday 11 November 2016

8.45 – 9.30	Graduate School	Prof. dr. Hans Nelen (director) Prof. mr. René de Groot (PhD dean) Dr. Anke Moerland (Programme coordinator) Licette Poll (secretary)
9.30 – 10.00	PhD candidates	Constantijn van Aartsen (Private Law) Matteo Bonelli (International and European law) Benedicta Deogratias (Private Law) Sandra Nobrega (Public Law) Chunlei Zhao (International and European law)
10.00 – 10.15	internal discussion	
10.15 – 11.15	Science Committee	Prof. dr. Ellen Vos (chair) Prof. dr. Monica Claes Prof. dr. Fons Coomans Prof. mr. Raymond Luja Prof. dr. Michael Faure Prof. dr. Bruno de Witte Marcus Meyer (PhD representative) Patrick van Eijs (secretary)
11.15 – 11.30	internal discussion	

11.30 – 12.30	Faculty Board and Chairs of Departments	Prof. mr. Hildegard Schneider Prof. dr. Hans Nelen Prof. mr. Anselm Kamperman Sanders Marlies van Dongen Prof. dr. Monica Claes Prof. mr. Jaap Hage Prof. mr. Aalt Willem Heringa Prof. mr. André Klip Prof. mr. Raymond Luja Prof. dr. Jan Smits
12.30 – 13.30	Lunch	
13.30 – 14.30	Faculty Board and Chairs of Departments	Prof. mr. Hildegard Schneider Prof. dr. Hans Nelen Prof. mr. Anselm Kamperman Sanders Marlies van Dongen Prof. dr. Monica Claes Prof. mr. Jaap Hage Prof. mr. Aalt Willem Heringa Prof. mr. André Klip Prof. mr. Raymond Luja Prof. dr. Jan Smits
14:30-15:00	break	
15.00 – 16.00	Internal discussion	
16.00 – 16.30	First impressions by Chair	

APPENDIX 4: QUANTITATIVE DATA

Table A.2: Research staff, numbers and research in fte, 2009–2015

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Professor (#/fte)	32 / 9.9	36 / 10.4	32 / 9.6	31 / 8.7	32 / 7.0	29 / 7.0	35 / 8.9
Associate professor (#/fte)	19 / 5.3	17 / 4.9	17 / 4.9	16 / 5.0	20 / 5.2	21 / 5.0	22 / 5.5
Assistant professor (#/fte)	48 / 15.0	54 / 17.0	49 / 15.8	45 / 13.0	39 / 9.4	38 / 9.2	48 / 12.0
Other (#/fte)	6 / 4.8	8 / 7.0	11 / 9.8	7 / 6.8	10 / 9.1	11 / 9.0	9 / 6.4
Total academic staff	105 / 35.0	115 / 39.3	109 / 40.1	99 / 33.4	101 / 30.7	99 / 30.2	114 / 32.8
PhD candidates (#) ^{2*}	57	61	63	51	42	40	44

Table C.1: Research output, 2009–2015

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Refereed articles	100	142	132	87	101	115	94
Non-refereed articles	43	31	45	33	35	32	28
Books	36	33	21	22	14	11	11
Book chapters	171	158	158	167	138	134	129
PhD theses	12	15	14	15	20	17	27
Book editing	27	24	29	40	30	49	27
Professional publications	307	255	269	231	227	220	239
Other research output	37	50	38	54	65	97	128

Table C.2: External funding, 2009–2015 (in k€)

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Research grants	432.6	160.0	262.9	306.0	317.5	412.4	442.0
Contract research	2,882.1	2,694.0	3,243.6	2,680.9	2,978.5	2,714.9	2,206.9
Total	3,334.7	2,853.9	3,506.5	2,986.8	3,196.0	3,127.3	2,649.0

Annex 9: Funding and expenditure, Faculty of Law, 2009 – 2015

	2009**	2010**	2011**	2012	2013	2014	2015
<i>Funding (fte / %)</i>							
Direct funding (1)	30.2 (86)	31.2 (79)	29.2 (73)	26.2 (78)	22.7 (74)	21.4 (71)	25.2 (77)
Research grants (2)	0.3 (1)	0.3 (1)	0.3 (1)	0.3 (1)	1.1 (4)	1.9 (6)	2.6 (8)
Contract research (3)	4.5 (13)	7.8 (20)	10.6 (26)	6.9 (21)	6.9 (22)	6.9 (23)	5.0 (15)
Total funding	35.0 (1)	39.3 (100)	40.1 (100)	33.4 (100)	30.7 (100)	30.2 (100)	32.8 (100)
<i>Expenditure (k€ / %)*</i>							
Personnel costs	15,452 (66)	16,584 (66)	16,699 (67)	15,483 (74)	15,774 (75)	16,428 (75)	16,052 (74)
Other costs	7,852 (34)	8,408 (34)	8,227 (33)	5,314 (26)	5,400 (25)	5,620 (25)	5,700 (26)
Total expenditure	23,304 (100)	24,992 (100)	24,926 (100)	20,797 (100)	21,174 (100)	22,048 (100)	21,752 (100)

* Total expenditure (including education and support)

** In the 2009 – 2011 period a different method for calculating the other costs was used

Table D.3: Enrolment and success rates, PhD employees and resident PhD students, cohort 2007–2012

Starting year	Enrolment		Total (M+F)	Success rate							
	Enrolment male/female			Graduated in year 4 or earlier	Graduated in year 5 or earlier	Graduated in year 6 or earlier	Graduated in year 7 or earlier	Graduated in year 8 or earlier	Graduated in year 9 or earlier	Not yet finished	Discontinued
	M	F									
2007	4	7	11	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	6 / 55%	2 / 18%	1 / 9%	1 / 9%	1 / 9%	0 / 0%
2008	6	10	16	3 / 19%	2 / 13%	2 / 13%	2 / 13%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	4 / 25%	3 / 19%
2009	8	7	15	1 / 6%	5 / 33%	5 / 33%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	2 / 14%	2 / 14%
2010	5	7	12	0 / 0%	3 / 25%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	8 / 67%	1 / 8%
2011	7	12	19	0 / 0%	4 / 21%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	12 / 63%	3 / 16%
2012	8	4	12	1 / 8%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	10 / 80%	1 / 8%
Total	38	47	85	5 / 6%	14 / 16%	13 / 15%	4 / 5%	1 / 1%	1 / 1%	37 / 44%	10 / 12%