

Research Assessment 2016

Utrecht University
SCHOOL OF LAW (2009-2015)

February 2017

Preface

This report is the result of the assessment of the Utrecht University School of Law's research. The scope of the assessment was the period 2009-2015. Since its research in the period 2009-2012 was already examined in a mid-term review and the School of Law has fundamentally restructured its research as from 2013, the emphasis of the external evaluation has been on the first three years of the new programmes (2013-2015). For this purpose the School of Law has carried out self-assessments both of the School of Law as a whole and of its separate research programmes as from 2013.

The review committee consisted of four distinguished professors, three from Europe, one from South Africa, and a chairperson from the Netherlands. We have tremendously enjoyed working together, especially during the site visit at the School of Law in Utrecht. It was a great privilege and pleasure to learn from each other's expertise. As chair I greatly appreciate the commitment and high quality of my fellow committee members.

Also on behalf of them I would like to acknowledge the quality and thoroughness of the School of Law's qualitative and quantitative self-assessments that form the basis for the review. This must have taken a lot of time and effort. The Committee also appreciates the availability, openness and frankness of the Head of the School of Law Prof. Ton Hol, the Research Director Prof. Rob Widdershoven, the research leaders and research staff during the site visit. This was absolutely of great added value and has significantly enhanced the insights of the Committee.

Special thanks go to Dr. Jetje de Groof, who served as a secretary to the review. She provided every support the Committee needed to accomplish the complex task of review in a relatively short period and provided guidance throughout the assessment process from the beginning to the completion of the report.

The Committee's responsibility was to evaluate the functioning of the School of Law overall and the five research programmes within it. The goals of the review are to contribute to the improvement of the School of Law's research strategy and ambitions and the research of each of the five research programmes. We hope that our comments will be useful to the further development and future of the Utrecht University School of Law's research.

Taru Spronken
Chair of the Committee

The review committee and the review procedures

1. The System of Quality Assessment of Research in The Netherlands

An external Committee of peers evaluated the research quality of the School of Law (Utrecht University), during a site visit on 10 and 11 November 2016, and reports its findings in this document.

This quality assessment (peer review) is part of the assessment system for all publicly funded Dutch research institutions. In accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021 for Research Assessment in the Netherlands (SEP) and the Terms of Reference (TOR) of the Utrecht University School of Law, the Committee's tasks were to assess the quality of the School of Law and its five research programmes and to advise on how they might be improved. The assessment was to be based on the information provided by the School of Law and the various programmes, and on interviews with management, the research directors, staff members, PhDs and PhD students.

The current assessment was part of a procedure that was initiated by the Council of Law School Deans (henceforth RdR) of the Netherlands. According to that procedure the research output of ten Dutch law faculties was to be simultaneously evaluated by separate external assessment committees. The RdR decided that this process would be executed in a 'coordinated but decentralized' way ('gecoördineerd decentraal'). This means each university was responsible for the organization of the review, following the procedures decided upon by its Board of Directors and the RdR. In addition, each university could decide, in its Terms of Reference, which research units would be evaluated, whether the evaluation would be qualitative or quantitative (or both), and what the benchmark for this assessment would be. At the same time, two ways of coordination were foreseen in the procedure. First, a 'Disciplineprotocol Rechtswetenschappelijk Onderzoek 2016' was established, that would be used as a basis for all procedures. Second, Prof. Van Genugten was appointed as a coordinator, with the aim of streamlining the process and writing a state-of-the-art report on legal research in the Netherlands. It was the first time that this specific procedure was followed.

2. Criteria and Assessment Scale

The SEP requires the Committee to assess the research on three main criteria:

- Research quality (the level of the research conducted);
- Societal relevance (social, economic and cultural relevance of the research);
- Viability (strategy, governance and leadership).

The qualitative assessments are supplemented by assigning discrete categories (1-4): Excellent (1); Very good (2); Good (3); Unsatisfactory (4). Appendix 2 provides a complete description of each of the categories on this four-point scale.

The 'Disciplineprotocol Rechtswetenschappelijk Onderzoek 2016' (see 1.1.) mentions that research units that focus primarily on national law, but that function in an excellent way, and are acknowledged for this nationally and internationally, are also eligible to be assessed as 'very good' for their research quality. The description of 'very good' for 'research quality' that is offered by SEP, i.e. 'The research unit conducts very good, internationally recognized research', should be interpreted against this background. The 'Disciplineprotocol' stipulates that this recognition can be evidenced e.g. by invitations for keynotes, guest lectures, etc. The central point is that the group is considered to be 'very good' by its peers nationally and internationally.

3. The Members of the Evaluation Committee

The Evaluation Committee consisted of:
Prof. Dr. T.N.B.M. (Taru) Spronken, chair
Prof. J. (Jacqueline) Heaton
Prof. Dr. L. (Luc) Lavrysen
Prof. Dr. C.W.A. (Chris) Timmermans
Prof. Dr. A. (Aloïs) Van Oevelen

Dr. Jetje De Groof (Antwerp, Belgium) was appointed as secretary to the Evaluation Committee.

A short curriculum vitae of each of the members is included in Appendix 1.

All members of the Committee signed a statement of independence to ensure that they would judge without bias, personal preference or personal interest, and that their judgment is made without undue influence from persons or parties committed to the institute or programmes under review, or from other stakeholders.

4. Scope of the Assessment

The Utrecht School of Law is one of the departments of the Faculty of Law, Economics and Governance of Utrecht University. Research at the School of Law is done in five multidimensional research programmes: Judicial Administration and Conflict Resolution (Montaigne); Liability and Responsibility (UCALL); Regulation and Enforcement (RENFORCE); Water and Sustainability (UCWOSL); and Family and Law (UCERF).

The Committee was asked to operate according to the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) for public scientific research in the Netherlands 2015-2021, which was drawn up by the KNAW, VSNU and NWO. The protocol specifies the information that must be provided to the Committee and the criteria for the research assessment.

The assessment of the School of Law focuses on two levels of the research organization, i.e. the level of the institute as a whole and the level of individual research programmes. For the assessment of the School of Law, the Committee was asked to assess the quality, relevance to society, and viability of the School of Law's research and research policy. In addition, the Committee was requested to critically evaluate PhD supervision and education, and the policy concerning academic integrity. The Committee was requested to formulate a judgement on the institute as a whole in qualitative terms.

For the evaluation of the research programmes, the Committee was asked to assess the quality, relevance to society and viability of the research conducted. The Terms of Reference state that the Committee should do so by judging the unit's performance on the three SEP assessment criteria of research quality, relevance to society, and viability, and to give a qualitative as well as a quantitative appreciation. The main benchmark for the assessment of the research conducted is to be the own ambition.

The review covers the period 2009-2015. As the period 2009-2012 was already evaluated in a mid-term review, and as the organizational structures of the School of Law were completely reformed in 2012-2013, the emphasis of the current assessment is on the period 2013-2015. The self-assessments of the separate research programmes also focus on this period. At the level of the School of Law most of the tables provided to the Committee cover the entire reporting period. The same holds true for the key publications of the programmes.

4. Data provided to the Committee

The Committee members received a documentation package well in advance of the site visit. This contained the self-evaluations with a description of the mission, objectives and results achieved in the reporting period as well as developments anticipated in the future. The documentation also included quantitative data about staff composition, PhDs, publications, and financial resources. The Committee also received the SEP and TOR for the assessment.

5. Procedures followed by the Committee

Before the visit, the Chair of the Committee assigned a research programme to each Committee member to focus on and to take the lead during preparation, interview and discussion. This division of labour was done taking into account the specific expertise of each of the Committee members and resulted in the following overview:

Committee member	First reader	Second reader
Spronken	Montaigne	UCALL
Timmermans	RENFORCE	Water
Van Oevelen	UCALL	UCERF
Lavrysen	Water	RENFORCE
Heaton	UCERF	Montaigne

Committee members were asked to read the self-evaluation report and formulate questions for the interviews. The division of labour was drawn up in such a way, that at least two Committee members teamed up for each research programme.

Appendix 3 shows the programme of the site visit. On the night before the site visit, the Committee had a closed preliminary meeting to come to a preliminary judgement on the School and the assigned research programmes prior to the site visit, and to further decide on subjects to discuss during the interviews. During the site visit, the Committee met with representatives of both the School of Law and the individual research programmes. The Committee also spoke with PhD students and the PhD Dean. Between the interviews, time was available to the Committee to discuss the various findings. During the final day of the site visit, a closed session was held for the Committee to come to its final qualitative and quantitative assessment. This was done jointly with and in agreement between all Committee members. At the end of the visit, the Committee orally presented its main preliminary conclusions to the School of Law members.

After the site visit, the evaluation report was written. In line with the division of labour, Committee members took the lead in composing the section they had focused on. An integrated version of the report was circulated to the Committee for all members to comment on. After all Committee members had included their additions and comments, a final version was drawn up and sent to the School of Law for a check on factual errors. Finally, the report was delivered to the Faculty of Law, Economics and Governance of Utrecht University.

In line with the Terms of Reference (see '4. Scope of the Assessment'), the Committee has scored the research quality, societal relevance and viability of the School of Law's five research programmes on the scale of 1-4. The Committee wants to emphasise that inevitably, the grades given are largely the result of averaging the performances within the research group and cannot reflect the variety that was often found within one research programme or between the various research programmes. The SEP scores suggest an objective comparability that does not reflect the heterogeneous practice that the Committee has experienced in reality. The Committee therefore seriously questions whether the assignment of grades offers any surplus value to the qualitative assessment and recommendations or to the

overall goal of the research assessment, i.e. the improvement of the research at the School of Law.

In this report, the Committee presents its assessment of the School of Law, and of its five research programmes, in six separate sections. Each section starts with a description of the unit, based on the preparatory documents and the site visit. This descriptive part is followed by a chapter containing the evaluation of the Committee. Each section is concluded by the recommendations of the Committee.

Assessment of the School of Law

1. Description of the School of Law

1.1. Mission and research activities

Since its reorganization in 2013, the Utrecht School of Law has stood for multidimensional research in the main areas of law. Considering its central position in the School of Law's strategy, the concept of multidimensionality and its application in the School's research was discussed at length during the site visit. The Committee learned that it encompasses internal or external comparative legal research, can be conducted on a national, European or global level and can also comprise interdisciplinary research involving disciplines other than law. The central idea of the concept is that multidimensional research into a legal problem or societal challenge may achieve more depth and provide more innovative solutions or insights compared to mono-dimensional legal research into a single legal area, because the topics are approached from various angles provided by other legal areas, legal systems or other disciplines. The School of Law reports that this rigorous choice for multidimensionality is unique, both in the Netherlands and abroad.

In 2013, the School of Law reorganized its research into five multidimensional research programmes. Three of them, the core research areas, mainly study timeless general judicial topics: Judicial Administration and Conflict Resolution (Montaigne Centre), Liability and Responsibility (Utrecht Centre for Accountability and Liability Law, UCALL) and Regulation and Enforcement (Utrecht Centre for Shared Regulation and Enforcement in Europe, RENFORCE). The other two programmes, which are called 'gems', study substantive topics: Water and Sustainability (Utrecht Centre for Water, Oceans and Sustainability Law, UCWOSL) and Family and Law (Utrecht Centre for European Research into Family Law, UCERF). All of these programmes apply the multidimensional approach, albeit, so the School of Law reports, that the level of multidimensionality that as yet has been reached by individual programmes differs.

The research policy of the School of Law is based on four ambitions: (1) a unique multidimensional research profile; (2) focused research programmes conducting high-quality research; (3) creating opportunities for talent and next generations; and (4) improving financial sustainability. For each of these ambitions, policy instruments have been implemented. They are described in the sections below.

1.2. Management and organization

The Utrecht School of Law is one of the departments of the Faculty of Law, Economics and Governance of Utrecht University (LEG). The Dean of the Faculty formally answers to the Rector of the University with regard to research conducted at the Faculty. This responsibility is delegated to the Head of the School of Law (Prof. Hol) who is assisted by the School of Law's Board. In the School of Law's Board, the Research Director (Prof. Widdershoven) is responsible for the general research strategy and policy, for quality care of the research, for talent and PhD policy and for the Legal Research Master Programme (LRM). The Research Director is assisted by the Research Council, consisting of one of the directors of each of the five research programmes. The Research Council monitors the quality of research and advises the Research Director on strategic research matters. The Research Director is assisted by support staff. At faculty level, the Board of Studies of the Graduate School is responsible for faculty research matters.

The School of Law has a matrix organization. For teaching purposes the School is organized in four divisions, each covering a specific part of the legal discipline (Private Law, Criminal Law, Constitutional and Administrative Law and Jurisprudence, International and European Law). For its research, the School is structured around the five research programmes (see 1.1.). This

means that for all assignments of ftus, teaching and research needs have to be reconciled. From the preparatory documents and the interviews during the site visit the Committee learned that this organizational model can be rather bureaucratic, but also that this is inherent in the choice for multidimensional research in combination with a teaching model that is still based on the conventional division within the legal discipline, and to an organization that aspires to combine excellent teaching with excellent research.

An important instrument in support of the creation of a multidimensional profile, so the Committee learned, has been the multidimensional composition of the research programmes. All five research programmes ideally include legal researchers from all main areas of law, abolishing the former discipline-based programmes. However, this choice does not imply that researchers cannot develop their in-depth disciplinary expertise.

Another means to achieve multidimensionality has been the active promotion of the participation of the School's researchers in the university's multi-/interdisciplinary networks. In 2005 Utrecht University bundled its top research into so-called Strategic Themes and Focus Areas, aiming at facilitating cooperation between the various disciplines at the university in order to strengthen the financial valorisation and societal relevance of research. The research programmes of the School of Law participate in several of these strategic themes and focus areas. In this framework, interdisciplinary meetings are organized and additional financial means are provided to assign post-doc researchers or to appoint research fellows. Also, seed money is provided to set up interdisciplinary groups with the aim of designing interdisciplinary research proposals. During the site visit, the Committee learned that this has had a leveraging effect on the acquisition of research grants for the School of Law. In addition, in the coming years the Faculty's Research Investment Agenda is also geared towards conducting interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research.

1.3. Resources

1.3.1. Human Resources

Appendix 4 contains a detailed overview of the School of Law's staff. The rearrangement of the School's research was combined with a staff reorganization, which was necessary to improve the financial situation. It started in 2013 and was completed in 2014. Before 2013 the research staff included about 70 ftu (including PhDs). This has been reduced to about 60 ftu (including 23 ftu PhDs on average). As regards gender the composition of its research staff (excluding PhDs) is 52% female and 48 % male.

A human resources policy was developed to support the School's ambition of focused research programmes conducting high-quality research. The research programmes have a fixed number of research ftus – varying from about 4 (UCERF) to about 11 (RENFORCE) – which the directors can assign to individual researchers who they expect to make an important contribution to the research programme. This is done on the basis of a performance interview, which the directors of the research programmes have on a yearly basis with all research staff. Research staff are entitled to 0,2 ftu guaranteed research time, which can be augmented by ftus that were assigned to the research programme. The School of Law applies a quantitative research standard to every researcher, a policy that was introduced in 2003 to prevent an overly low research output from individual researchers. Senior researchers with a research assignment of at least 0.4 ftu are expected to produce at least three scientific publications per year, one of which is required to be in a foreign language.

The School's human resources policy also entails creating positions for talented employees. Since 2013 one post-doc position has been attached to each of the five research programmes, offering an opportunity for PhD graduates to continue their academic career. The Committee

learned during the site visit that these postdocs have an important function in creating the dynamic and multidimensional research environments the programmes aspire to be. Furthermore in 2012 the School created twelve new positions for associate professors with a focus on research (0,5 or 0,6 ftu research time). Another two were added in 2015.

1.3.2. Financial resources

The total funding of the School's research in 2015 was k€ 7.705. A detailed overview of the School of Law's staff can be found in appendix 4.

As the direct funding of the university, faculty and School has been steadily decreasing, its financial policy is directed towards guaranteeing financial stability. This means that achieving a healthy mix of funding sources is a primary goal. With this aim in mind, every research programme should earn at least 15% (plus overhead) of the yearly expenses of its research staff. If this target is exceeded, the extra financial means may – as an incentive - be re-invested in the programme's research activities. Researchers are given support to achieve this goal. At the faculty level, the Research Support Office supports applications for large-scale projects. The Committee learned during the site visit that this support office offers real added value. The School of Law moreover allocates a yearly budget of k€ 40 to facilitate applications by the most promising candidates. In addition, by participating in the strategic themes and focus areas of the university, researchers can make use of the seed money offered to groups of researchers of different disciplinary backgrounds with the aim of designing interdisciplinary research proposals.

In order to promote the dynamics of the core research areas and research gems, they have a financial budget for material and HR matters, varying from k€ 43 (UCERF) to k€ 80 (RENFORCE). This budget can be used for a variety of activities: e.g. meetings, conferences, outreach activities, visiting researchers, research stays abroad, etc.

1.5. PhD policy

PhDs are central in the School of Law's talent policy. Its PhD policy includes measures to create PhD positions, to improve the quality of proposals and candidates, to facilitate individual PhD research and to improve progress of PhD projects.

The number of PhD positions financed by direct funding has decreased from about 20 to 12 PhD candidates. To compensate for this decrease the School of Law put effort into creating 'appointed' PhD positions, financed by indirect funding and contract funding. In addition, the School has developed specific policies towards attracting bursary and external PhD candidates. Moreover, three PhD positions were created by re-investing funds by the research programmes having exceeded their financial target (see 1.3.2.).

Appendix 4 shows an overview of PhD progress and completion. In the assessment period 97 PhD theses were successfully defended. Compared to the previous evaluation period, the School reports that its success rate has doubled.

The School of Law reports that, since the previous external evaluation of the School of Law's research (Koers Commission) in 2009, several measures have been taken to improve the progress of PhD projects and reduce the number of candidates discontinuing their project. These measures include the introduction of a quality assessment of research proposals by the Research Council and offering a financial stimulus to encourage the timely completion of the thesis. Also, the School of Law has appointed a PhD Dean, Prof. Renée Kool, whose tasks are to counsel individual PhD candidates (including bursary PhD candidates) in matters of progress, supervision and well-being, and to act as mediator in the unlikely event of conflict between a

PhD candidate and his or her supervisors. The PhD Dean explained to the Committee that she meets with all PhD candidates in an introductory meeting, is present at the 'go-no go' meeting (see below) and at the annual performance interview. The Committee learned during the site visit that the level of involvement of the PhD Dean is highly appreciated by the PhD students.

As a general rule each PhD candidate has two supervisors, usually a professor and a post-doc or junior researcher who acts as a daily supervisor. For each PhD candidate the training and supervision activities are detailed in the Individual Training and Supervision Plan at the start of the research project. The PhD candidate and the supervisors have a performance interview at least once a year, which may result in an update of the Training and Supervision Plan. After the first year, this plan – both for appointed PhD candidates and for bursary candidates – includes the so-called 'go-no go' meeting, in which it is decided whether the progress of the project warrants its continuation. The Committee learned during the site visit that PhDs are very pleased with the frequency of meetings they have with their supervisors. Together with the PhD Dean, the supervisors form a 'support network' for both personal and PhD-related issues.

PhD students explained to the Committee that they appreciate the flexible way in which the PhD courses have been set up, leaving ample room for students to select the courses that are most relevant to them. The Faculty offers PhD candidates three basic research skills courses, which are obligatory for appointed and bursary PhD candidates and are voluntarily for external PhD candidates. The Committee learned during the site visit that PhD students also value the generic skills courses, like Academic Writing and Time Management, which are obligatory for appointed and bursary PhD candidates and are voluntarily for external PhD candidates. The larger part of the PhD training has been outsourced to two research schools, the Ius Commune Research School and Human Rights Research School. The Committee took note of the fact that the master class of the Ius Commune Research School is widely acclaimed.

As a rule, PhD candidates with a four-year appointment at the School of Law are involved in teaching activities. The Committee talked at length with the PhD students on whether the teaching obligations do not interfere with their PhD work. The students all regarded the teaching as having added value for their career and explained that teaching can take up a maximum of 15% of the total time. In addition, it mostly takes place during the second and third year of the assignment, leaving ample time in the final year to finish the PhD.

The Committee learned from the PhD students that the faculty PhD Council is widely appreciated for its representation in various bodies and for its lobby work. Another important element is community building, which was considered to be extremely important by bursary PhD students, who are mostly international students. The Council also organizes yearly thematic days, most recently on integrity and multidisciplinary.

The Committee learned in its discussions with UCWOSL that this programme has attracted a Chinese postdoc, who is a PhD graduate from the group, to offer extra guidance to Chinese bursary PhD students.

The Committee gauged what the multidimensional approach means for the PhD students. It observed that although the focus of most PhDs has multidimensional components, the majority mentioned their department and not their research programme as home base in the introductory round. Although a minority mentioned to the Committee that they belong to a research programme, the majority were of the opinion that the programmes are rather seen as initiatives offering interesting activities. This is also reflected in the conclusions and recommendations of a PhD survey in 2014 annex 8 to the self-assessment of the School of Law, where it is observed that not all PhDs know to which research programme they belong and the recommendation is made to provide each PhD student, including the PhD students from non-EU countries with a position within a research programme, that fits their topic best.

1.6. Integrity

Utrecht University has developed a Code of Conduct regarding integrity. In addition, the Faculty of Law, Economics and Governance has documented its policy of Research Integrity in general terms. The policy includes rules of conduct on the independence of contract research and specific requirements concerning PhD research (check on plagiarism, a ban on membership of the PhD assessment committee for those who have co-authored any of the chapters of the manuscript). Since 2015, all Utrecht PhD candidates have had to declare at their defence ceremony that they will comply with standards of integrity. The faculty document moreover informs all staff members on how to proceed if any issues of integrity may arise. Raising awareness is an important part of the School of Law's integrity policy. As regards PhDs, the faculty is developing a yearly workshop on integrity as part of the PhD training. In addition, in 2015 integrity was the topic of the Faculty's yearly PhD Day.

The School of Law reports on the increasing tension between academic freedom and the interests of organizations financing contract research, in particular if the research topic is politically sensitive.

So far, staff members have been responsible for the management and availability of research data. The UU is developing a new policy to ensure that data remain available after research projects are finished. According to this policy, researchers are responsible for these data during the entire research project.

2. Qualitative assessment of the School of Law

In this section, the Committee evaluates the performance of the School of Law as a whole on the three criteria of research quality, relevance to society and viability. In addition, the Committee gives its evaluation of PhD supervision and education, and of academic integrity, as stipulated in the Terms of Reference. An overview of the Committee's recommendations for the School of Law is given in section 3 of this report.

2.1. Research quality

The Committee is very well aware of the fact that a substantive reorganization preceded the period on which this assessment focuses (2013-2015). This restructuring involved cutting expenditure and reducing research staff by 14% (see 1.3.1.). Any assessment of the research achievements of the School of Law in this period therefore has to be put in this context and perspective.

The Committee praises the School of Law for having seized the (financial) challenges it was faced with as an opportunity to fundamentally rearrange its research. In this way, the School also acted on the main recommendations in the Midterm Review 2009-2012 that were inspired by the findings of the Report 'Profiled Ambition' of the Franken Commission. In the Midterm Review it was stressed that clear choices had to be made in order to not endanger the School of Law's financial viability and to uphold the quality of its research. The recommendation in the Midterm Review to choose multidimensionality as a core concept of research and concentrate the research in three centres of gravity and two smaller more substantive topics called 'gems', was carried out as from 2013. The same holds true for the recommendation to differentiate the research-time of the staff dependent on their involvement in the five focus areas of research.

Overall, the Committee obtained a very positive impression of the results of the new research policy. The Committee was struck by the large quantity and good quality of the School of Law's

research output, which will be reported on more in depth below, in the separate reviews of the research programmes.

The Committee compliments the School of Law on maintaining such a high level of productivity in times of budget cuts and reorganization and on creating excellent professional support for maintaining these standards. Although it is still too early to form a final opinion on the new approach, very promising results are already visible.

The Committee is keen to point out that the School of Law in general has a good record of publishing in both peer-reviewed journal articles and books of high quality. In terms of quality of research output, preference is given to refereed journal articles over books. As regards the latter, sole or co-authored books are generally privileged over edited books. The Committee is of the opinion that this should not deter the School of Law from highlighting the importance of edited books in its publication strategy, as they are important vehicles for the dissemination of multidimensional work. This is especially true for those edited books that emerge directly from the multidimensional research agendas of the research programmes.

Following the site visit, the Committee received, for each of the research programmes, an overview of the publications that are multidimensional in nature. From this outline, the Committee concludes that the number of multidimensional publications has increased in most of the research programmes during the review period, which can be seen as a sign of success of the new research strategy.

Multidimensionality as a central concept, as the Committee has understood from the self-assessment and the site visit, can be achieved in various ways (see 1.1.). It must be said that multidimensionality and interdisciplinarity are as such not new or unique ways to conduct legal research and the Committee notes that in general they are easy to proclaim but difficult to attain. Yet the School of Law has managed to foster a climate conducive to genuine multidimensionality, by putting an organizational structure in place to stimulate cooperation and collaboration across disciplinary or monodimensional borders. The School of Law has achieved this by initiating research programmes concentrated around focused topics and bringing together in these programmes legal researchers from across diverse areas of law (private law, criminal law, constitutional and administrative law, legal theory, European and International law, Human Rights Law), while at the same time abolishing the former discipline-based research entities and programmes. Although it is still too early to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the new approach and organizational structure, the Committee is impressed with what has already been achieved and with the resilience it encountered during the site visit when talking to the researchers of the various research programmes.

To the uninitiated—which includes all Committee Members—the School's organization, as described in section 1.2., seems confusing and unnecessarily complex, with the matrix structure within the School of Law, and initiatives at the level of the School, Faculty and University often coinciding. In the self-assessments and SWOT analysis it is mentioned that this complexity might be a threat to multidimensionality. Concern is expressed that the matrix organization results in fragmented and inefficient decision-making and that sometimes researchers tend to restrict themselves to their own field of studies or return to their initial organizational unit and disregard their participation in the multidimensional research programmes. This seems to be aggravated by the fragmentation of research time. Some scholars are involved in more than one research programme or are only for a small part of their research time allocated to a programme. In combination with large teaching loads this may result in lack of time for cooperation in the research programmes.

Having spoken to the School of Law management and members, the Committee was however reassured that this complex matrix organization does indeed provide a framework that

facilitates flexibility, networking, and mobility for researchers who might otherwise feel constrained by the traditional boundaries of their legal discipline. According to the Committee, all the School's research programmes have adapted very well to the new matrix organizational structure. Although the matrix structure requires much more consultation and cooperation, the programmes do not view this as a serious disadvantage and have made the most of the new structure.

The Committee notes that the structural allocation of a full time postdoc in the research programmes has been an effective policy to stimulate the continuity and connection within the research programmes and its participants. In addition this is an excellent opportunity to create positions for talented PhD students who have obtained their doctoral degree, thus meeting another ambition of the School of Law, i.e. creating opportunities for the new generation of talented researchers. In this way the knife cuts both ways and the Committee strongly advises the School to continue this policy.

The Committee notes that many researchers, despite the organizational challenges, were positive and enthusiastic about the possibilities to call upon the expertise in other programmes and the willingness to help each other. One of the incentives to make this work might be that all researchers and research programmes face the same organizational difficulties that can only be solved when there is solidarity between its members.

The Committee learned throughout the site visit that the layered organization (school, faculty and university level), with the different strategic themes and focus areas, has had a positive effect on developing and designing interdisciplinary research within the School of Law. This on the one hand is a consequence of the new funding perspectives, e.g. through the possibility to obtain so-called seed money. On the other hand, structures have been put in place to meet and discuss with other disciplines, which has initiated a dialogue.

The Committee is moreover of the opinion that the restructuring of the School of Law's research programmes has increased the visibility of the School of Law to outside partners and has been an avenue for researchers to develop external networks. In this way, the new strategy has been an effective response to shifting funding opportunities. The new structure has undeniably stimulated external fund-raising both from competitive second-stream (Dutch government) sources and from equally competitive third-stream (non-Dutch government) sources. The School of Law research programmes are already reaching their goal of generating 15 % of the yearly expenses of their research staff by external funding and contract research. The School of Law owes this success in large part to the excellent administrative support for fund-raising efforts, notably through the services of the Research Support Office. The direct involvement of the heads of the research programmes ensures the highest quality control of grant applications. Researchers of the School of Law also stressed the leveraging effect of participation in the university-wide focus areas.

In sum, the Committee is of the opinion, that through its reorganization, the School of Law is making headway in working towards its ambitions of (1) creating a unique multidimensional research profile; (2) building focused research programmes conducting high quality research; (3) providing opportunities for talent and next generation and (4) improving financial sustainability. Nevertheless, the Committee also wants to voice a few points of concern. One general concern that is widely shared in the self-assessments is the growing tension between contract research that supports financial sustainability, and academic freedom that is needed to accomplish the goals of the research programmes. Most School of Law members have acknowledged the need to prioritize their commitments and manage their time so that grant-seeking does not interfere with other key activities within the research programmes. Although efforts to balance the demands of fund-raising and researching (less so teaching) transcend the School of Law level, they should be addressed as a real problem in the School of Law policies.

The call for rising productivity in fund-raising accentuates the growing pressure on 'free' research time. There needs to be a continuous reflection on the relationship between quantity and quality of research (output). The School of Law should make clear that it takes this challenge seriously.

A second issue concerns the relation between individual research and the contribution to the multidimensional research programmes. The Committee is of the opinion that multidimensional research cannot do without the possibility for each researcher to maintain and further develop one's disciplinary expertise. The latter is needed to pull the multidimensional aspects of the research programmes to a higher level. The Committee recommends flexibility in allowing researchers possibilities to conduct research within their own discipline and to provide structural, clearly defined and communicated opportunities within the research programmes to do this. A good example can be found in the UCALL policy which explicitly prescribes that at least one of the three publications that each researcher should accomplish yearly, should fall within the multidisciplinary research of the programme while two may be the result of individual research in one's own expertise area. In this respect the Committee positively evaluates the policy implemented that the directors of the research programmes are allowed flexibility in allocating research time to researchers depending on their involvement in specific research topics. The Committee already pointed at the risk of fragmentation of research time of individual researchers, because the information given in the self-assessment report seemed to show that some scholars are involved in more than one research programme or are only for a small part of their research time allocated to a programme. The Committee notes however that the possibility to differentiate research assignments allows researchers to temporarily devote a larger portion of their time on a certain research project, de facto reducing the risk of fragmentation.

A third observation the Committee would want to make is that it appeared from the self-assessments and the site visit that relatively small research units, also called the gems, The Utrecht Centre for European Research into Family Law (UCERF) and the Utrecht Centre for Water, Oceans and Sustainability Law (UCWOSL) as well as the Utrecht Centre for Accountability and Liability Law (UCALL) with clearly defined substantive topics, are the most successful in conducting multidimensional research and show great cohesion within the research group. It would be advisable to consider these two aspects, size of the research group and choice of topics, in the future strategy and also with regard to the development of the other two larger programmes of Utrecht Centre for Shared Regulation and Enforcement in Europe (RENFORCE) and the Montaigne Centre. The Committee has made specific recommendations in this respect in the evaluation of Montaigne and RENFORCE.

2.2. Relevance to society

The Committee agrees, as is written in the self-assessment, that legal research is societally relevant by definition. The areas covered by the research programmes are highly relevant to society, as will be elaborated more in the review of the individual programmes below.

Even without being able to demonstrate this by scientific metrics, it is clear to the Committee that the Utrecht School of Law is making a strong outreach effort. Next to professional publications researchers are eager to disseminate their work to a wider non-academic audience by means of popular publications, appearances in the media, personal websites and blogs administered by the research programmes. The Committee wants to emphasise that the Utrecht Law Review is a good channel to communicate the multidimensional approach to the outside world.

The School's relevance to society is also demonstrated by the amount of contract research with societal impact and strategic alliances with legal practice. The Committee discussed with

different groups of interviewees how the School succeeds in keeping its academic independence and integrity. This point was already covered in section 1.6. and will be further discussed in section 2.4.

Many staff members have positions in courts as honorary judges, in advisory commissions or governmental agencies and participate in legal debates of high societal relevance. Most of the research results are directly relevant for legal institutions.

2.3. Viability

As regards viability the Committee is of the opinion that the School of Law, with its new research strategy and concept, has put itself in a favourable position for the years to come. The choice for multidimensionality is well embedded in the School of Law's structure and research programmes and is supported by Utrecht University's Strategic Themes and Focus Areas. Nevertheless, there is a risk that the complexity of the organization could result in excessive institutionalisation, thereby preventing rather than enhancing collaboration. The Committee is of the opinion that the School needs to continually nurture and maintain the conditions that are conducive of multidimensionality. Nevertheless, the Committee finds that the School of Law, the Faculty and the University have put appropriate structures in place and provide adequate incentives for a positive and resourceful environment that fosters multidimensionality. The Committee commends the School of Law for having gained financial sustainability and is of the opinion that its financial policy ensures that the School and its research programmes are financially viable. The Committee applauds that the School is successful in aligning its contract research with its own research interests. This means that to a large extent, the funding obtained from contract research enables the School's researchers to do research in topics they are scientifically interested in.

Although some research programmes are still in a period of transition towards multidimensionality and there are certainly still challenges to meet, such as securing input from various disciplines in the research programmes, preventing fragmentation of research time, and balancing fundamental and contract-research, due to the School of Law's policy the Committee trusts that continuity and viability of the School of Law's research are guaranteed for the coming years.

2.4. PhD programme

The Committee commends the School of Law for having established a funding strategy that enables the School to continue to attract PhD students in times of decreasing structural funding. During the review period the number of external PhD positions, financed by indirect funding and contract funding and bursary PhD candidates, has increased significantly. Since 2013 five candidates have gained their own PhD positions through successful applications for NWO Research Talent grants. The Committee also applauds the strategy of reinvesting overhead money from external funding in order to create PhD positions.

During the site visit the Committee met with a very enthusiastic group of PhD researchers, and praises the School of Law for having created a stimulating research environment for its junior researchers. On the basis of the information provided in the self-evaluation report and the discussion during the site visit, the Committee is of the opinion that the School of Law has succeeded in establishing a very solid system of monitoring and supervision, which is highly appreciated by the PhD students. The fact that the success rate of PhDs has clearly improved, supports the Committee in its opinion that the PhD policy has been very effective. Elements of best practice include the active monitoring of the scope of the PhD project at the beginning of the trajectory, and the creation of the function of PhD Dean. The role of the PhD Dean, who is very convincing and involved, can hardly be overestimated. Another example of best practice is

the deployment of a Chinese postdoc (a PhD graduate from Utrecht) to provide extra guidance to Chinese bursary students doing their PhD in Utrecht.

The Committee endorses the flexible way in which the PhD programme has been set up and wishes to echo the students' appreciation for the generic skills courses offered at the level of the faculty and the School of Law and the master class of the Ius Commune Research School. The Committee welcomes the fact that students are involved in teaching, but that measures are foreseen to ensure that this does not become a burden preventing timely conclusion of the PhD. The Committee is moreover very positive about the role of the PhD Council.

The Committee took note of the fact that the majority of PhD students are at the moment not (actively) involved in further developing the multidimensional approach. The Committee suggests that the PhD students should be more structurally involved in the research programmes as was recommended in the evaluation of the PhD survey in September 2014, by securing the participation of all PhD candidates in one of the School of Law research programmes. This will increase the benefit PhD students can have from the academic multidimensional environment and will vice versa enrich the research programmes.

2.5. Research integrity

The Committee has no concerns about the School's data management practices, the level of research integrity and the transparency of the research culture. The Committee is of the opinion that the School of Law's research staff is well aware of the challenges of contract research to the independence of research, but deals with this in an adequate way.

3. Recommendations

The Committee recommends that the School of Law should continue its flexible approach to allowing researchers to conduct research within their own discipline. The Committee suggests that the School should provide structural, clearly defined and communicated opportunities within the research programmes to do this. A good example can be found in the UCALL policy which explicitly prescribes that at least one of the three publications that each researcher should accomplish yearly, should fall within the multidisciplinary research of the programme while two may be the result of individual research in one's own expertise area. At the same time, this measure also makes it clear what the demands are as regards the multidimensional component of research output.

The Committee is of the opinion that in its publication strategy, the School of Law should continually highlight the importance of edited books in its publication strategy, as they are important vehicles for the dissemination of multidimensional work.

The Committee recommends that the School continuously reflect on the relationship between quantity and quality of research (output) and search to strike a balance between fund-raising and researching in view of the demands the former puts on 'free' research time.

The Utrecht Centre for European Research into Family Law (UCERF) and the Utrecht Centre for Water, Oceans and Sustainability Law (UCWOSL) as well as the Utrecht Centre for Accountability and Liability Law (UCALL) are the most successful in conducting multidimensional research and show great cohesion within the research group. These groups have clearly defined substantive topics and are small in size. The Committee recommends that these two aspects, size of the research group and choice of topics, should be considered in the future strategy and also with regard to the development of the other two larger programmes of Utrecht Centre for Shared Regulation and Enforcement in Europe (RENFORCE) and the Montaigne Centre. The Committee

has made specific recommendations in this respect in the evaluation of Montaigne and RENFORCE.

The Committee suggests that the PhD students should be more structurally involved in the research programmes as was recommended in the evaluation of the PhD survey in September 2014, by securing the participation of all PhD candidates in one of the School of Law research programmes. This will increase the benefit PhD students can have from the academic multidimensional environment and will vice versa enrich the research programmes.

Assessment of the research programmes

Judicial Administration and Conflict Resolution (Montaigne)

1. Description of the Montaigne Centre for Judicial Administration and Conflict Resolution

1.1. Mission and research activities

The Montaigne Centre combines multidimensional expertise in the field of judicial administration and conflict resolution. Societal developments such as Europeanisation and globalisation require a fundamental reorientation of the judicial profession and of the role of law as an instrument of conflict resolution. The Centre's research has been divided into a number of sub-themes, i.e. the reorientation of procedures and procedural law; the organization of conflict resolution institutions; semi-legal and non-legal conflict resolution; the tension between court, legislator, and governance; the relation and interaction between courts in a European context; and transitional justice.

The main research question of the Montaigne Centre is: Which forms of conflict resolution are appropriate in today's changing society and how should the various procedures be designed and organized to strike a good balance between justice, certainty, effectiveness, speed and efficiency? Its researchers try to answer this question by focusing on national, European and international procedures and institutions in judicial and justice administration, from conflict resolution in concrete cases at micro level to judicial administration in a fast-changing world at macro level. The Centre aims to transcend the traditional legal disciplines by also applying social-science research methods and conducting qualitative and quantitative empirical research. It endeavours to continue and further develop international cooperation.

1.2. Management and organization

The Montaigne Centre is a core research area in the School of Law and was founded on 1 January 2013. Its management team consists of two professors as research directors (Prof. Bauw and Prof. Langbroek), a senior researcher, a postdoc researcher, a student assistant and a secretary.

The current research of the Montaigne Centre was part of the Programme for European Public Law and partly of the Programme on Human Rights in a World of Conflict and Diversity until 1 January 2013. Essential themes of the Montaigne Centre are a continuation of the same topics in both previous programmes. Since September 2014, efforts have been directed at integrating research efforts into themes that are not restricted to one area of law. Researchers are explicitly asked to 'link' with researchers inside and outside Utrecht School of Law and to seek connection with the relevant social field for possible cooperation. In order to stimulate this collaboration, the management team has organized lectures, research sessions, and methodology sessions, and has also produced a monthly newsletter. Effectively, a researcher should show commitment to the Montaigne Centre's research subjects by publishing in line with the research programme and showing active participation in Montaigne projects. In addition, researchers of Montaigne are stimulated to build international networks, participate in international research projects and organize international conferences.

1.3. Resources

1.3.1. Human Resources

Appendix 4 presents the composition of the Montaigne Centre. It shows that research time, especially of senior staff (6.58 full-time units), is divided between 28 staff members. In 2016, 22 PhD researchers were employed, working as bursary students or researchers externally connected to the Montaigne Centre. It is one of the characteristics of the Montaigne centre that several researchers have a very small amount of research time, for example 0,05; 0,1 or 0,2 ftu.

The Centre reports that problems with staff capacity to carry out projects have so far successfully been solved by cooperation with UCALL and RENFORCE. This was confirmed to the Committee during the site visit. Nevertheless, the Centre also mentions in its report that a lesser fragmentation of research time may enhance the development of their research.

1.3.2. Financial resources

Appendix 4 contains a detailed overview of the Centre's budget. The portion of direct funding remained more or less stable between 2013 and 2015, whereas the contribution of research grants to total funding is on the rise (16% in 2013 and 24% in 2015). There was a decrease in contract research from 31% in 2013 to 20% in 2015. The mutual ratio between direct, indirect and contract funding has remained more or less stable. In 2013, 2014 and 2015, the Centre reached the School of Law's target of acquiring 15% of funding through external funds in 2014 (see assessment School of Law, section 1.3.2.).

2. Qualitative and quantitative assessment of the Montaigne Centre

In this section, the Committee evaluates the performance of the Montaigne Centre as a whole on the three criteria of research quality, relevance to society and viability. An overview of the Committee's recommendations for the Montaigne Centre is given in section 3 of this report.

2.1. Research quality

The Committee observed that the Montaigne Centre is in a phase of transition. Since 2013 the Centre has focused its research on conflict resolution, judicial administration and justice administration in national, European and international contexts. In September 2014 the focus shifted to addressing these themes beyond specific areas of law. In the self-assessment, reference is moreover made to the draft research programme 2016-2022, in which a framework of analysis for the Centre's research is proposed and a focus on legal decision-making on the following themes is proposed: the reorientation in procedures and procedural law, semi-legal and non-legal conflict resolution and administration of justice and conflict resolution in societies in transition. These themes will be approached from three different perspectives: responsive justice, procedural justice and legal unity versus diversity. In this multidimensional approach empirical research should also play a role.

Based on these observations and the discussions during the site visit, the Committee has the impression that the goals and ambitions of the Montaigne Centre are still very much in a phase of development and discussion and have not yet crystallised into a coherent approach or direction with a clear methodology. This is probably caused by the fact that several existing programmes in which the Montaigne Centre was participating before 2013 (see 1.2.) and projects like Challenging of Judges, Offender Supervision in Europe, and Innovating Appeal Courts, have since 2013 been included in the current structure of the Montaigne Centre. The Committee agrees that monodisciplinary research clearly will continue to play an important role in the Centre, as it forms the basis for the multidimensional approach. Nevertheless, the Committee accepts that the challenge now lies in merging the various 'blood groups' of the participating researchers and involving them in multidimensional projects. The Committee fully understands that this takes time and that the goals and ambitions of the Centre cannot be realised in the three years (2013-2015) that are covered by the current review. In this sense, the Committee endorses the priority that is given in the Centre's strategy to stimulate cooperation between its researchers in order to conduct multidimensional research.

Although the Committee commends the Montaigne Centre for already having successfully tackled some multidimensional research projects that individual researchers would not have pursued on their own, it is also of the opinion that it is too early to assess the added value of the specific focus and methodology the Centre has chosen. In this phase of transition, the Committee recommends that the Centre should concentrate on the continued development of its strategic targets and research methodology, in order to build a solid basis for further cooperation and for achieving its objectives. The Committee feels that the complexity of the research design, as described above, can be reduced and that clear choices should be made regarding focus areas and the multidimensional methodological approach. Notwithstanding the fact that Montaigne consists of a large group of researchers, a difficulty for realising the multidisciplinary approach lies in the very small amount of time that is available for each researcher (see 1.3.1.) to invest in the research Montaigne aims to accomplish.

Nevertheless, the research output during the assessment period 2013-2015 is impressive and solid. In total 14 PhD dissertations were successfully defended (5 Dutch and 9 international). The researchers in the Centre published 98 peer-reviewed articles (including 40 in international peer reviewed journals), 15 scientific books, 108 book chapters and 18 edited volumes. In line with the focus of the programme on judicial administration and conflict resolution, which has a profound basis in judicial practice, the number of professional articles (208), annotations (85), handbooks (16) and professional book chapters (47) is also of a considerable multitude. The scientific as well as the professional publications show a great diversity of areas covered, including a variety of topics on judicial administration, criminal sanctions and punishment, comparative criminal procedure, international criminal law, international tribunals, human rights, constitutional law etc. According to the Committee, this broad diversity results from the fact that most publications stem from existing programmes in which the Montaigne Centre was participating before 2013 and that unfinished commitments which had arisen before January 2013 had to be met, as is explained in the self-assessment.

The key publications of the programme reflect the same diversity. They are all in themselves of (very) good quality. The dissertation of Mc Gonigle Leyh of 2011, 'Procedural Justice? Victim Participation in International Criminal Proceedings' deserves special mention. This book is an excellent publication on transitional justice. The same applies to the book edited by Buyse and Hamilton on Transitional Jurisprudence and the ECHR, published by Cambridge University Press in 2011, bringing together a collection of studies from all over the world on the challenges that are faced in upholding human rights in situations of transition from war to peace or dictatorship to democracy.

A large number of the publications deal with the practice of administration of justice and conflict resolution, which is in line with the research themes and aims of the Montaigne Centre. The Committee however supports the Centre's directors in their ambition to reduce the overall number of publications by 20%. The Committee endorses the Centre's policy of trying to strike a better balance between professional publications on the one hand and multidimensional, high-level, peer-reviewed research, which are at the core of the Centre's strategy, on the other hand.

Proof of the quality of the Centre's researchers can be found in their participation in editorial boards and their activities as expert members in various organizations, judicial bodies and assessment committees. They have been active in organizing seminars and conferences and have taken part in international research projects.

Taking into account the numerous foreign and nationally funded research projects, there is no lack of scientific recognition of individual researchers of Montaigne. The Centre has been able to attract numerous external PhD students, but has, unfortunately, been less successful in receiving NWO or international grants for doctoral researchers. The Montaigne Centre is very well equipped to acquire external funding for applied legal research and from this perspective the

financial situation qualifies as 'healthy and sustainable'. However, the ongoing stream of research assignments puts the Montaigne Centre in the situation that choices have to be made as to the priorities that have to be set. The Committee endorses the policy decision conveyed in the self-assessment that from 2015 onwards Montaigne should develop projects within the university's focus areas with regard to future grant applications, with the consequence that a smaller number of projects and assignments from external institutions will be accepted. The Committee is not in a position to assess how this will influence the financial prospects of the Centre in the future.

The Committee observes that it is still a challenge for the Montaigne directors to manage the individual researcher's research time (a weakness mentioned in the SWOT analysis) and is of the opinion that more senior researchers should be involved on a regular basis to play a leading role in the Centre. In this respect the recent recruitment of Prof. Janneke Gerards and Prof. Elaine Mak on the part of the Montaigne Centre, is to be seen as a positive development.

In conclusion, the Committee is of the opinion that the Montaigne Centre conducts good research.

Score: 3

2.2. Relevance to society

The central research theme of the Montaigne Centre is obviously of great societal relevance. The Committee finds all the narratives in the self-assessment convincing in this respect. The numerous projects the Montaigne Centre is involved in, including externally funded advisory work show that the expertise of the Centre is widely acknowledged and appreciated at national and international level. Also, the bilingual website of Montaigne and the widely read blog including a newsletter are evidence of the fact that Montaigne's expertise is made accessible to the public at large. The Committee commends the Centre for the level and success of its societal outreach.

In conclusion, the Committee is of the opinion that the Montaigne Centre makes a very good contribution to society.

Score: 2

2.3. Viability

Because the research programme of the Montaigne Centre is still 'under construction' the assessment of the Committee on viability can only be a provisional one. The research theme is highly relevant for society and its importance will even increase in the future as fundamental multidimensional research on conflict resolution is of great importance and going through changes worldwide. The challenge will be to find focus areas within the rich variety of potential research topics. Furthermore, coherence should be promoted so as to support and enhance the research potential and quality that are, without a doubt, present in the group of Montaigne researchers and to enable its researchers more readily to cooperate and work together. In this respect the draft research programme for 2016-2020 is a good start, but it needs further development and focus.

The Committee is of the view that the Centre's management has adapted well to the new matrix organizational structure. It is of the opinion that the Centre's plan to enhance its earning capacity is solid. Important in this respect is the maintenance of its national and international networks, e.g. by attracting visiting scholars. Also, the Centre wants to develop seed money

applications in order to be able to develop grant applications and enhance the chances of success in grant applications by supporting researchers with travel cost, publication costs, but also by offering them platforms to improve their research. In view of the Centre's financial viability, the Committee is of the opinion that it should continue to search for funding sources that will enable it to do research that fits in the programme, e.g. through attracting research grants, or by acquiring contract funding for assignments that are aligned with the Centre's research interests.

The management team of the Centre now needs to ensure that this promising programme flourishes in years to come. This will require excellent and continued leadership. In this perspective, the Committee suggests that the frequent changes in leadership that occurred in the last few years, are to be avoided in the future. If these conditions are met, the Committee trusts that the programme will reach its full potential.

In conclusion, the Committee is of the opinion that the Montaigne Centre makes responsible strategic decisions and is therefore well equipped for the future.

Score: 3

3. Recommendations

The Committee is of the opinion that the draft research programme 2016-2020 is (too) complex and broad. It needs more focus and coherence.

The Committee recommends that the number of themes should be reduced and that spearheads the Montaigne Centre wants to concentrate on should be developed.

Efforts should be made to find collective but nevertheless concrete research topics in which researchers from various backgrounds work together more closely, bringing in their expertise.

The management of the Centre should increase their efforts to attract grants for independent research within the focus areas of the research programme.

Liability and Responsibility (UCALL)

1. Description of the Utrecht Centre for Accountability and Liability Law

1.1. Mission and research activities

UCALL has set out to conduct multidimensional research on the boundaries of liability, responsibility and accountability in the Netherlands, in Europe, and beyond. Its philosophy is to combine forces and bring together knowledge of private law, criminal law, administrative law, public international law, legal theory, European law and human rights law by close cooperation between the UCALL members in small research groups as well as organized research activities for the group as a whole. This allows a multidimensional approach on issues of liability, responsibility and accountability. UCALL's main research question is: What are the limits to liability in the main areas of the law, and are these limits adequate? If not, where should these limits be drawn given what society wants to achieve regarding liability and accountability when it comes to redress, influencing behaviour and standard setting? In its research approach UCALL focuses on five themes: Controlling society, layering, limits, coherence, and dynamics.

1.2. Management and organization

UCALL's research programme was developed in 2012. Before, there was no multidimensional approach to the issues of liability, responsibility and accountability at the Utrecht School of Law. In the research programmes of the departments some attention was paid to issues of liability, but only in one area of the law.

The research centre has two directors (Prof. Giesen and Prof. Kristen), who decide on UCALL's policy related to projects, focus and targets, as well as the composition of research staff and financial management. A management team supports the directors. With respect to its daily affairs, UCALL pursues a bottom-up management. Researchers participate in committees that are responsible for the various aspects of UCALL (e.g. the UCALL blog). Each year UCALL organizes an off-site retreat, during which UCALL's researchers evaluate the results of the preceding year and develop new lines of research. UCALL encourages its researchers to collaborate, particularly with colleagues from different areas of law. In order to facilitate this, Research Focus Groups have been established that work on selected topics covering several areas of law and/or other disciplines. Everyone is expected to be active in at least one such Research Focus Group.

UCALL reports that its multidimensional approach has led to close cooperation of UCALL's researchers with other researchers from the School of Law, particularly the Montaigne Centre, RENFORCE and UCWOSL. UCALL also actively participates in Utrecht University's Strategic Theme Institutions for Open Societies. The private and administrative law researchers at UCALL work closely together with most specialists in the field of tort law and administrative law in the Netherlands and Belgium.

1.3. Resources

1.3.1. Human Resources

At the end of 2015, the research group consisted of nine professors, three associate professors, nine assistant professors, and eight PhD candidates. Appendix 4 contains a complete overview. All members are lawyers and specialise in tort law, corporate law, criminal law, administrative law, legal theory, European law, public international law and/or human rights law.

1.3.2. Financial resources

Appendix 4 shows an overview of UCALL's funding situation. The amount of direct funding decreased from 8.57 ftu in 2013 to 6.96 ftu in 2015, while at the same time contract funding increased from 0.15 to 2.58 ftu. The total amount of research ftus grew from 10.73 ftu in 2013 to 11.99 ftu in 2015 purely on the basis of the increase of contract funding. As a consequence the mutual ratio between direct, indirect and contract funding developed from an imbalanced ratio of 80% - 19% - 1% to a more nuanced division of 58% - 21% - 21 % respectively. This means that in 2015 42% of UCALL's research staff was externally funded, with a steady level of indirect funding. In 2014 and 2015, it reached the School of Law's target in acquiring external funds in 2014 (see assessment School of Law, section 1.3.2.).

The Committee read in the self-evaluation report that UCALL is continuously looking for indirect and contract funding. A steady flow of externally funded research projects is essential for the continuation of UCALL, leading to a threefold approach: first, to scout for talented researchers, secondly to search actively for opportunities for acquiring and executing contract research and drafting tenders for this purpose; and thirdly by disseminating research deliverables, in order to inform all possible stakeholders about any new UCALL research output.

2. Qualitative and quantitative assessment of UCALL

In this section, the Committee evaluates the performance of UCALL as a whole on the three criteria of research quality, relevance to society and viability. An overview of the Committee's recommendations for UCALL is given in section 3 of this report.

2.1. Research quality

The Committee endorses that UCALL has chosen a unique focus and established during the site visit that this has led to interesting interactions. The Committee is of the opinion that this focus has enabled the group to successfully add value to its research, notwithstanding the substantial intellectual challenge the chosen approach embodies.

The added value of UCALL's specific focus is demonstrated by the key publications that include various angles of multidimensional research on the central UCALL theme of the limits of liability. They all show the analytical benefits of the multidimensional approach. In this respect the research topics are very well chosen as also appears from the successful PhD defences in 2013 and 2015. The doctoral thesis of Enneking (key publication no. 2) is a fine example of combining various legal and non-legal perspectives by comparing civil liability with international public law, company law and external non-legal areas of international relations, political and economic sciences. The same applies to the publications on the intersection between criminal and civil liability in the key publications by Rijnout, Sikkema and De Zanger (no. 3) on state liability, and Giesen, Kristen and Kool (no. 6) on compensation for victims. The European perspective can be found in the excellent publication of Ryngaert (key publication no. 4) on member states responsibilities for acts of international organizations according to the ECHR and EU law.

Although UCALL mentions in its SWOT analysis that administrative law is not yet fully represented in UCALL's research group, the Committee learned during the site visit that UCALL recently managed to include the administrative law perspective in its research. This is also apparent in the key publication no. 5 of Giesen, Emaus and Enneking on responsibility, liability and privatization of public tasks.

The Committee endorses UCALL's acknowledgement that a multidimensional approach must go hand in hand with profound monodimensional research, of which the doctoral thesis of De Jong on intentionality and intention in criminal law from a philosophical perspective is an excellent example.

As regards the group's publication strategy, one of the ambitions of the research group is to publish fundamental as well as applied studies. The Committee is of the view that there is a good balance between peer reviewed and professional publications. The Committee endorses the combination between these two types of publications by using the UCALL-blog.

Furthermore, the Committee finds that UCALL's research output embodies a good mix of national and international academic publications, in leading journals as well as in the form of contributions to books and monographs. Of the seven key publications, four are in English and three are in Dutch. These key publications are of a high standard. Although UCALL has a limited staff, the group has produced an impressive number of publications. The research group applies quantitative criteria as regards output, which are reached.

UCALL demands from its researchers that at least one out of the three academic publications that are required annually is multidimensional, and explicitly falls within the UCALL focus, while two may be the result of individual research in one's own expertise area. This allows UCALL researchers to develop their personal specialisation in their specific legal area. The Committee considers this to be an effective instrument in working towards high-level multidimensional output. According to the Committee this requirement not only provides a clear guideline, but also assures a sound balance between monodimensional and multidimensional research. As mentioned before (Assessment of the 'School of Law', section 2.1.), the Committee is of the opinion that the latter cannot do without the former. It suggests that this best practice should also be considered in the other research programmes. This policy also might provide a solution for a threat that is mentioned in the SWOT analysis, namely the tendency of (some) UCALL researchers to return to their initial organizational unit and disregard UCALL goals.

The Committee approves the bottom-up approach to evaluate and develop lines of research inter alia by organizing off-site retreats with the UCALL researchers, which benefits the internal cooperation, inspiration and focus of the researchers of UCALL as a research centre. The Committee has established that these measures, under the enthusiastic, dynamic and radiant leadership of Giesen and Kristen, have succeeded in creating an inspiring and cooperative research environment. The Committee was struck by the great enthusiasm and the collegiality within this research group.

UCALL's ambition to become the leading research centre in its field is attainable in the Netherlands. Nevertheless, it will be difficult to reach this status in Europe as long as UCALL's two most important fields of research (criminal law and liability law) are nationally oriented, with the majority of publications in Dutch. In the self-assessment this is acknowledged in UCALL's future goals and ambitions. The Committee agrees that in order to achieve European impact, cooperation within the European academic community will have to be increased.

In conclusion, the Committee is of the opinion that UCALL conducts very good, internationally recognized research.

Score: 2

2.2. Relevance to society

The Committee is of the opinion that UCALL makes a very good contribution to society. The research themes of the research group, especially criminal law and liability law, are of particular

societal relevance. In order to share its knowledge and expertise with civil society, UCALL actively disseminates its results worldwide through its website and its weblog. As regards its academic output, the Committee attaches importance to the fact that in addition to the publication of articles in international and national books and academic journals, researchers of UCALL disseminate their academic output through open-access databases and websites.

UCALL researcher's activities outside academia further add to its relevance to society. Many researchers of UCALL have been invited by the 'Training and Study Centre for the Judiciary', district courts and the Supreme Court to give lectures for judges on particular issues. Researchers of UCALL have appeared as experts in public hearings for the Dutch Parliament or have provided this Parliament with expert opinions or have given lectures for policymakers. Several members of UCALL are members of scientific committees, editors in chief or members of the editorial board of legal journals. Some of them have received awards or scientific prizes.

In conclusion, the Committee is of the opinion that UCALL makes a very good contribution to society.

Score: 2

2.3. Viability

The Committee agrees with UCALL's analysis that its financial basis is sound and sustainable. The Committee welcomes the changed ratio between direct, indirect and contract funding (see 1.3.2. above), because it allows UCALL to grow and to invest in academic research, PhDs and post-doc researchers. As regards its contract funding, the Committee approves that UCALL manages to align its assignments with its research objectives, which the Committee sees as a win-win-situation. Another indicator of the continued viability of UCALL is that it includes a sound balance between young and experienced researchers.

The overall impression of the Committee is that UCALL's research planning is well organized and that the research fits very well with the aims of UCALL as well as with the department and faculty policy. From what the Committee has learned from the self-evaluation and the site visit, the Committee believes that UCALL is very well equipped to achieve its strategic goals regarding research quality. The dynamic leadership and the enthusiastic, ambitious and coherent research team further add to the Committee's assessment that UCALL has very good prospects for the future.

In conclusion, the Committee is of the opinion that UCALL is very well equipped for the future.

Score: 2

3. Recommendations

The Committee recommends that the research group should strengthen administrative law in the research programme.

The Committee suggests that the research group continue to work towards a good balance between direct, indirect and contract funding.

The Committee encourages the research group to publish more in international refereed journals and to engage with the international (European) research community.

Regulation and Enforcement (RENFORCE)

1. Description of the Utrecht Centre for Regulation and Enforcement in Europe

1.1. Mission and research activities

While the discussion on better and smarter regulation has become a classic in the EU debate and is well researched, there is little research on the variables that determine which regulatory and enforcement instruments, at which level, are most suitable to attain the goals of EU policy areas. To deal with this gap and to take advantage of the strong research tradition of the Europa Instituut of the Utrecht Law School, RENFORCE was established in 2013, focusing on the following main question: What is the current mix of shared regulation and enforcement of European policies, and how can the optimal mix take shape, both from the perspective of safeguarding core values and from the principle of effectiveness? What are the guiding principles and key conditions for this, taking the interaction between the European and national dimension into account?

In terms of both content and methodology, a multidimensional approach has been adopted. Research is organized around four core themes: (1) Core values of regulation and enforcement; (2) Policy cycle and shared regulation and enforcement regimes; (3) Actors involved in regulation and enforcement; (4) Shared legal order and the interplay between the European and the national legal order. From a methodological perspective, such functional policy-field studies on EU regulatory and enforcement arrangements require not only cross-sectoral comparative research but also research covering different legal fields.

1.2. Management and organization

RENFORCE builds on the research tradition and reputation of the Utrecht School of Law, specifically its Europa Instituut, regarding the interaction between EU and national regulation and the impact of EU law on the domestic legal order and the related Europeanisation of various legal fields. Until 2012, this research was organized in various programmes related to these different fields. RENFORCE was set up in 2013 specifically to integrate and bring together the research and researchers in the various legal fields and to organize this research around one core question.

Four researchers coordinate RENFORCE (professors van den Brink, Luchtman, Senden, and Vervaele). In addition to initiating joint projects in the light of the overall goals and main themes of the programme, they enhance cooperation of scholars from different legal fields, support individual research initiatives, represent RENFORCE in the Research Council of the School of Law, are responsible for the budget, and control the quantity and quality of academic output.

RENFORCE has established a close collaboration with researchers from other research schools and faculties within Utrecht University. It is closely linked to the multidisciplinary Strategic Theme of Institutions of Open Societies (IOS). Many joint activities and projects are reported to have been initiated.

1.3. Resources

1.3.1. Human Resources

An overview of RENFORCE's staff composition can be found in appendix 4. RENFORCE reports that its team is well balanced with respect to the level of expertise - roughly 1/3 senior (12-16 full professors), 1/3 midcareer (19-22 Associate and Assistant professors and postdocs) and 1/3 junior researchers (15 PhD researchers and lecturers) - and with respect to gender. The division between male and female scholars is approximately 50-50%, also with respect to the senior staff: seven female and five male full professors in 2015. In addition, RENFORCE has

approximately 20 bursary PhD candidates and fellows from within Utrecht University as well as from other institutes. The group is international; researchers come from more than ten different EU countries. In 2013-2014, RENFORCE welcomed six (out of 48) new members of staff (12.5%).

1.3.2. Financial resources

Appendix 4 contains an overview of RENFORCE's financial situation. RENFORCE reports its financial situation to be sustainable. On the income side it is a mix of direct funding, indirect funding and contract funding. The main source of funding is direct funding. RENFORCE indicates that its investments in applying for indirect and contract funding (EU and NWO for instance) have started to pay off. In 2013-2015, grants received from public institutions and companies amounted to 25 % of the annual budget.

On the expenditure side, funds are mainly invested in staff (87%). RENFORCE has been able to attract a considerable amount of externally funded PhD research in the field, in addition to the rather limited number of direct-funded PhD positions the Faculty can offer. RENFORCE invests in post-doc research capacity in order to build cohesion. Part of the material budget has also been invested in student-assistant support and to attract highly visible visiting researchers in the field.

2. Qualitative and quantitative assessment of RENFORCE

In this section, the Committee evaluates the performance of RENFORCE as a whole on the three criteria of research quality, relevance to society and viability. An overview of the Committee's recommendations for RENFORCE is given in section 3 of this report.

2.1. Research quality

The main question addressed by the research programme concerns the current mix of shared regulation and enforcement of EU policies and what the optimal mix should be. According to the self-assessment this research has three dimensions: institutional and governance, constitutional and substantive (policy areas). At the same time the programme is said to be organized around four main themes: core values of regulation and enforcement, policy cycle and shared regulation and enforcement, actors involved, shared legal order (see section 1.1. above). The Committee wonders whether this combination of one, in itself clear, question with three different dimensions and four main themes is not rendering the delimitation of the field of research unnecessarily complex, thus running the risk of blurring the focus of the research and the coherence of the various joint and individual projects. However, the Committee also received a more analytical document (Zwaartepunt 'Gedeelde regulering en handhaving in Europa' - Managementsamenvatting), defining the relationship between the main research question and a number of sub-themes and sub-questions. This document demonstrates that the programme is adequately structured and its scope and focus are well considered.

Obviously, when researching the optimal mix of shared regulation and enforcement of European policies, the role and possible input of international law and regulation must be taken into account. It follows from the documents submitted to the Committee that this is indeed intended. The Committee would recommend however that the international law dimension should be made explicit in the formulation of the fourth key theme.

The Committee is of the opinion that the RENFORCE management has taken the necessary measures to provide an environment that is supportive of constantly improving research quality. In this regard, the Committee took note of the organizational structure of the Centre, the

composition of its board and the academic reputation of its members. In addition, it observed the dynamic development of a number of joint projects, the continuing reflection on research methods (methodology group), and the exposure to international academic debate of the theoretical foundations of the RENFORCE programme.

Having been set-up in 2013, the research results of the Centre cover a period of about three years. The quantitative output in terms of numbers of scientific publications is impressive and largely exceeds what is required by applicable standards.

As far as joint projects are concerned, which form the heart of the research programme, two projects have been finished and have resulted in publications. In the meantime five more projects have been started. Reading the self-assessment the overall impression is that research planning is well organized. All the projects, those finished and running, without any doubt fit in with the research policy framework set at the level of the School of Law.

Both publications that have resulted from joint projects (Sovereignty in the shared legal order of the EU and the Utrecht Law Review Special Issue on Regulation and Enforcement) contain a number of separate studies on a whole series of issues, mostly relating to specific sectors but also of a more horizontal nature, generally producing highly interesting and valuable analyses. For future research projects of this nature the Committee considers that the outcome of the research could still benefit from a more strict structuring and surveillance of the execution of the project, in terms of the horizontal conclusions to be drawn from the sector studies diagnosing shortcomings or best practises, formulating recommendations in that regard, detecting questions for further research. A suggestion could be to organize the individual/sector studies on the basis of a detailed questionnaire, discuss interim results with all the contributors during workshops and produce a general report, which in drawing conclusions and formulating recommendations would build upon the findings of the individual studies.

As far as the other key publications are concerned: both the doctoral thesis of Anoeska Buijze on Transparency and the really excellent book of Annetje Ottow on Market and Competition Authorities, are highly valuable individual contributions to the RENFORCE research output. For the remaining key publications it must be said that the link with the RENFORCE research themes is not always so obvious. More generally the Centre may be advised to ensure that future publications explain the RENFORCE relevance of the research in question whenever this is not self-evident. That would also have the advantage of possibly enhancing the visibility and reputation of the RENFORCE research.

The self-assessment presents sufficient tokens of scientific recognition of individual researchers of the Centre as well as the Centre itself. In that regard grants for research projects from EU funds, Vidi projects, memberships of international networks and committees, of editorial boards, positions as expert or advisor at international organizations, and visiting professorships at foreign universities may be mentioned. Also worth mentioning is the acceptance of a visiting professorship at the RENFORCE Centre by Prof. Paul Craig, an eminent, internationally recognised expert in European law from Oxford University.

Many of these recognitions demonstrate that the Centre is internationally well connected. The existence of a solid international network is moreover confirmed by the international composition of the research staff, particularly with regard to young scholars, and the organization of and participation in international conferences and workshops. The importance of international contacts in view of the European dimension of the research themes is obvious. Indeed, cooperation with experts in the field from other EU countries and their participation in individual research projects is to be welcomed and could still be increased.

As far as human resources are concerned the Centre disposes of a large group of researchers

(see section 1.3.1.). Ensuring the necessary coordination and coherence of the various research projects poses a big challenge to the management in the first place but also for all persons involved. That is the more so since many researchers participate in the Centre only for a relatively small part of their working-time. Some of them, more particularly the senior staff, will be engaged with the Centre on a more regular basis whereas the involvement of others will be limited to a particular project. Both must be possible. Flexibility in the organization will be an absolute necessity, particularly in a matrix structure, to pay due regard to the interests not only of the persons concerned but also of the various research programmes.

The self-assessment qualifies the financial situation as 'healthy and sustainable'. At the same time the SWOT mentions as a threat the increasing competition for research projects (only 6% of all applications funded). As described in section 1.3.2. the contribution of direct funding is still fairly high (64%). It is true that in the period from 2013 to 2015 the Centre was able to increase its contract research funding. Also for this reason a favourable assessment of the financial perspectives of the Centre does not seem unwarranted. At the same time the Committee notes that the SWOT mentions as a weakness that 'contribution to acquisition (both in terms of attempts and results) is unevenly spread across the group', and as an opportunity that the 'capacity to attract research funding (indirect funding and contract funding) may be strengthened'. Obviously, the management of the Centre will have to increase efforts in this regard both internally and externally.

In conclusion, the Committee is of the opinion that RENFORCE conducts good research.

Score: 3

2.2. Relevance to society

The societal relevance of the main research question and to a large extent also of the four main themes is obvious and does not need further comment. Moreover, the examples and illustrations given in the self-assessment are sufficiently convincing in that regard. The legal fact sheet on the Association Agreement with Ukraine and the referendum, which the Centre published on the website of the University and has been widely consulted and referred to by the (social) media, gives an excellent example of making in-house expertise accessible, and intelligibly so, to the public at large.

The overall conclusion of the Committee is that RECFORCE's research makes a very good contribution to society.

Score: 2

2.3. Viability

The new programme only having started in the last two years of the review period, the Committee's judgment about the viability of the Centre can only be a provisional one. However, the observations already made about the quality of the programme, the first publications, the quality of the management, the strategy, and the available human and financial resources demonstrate that the Committee is altogether favourably impressed by the progress made in such a short period of time and generally confident about the future of the Centre.

With regard to viability a final comment should be added. The SWOT expresses two more precise concerns. The first one relates to the weak representation of private law in the programme; the second to the 'risk of a shortage of young legal scholars engaged in fundamental, normative legal research and/or research in areas of law which are not popular for external funding.' Both

concerns are sufficiently serious - also because they expose the longer-term risk of affecting the quality of ongoing and future research - to require further action. The Committee recommends that consideration be given to reservation of part of the available research funding (either direct, indirect, or contract funding) to fill these gaps.

In conclusion, the Committee is of the opinion that RENFORCE is well equipped for the future.

Score: 3

3. Recommendations

The Committee is of the opinion that the international law dimension should be made explicit in the formulation of the fourth key theme of the programme.

The outcome of joint research projects in terms of horizontal conclusions to be drawn from the sector studies diagnosing shortcomings or best practises, formulating recommendations in that regard, detecting questions for further research, could still benefit from a more strict structuring and surveillance of the execution of the project.

Future publications should explain the RENFORCE relevance of the research in question whenever this is not self-evident.

Cooperation with experts from other EU countries and their participation in individual research projects could still be increased.

Efforts to acquire external research funding should be increased both internally and externally.

Possibilities should be explored to reserve part of available research funding either direct, indirect, or contract funding so as to be able to strengthen the position of private law in the programme and to ensure indispensable fundamental, normative legal research.

Water and Sustainability (UCWOSL)
Utrecht Centre for Water, Oceans and Sustainability Law

1. Description of the Water & Sustainability programme

1.1. Mission and research activities

The research programme 'Water and Sustainability' (2013-2018) is carried out at the Utrecht Centre for Water, Oceans and Sustainability Law and builds on previous research programmes carried out at this centre. Following the fundamental restructuring of the Utrecht School of Law in 2012, it was defined as one of two 'gems' of the School of Law (see assessment 'School of Law, section 1.1.).

The research looks at the institutional arrangements and the role of public and private actors, the development of regulatory approaches and policy instruments and conflict prevention and settlement, all based on the fundamental values and principles that guide society towards sustainable development. Sustainability, equity and shared responsibility are core values of the research programme and provide a binding element between the individual research projects. The research is problem-oriented and its focus is twofold: the research is both fundamental (including the development of methodologies) and applied to be able to fulfil societal ambitions.

Compared with its research in previous periods, UCWOSL has broadened its research scope towards more *multidimensional* research, with legal theoretical research, human rights, criminal law, criminology and the role of private actors including corporate social responsibility. There is also a strong focus on *multidisciplinary* research in which UCWOSL researchers cooperate in international and national research programmes with scholars from other disciplines such as environmental governance, marine biology, economy, political science, toxicology, ecology, hydrology and civil engineering. Its main research question is: What contribution can law make to sustainable management of oceans, freshwater systems and deltas, on the basis of mutual responsibilities, and to the pursuit of an equitable distribution of associated risks and natural resources? A schematic overview of the research programme can be found in appendix 4.

1.2. Management and organization

The programme is directed by Prof. Van Rijswijk in close cooperation with Prof. Oude Elferink and Dr. Groothuijse. They form the daily management of the research group. The research group meets once a month to discuss current research of the individual researchers or research projects. Cooperation and coordination of the research take the form of (inter)national expert meetings, conferences and workshops. UCWOSL participates actively in Utrecht University's Strategic Themes 'Sustainability' (Water, Climate and Ecosystems) and 'Institutions', and in the Focus Area 'Future Deltas'. The group also reports that it is active in many international networks.

1.3. Resources

1.3.1. Human Resources

Appendix 4 gives a complete overview of the evolution of UCWOSL research staff in ftus. Having started in 2013 with a small group of permanent staff and a limited range of temporary researchers, post-doc researchers and PhD candidates, UCWOSL reports the research group to have been at full force since the beginning of 2016. The group has indeed expanded its scope towards the field of Environmental Law, Public International Law, Public Institutional Law and Nature Conservation Law by engaging and appointing various professors and associate professors. Nine assistant professors with permanent positions, and four non-permanent researchers complete the research group. Fourteen PhD students are working on their PhD research in the field of water and/or sustainability law. Finally a group of lawyers are associated

with UCWOSL. They are working in professional practice or at other universities in the same research field, or they are emeriti professors.

1.3.2. Financial resources

Appendix 4 gives a complete overview of the evolution of UCWOSL financial resources.

UCWOSL reports that during the evaluation period a shift has taken place in the financial organization of the research group. The former Environmental Law group strongly depended on funding from short-term research projects and advisory work (contract funding). In the period 2009-2013 investments were made in more fundamental research funding, by investing in the development of larger research grants, in cooperation with potential consortium members and by training staff members in the writing of research proposals. Research on demand is still an important part of research funding, but a more balanced situation has been achieved. In 2015, direct funding counted for 37%, research grants for 18%, and contract research for 45%.

2. Qualitative and quantitative assessment of UCWOSL

In this section, the Committee evaluates the performance of UCWOSL as a whole on the three criteria of research quality, relevance to society and viability. An overview of the Committee's recommendations to UCWOSL is given in section 3 of this report.

2.1. Research quality

The Committee is of the opinion that the research group conducts very good and internationally recognised research, as is evidenced by its scientific production, which has been very high in the assessment period: 12 PhDs were defended, 8 of which were under the current programme, thus exceeding the programme's objective of 1 per year. In the period 2013-2015, 88 peer-reviewed articles (including 75 in international peer-reviewed journals) have been published, as well as 25 scientific books, 74 book chapters and 12 edited volumes. More publications are under way, in particular in the framework of the EU STARFLOOD project. In addition, multidisciplinary papers were published in journals with a high impact factor. UCWOSL researchers acted as guest editors of eight special issues of peer-reviewed journals. Members of the research group have been invited to write *Preadviezen* that are discussed at annual meetings of academic and professional associations. They were editors and authors of handbooks in the research area covered by the programme.

The Committee consulted the key publications of the programme and acknowledges their very good quality. Some of them can be qualified as excellent. That is e.g. the case with the *2009 Preadvies* of B.J. Schueler, to cite a publication in Dutch, and *The Law of the Sea and the Polar Regions* book of 2013, to cite an example in English. The Commission is of the opinion that the approach used in this book, that has an impressive worldwide circulation (562 holdings in WorldCat libraries)¹, could be a good model for ongoing academic research projects: sectoral studies based on a questionnaire, provisional conclusions discussed during one workshop, a final conclusion bringing the various strands together and arriving at well-informed recommendations.

The Committee considers as further tokens of UCWOSL's academic recognition and quality the fact that its researchers are on the editorial board of several journals and book series, both internationally and nationally. They actively participate in international and national

¹ <http://www.worldcat.org/oclc/857711489>

conferences, often as a keynote or invited speakers, and are active in large research consortia at international and European level.

The Committee applauds UCWOSL's success in attracting international, EU and national research grants. Individual research grants such as Marie Curie, ERC starting grants, NWO Vidi and talent grants as well as other awards (e.g. *Schilthuispenning* for Van Rijswijk) indeed show the quality of the research group and its individual researchers.

In conclusion, the Committee is of the opinion that the research output is solid, and generally in line with both the research programme of UCWOSL and the multidimensional ambition of the School of Law. Its research is moreover embedded in the University's strategic themes and focus areas. The Committee commends UCWOSL for having built a dynamic international and open research environment. UCWOSL is well-known by the academic community, both nationally and internationally.

In conclusion, the Committee is of the opinion that UCWOSL conducts very good, internationally recognized research.

Score: 2

2.2. Relevance to society

The research themes and focus of UCWOSL are of particular societal relevance. Some of them are expected, especially under the influence of climate change, to become even more relevant in the coming decennia. Members of the research group are actively involved in the work of international organizations (UN, OECD, FAO, IPCC, ICCAT, Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission) dealing with those issues. Furthermore, UCWOSL researchers advise the Dutch Parliament on a variety of issues and in different societal debates related to its area of expertise. UCWOSL researchers hold a wide range of positions in international and national advisory boards and advise several Dutch Ministries on an ad-hoc basis.

Dissemination of outcomes takes place by means of policy briefs, websites, conferences, participation and discussion in EC Working Groups. Members of UCWOSL participate in the board of associations in the field of environmental, international and administrative law. Expert sessions are organized to ensure that the academic work is relevant for professionals as well. Also the handbooks and a substantive number of case notes in national and international journals contribute to the societal relevance of the research. Part of UCWOSL's activities are the organization of international and national conferences, workshops and expert meetings both for academics and professionals as well as in cooperation with students.

In conclusion, the Committee is of the opinion that UCWOSL makes an outstanding contribution to society.

Score: 1

2.3. Viability

UCWOSL can pride itself on being financially sound. There is a good mix of direct funding, indirect funding and contract funding, which allows UCWOSL to invest both in academic research, PhDs and post-doc researchers and in sharing research results with society.

In the nearby future the focus on environmental law and governance will be stronger because of

the appointment of professors of environmental law and nature conservation law (in January 2016). It is expected that this will result in better contributions to academic and societal challenges such as the circular economy, the ongoing soil subsidence in deltas, the threats and opportunities of ecosystem services and the nexus between water and soil, water and energy, as well as the nexus between water, environment and food. Furthermore, research into general research topics such as new ways of public participation and better access to justice will be expanded.

All this will require continuous efforts regarding applications for research grants, both at the international, the EU and the national level, which will be a challenge as the general success rate is rather small. The Committee endorses UCWOSL's strategy to broaden its international network and intensify cooperation with the strategic themes and focus areas within the university. The Committee welcomes that UCWOSL aims to intensify its cooperation with China and greatly values the fact that it has implemented an accompanying measure through the attraction of a Chinese postdoc, who will guide and supervise Chinese PhD students. The way candidate Chinese PhDs are screened before engaging them can be seen as best practice. The current investments in the preparation of research proposals are of the utmost importance for the future as direct funding continues to decrease.

The dynamic leadership, the enthusiastic, ambitious and coherent team consisting of a balanced mix of experienced senior researchers and talented young researchers, the healthy financial situation, the forward-looking investment in research proposals for international, EU and national research grants, the strong embedding in the UU Strategic Themes and Focus Areas, the coverage of research topics within the great societal challenges of EU research, the Dutch national research programme and the National Science Agenda, the focus on multidisciplinary research in EU and Dutch research funding, brings the Committee to the conviction that UCWOSL is very well equipped for the future, even in an environment, as the SWOT-analysis indicates, of increasing competition to win research projects. Although the matrix organization of the School of Law, the additional time and effort needed for multidimensionality, and even more, multidisciplinary, are presented as weaknesses, the site visit showed that they are perhaps rather challenges that need not be overcome all the time or be met in each and every part of the research conducted.

In conclusion, the Committee is of the opinion that UCWOSL is excellently equipped for the future.

Score: 1

3. Recommendations

The Committee recommends that the School of Law consider giving UCWOSL a more durable form, subject to periodical positive evaluation.

The Committee suggests that UCWOSL should continue to maintain a good balance between multidimensional and multidisciplinary international research output, on the one hand, and monodisciplinary and to a Dutch audience directed high-quality publications, tuned to the various stakeholder groups, on the other hand.

The Committee recommends that UCWOSL should continue to advocate for full integration of legal science in multidisciplinary research projects from their inception.

The Committee suggests that UCWOSL should continuously pay sufficient attention to the five areas of research pictured at the top of figure X in appendix 4.

Family and Law (UCERF)

1. Description of the Family and Law programme

1.1. Mission and research activities

The aim of UCERF is to create new insights into family and law, directly relevant to society. Before 2013 family law researchers already cooperated in UCERF, but focused on classical family law. As a result of the strategic reorientation in 2013 a new research programme was developed, broadening the research scope to family and law, which takes a much broader perspective and departs from the principal question of rights and duties of families in *all legal areas*, also including for instance social security law, tax law, labour law, youth protection law, criminal law, civil procedural law, European law and international law. In 2013 UCERF started three new research themes in the overarching research programme ‘The regulation of family relations’, focussing on the conflict between public and private interests.

This reorganization, so UCERF reports, has led to its current unique research profile, which is based on a multidimensional approach (either different areas of law, different disciplines and different levels of law, international, European and national); integrates and incorporates a human rights and gender perspective; uses a comparative-law method; and includes empirical data/methods.

All this results in the general research question of UCERF: What aspects of family relations should be regulated by the state (in mandatory regulations), when should the state take protective measures, and to what extent are families free to arrange and agree upon their relationships? Against the background of this research question, UCERF covers a broad spectrum of topics in family and law research ranging from the implications of human rights in those areas of social security law and labour law which are relevant to families, to gender, religion and identity-related *topics* in family law.

1.2. Management and organization

Until September 2015 UCERF was directed by Prof. Boele-Woelki, who then accepted a prestigious position at Bucerius Law School. Prof. Schrama is now Head of UCERF, first ad interim and from March 2016 as full-time professor of family law and comparative law. Prof. Burri, the associate professor of the research programme, assists in leading the research group. The group meets every six weeks to discuss recent developments and work on its joint projects. During the site visit, the Committee learned that due to the small scale of the research programme, an open door policy is adopted, which greatly enhances co-operation between UCERF researchers.

UCERF also cooperates with other researchers within the university and faculty. It participates in the Utrecht University strategic themes of ‘Dynamics of Youth’ and in ‘Institutions for Open Societies’. UCERF researchers moreover take part in the Focus Area ‘Cultures, citizenship and human rights’. In addition, UCERF has a long-standing cooperation with family sociology researchers and cooperates with the economics department. These cooperations have led to joint publications, conferences and successful applications for research grants. The Committee moreover learned from the self-evaluation report that UCERF is also active in networks beyond university borders (e.g. the Alliance Family and Law and ‘Rethinkin’).

1.3. Resources

1.3.1. Human Resources

UCERF currently has 14 researchers (in the last three years between 4.7 to 6.7 ftu, see Appendix 4) who carry out research in the field of family and law. Although this is a relatively small group in the faculty, UCERF notes that it is one of the largest centres in Europe.

1.3.2. Financial resources

An overview of UCERF's financial situation can be found in appendix 4. UCERF reports its financial situation to be sound, due to a mix of government funding, research grants and contract research. Although its main source of funding is government funding, its investments in applying for indirect funding and contract funding (EU, WODC, vFAS) have been successful. Furthermore, the EU Equality Network yearly generates a substantial financial sum. Part of its budget is spent on the organization of symposia and conference attendance by UCERF researchers.

2. Qualitative and quantitative assessment of UCERF

In this section, the Committee evaluates the performance of UCERF as a whole on the three criteria of research quality, relevance to society and viability. An overview of the Committee's recommendations to UCERF is given in section 3 of this report.

2.1. Research quality

UCERF has a unique research profile (see 1.1.). The Committee is of the opinion that UCERF has successfully added value to research by effectively pursuing its strategic objective. UCERF should be commended for the very enthusiastic manner in which it has pursued multidimensional research. Furthermore, UCERF's researchers have used multidimensionality to the mutual advantage of their research at UCERF and their teaching as members of the School of Law. Consequently, multidimensionality has had positive consequences not only for research in UCERF but also for teaching by members of UCERF. UCERF's success in achieving its strategic objective of engaging in high-quality, socially relevant multidimensional research is an example to be emulated by the whole of the School of Law.

UCERF is a strong research group with well-defined and focused research themes. It has well-developed ambitions as benchmarks. One of its ambitions is to publish research of the highest quality. The Centre has certainly succeeded in fulfilling this ambition. The Committee notes that much of the research of UCERF is excellent and published in top-ranked outlets. Furthermore, the mix of publications in Dutch and English, together with the emphasis on publication in high-quality journals, provides a strong reputation for UCERF's research locally and internationally. However, it is a pity that (some of) the key publications have not been published in English.

Some of the publications of UCERF provide examples of best practice in the field of research into family and law. In this regard two key publications should specifically be mentioned: K. Boele-Woelki, S. Burri (eds.), *De rol van de staat in familierelaties: meer of minder?*, Den Haag: Boom Juridische Uitgevers, 2015, serie Familie & Recht, and M. van den Brink en J. Tigchelaar mmv Eric Gubbels, *M/V en verder, Seksregistratie door de overheid en de juridische positie van transgenders*, Den Haag: Boom Juridische Uitgevers, 2015. In view of the outstanding research contained in these key publications and the international importance of the topics covered by these key publications, it is a pity that they have not been translated into English. This applies particularly to M. van den Brink en J. Tigchelaar mmv Eric Gubbels, *M/V en verder, Seksregistratie door de overheid en de juridische positie van transgenders*, which addresses a

very topical issue on which international and multidimensional research is scarce. The publication does contain an English summary and the country reports are in English, but this highly socially relevant and valuable research would have been more accessible internationally had the entire publication appeared in, or been translated into, English.

The Committee is of the view that the scale of the Centre's research results is impressive. Although the number of staff members involved in UCERF is relatively small, the Centre manages to produce a large number of outputs. This includes a high number of peer-refereed articles, many of which are international articles. This is one of the major strengths of UCERF. The members of UCERF also generated a large number of international book chapters. From an academic point of view, publishing in local and international refereed journals remains of paramount importance. However, publications for professionals, policy makers and the general public are also of great importance, especially in the highly socially relevant field of family and law. UCERF's success in managing to produce a balanced number of pure academic publications, publications for professionals, publications which are considered by policy-makers, and information for the general public is admirable.

Unfortunately, UCERF has a small number of PhD candidates. One of the reasons for the relatively low success rate of PhD candidates is that some of the candidates took quite some time to make progress with their research. However, two candidates are nearing completion. Further, although the Legal Research Master yields talented new students who might enrol for a PhD, funding of PhD candidates - even those who have shown themselves to be talented Legal Research Master students - is a problem. However, UCERF is vigorously pursuing avenues for obtaining funding to appoint a very talented prospective PhD candidate.

In short, the Committee considers the quality of UCERF's research and the contribution which this research makes to the body of scientific knowledge to be outstanding.

In conclusion, the Committee is of the opinion that UCERF has been shown to be one of the few most influential research groups in the world in its particular field.

Score: 1

2.2. Relevance to society

The quality, scale and social relevance of UCERF's contributions are excellent. For example, the Centre deals with topics such as the aging population ('vergrijzing') and transgendered persons from various perspectives.

UCERF's research has influenced law making and policy decisions. For example, UCERF's research projects for the Dutch Ministry of Security and Justice have had a direct impact on policy and legislation. UCERF has also prepared a recent report for the European Parliament and presented it to the Parliamentary Committee on Women's Rights and Gender Equality, and *The Principles on European Family Law* prepared by the Commission on European Family Law are used in European case law and by the legislature. For instance, the Dutch and Danish legislatures have used the *Principles on European Family Law* on property relations between spouses to redesign the matrimonial property regimes. Furthermore, UCERF's multidimensional research contributes to more evidence-based input being provided into law making and policy decisions and by including empirical data on family related topics.

UCERF has also been very effective in contributing to legal and societal debates on socially relevant issues. It has done so by disseminating the results of its research by way of a substantial

number of professional articles, conference contributions, an annual symposium for legal professionals, company courses, and invited lectures.

The overall conclusion of the Committee is that UCERF's research makes a very good contribution to society.

Score: 2

2.3. Viability

UCERF has gained the reputation of being the leading Dutch and European research centre for family and law, and is set to continue its leading international role. The Committee is of the view that UCERF is very well equipped for the future and is a highly viable research unit.

Sometimes the loss of a key member of staff impacts negatively on the viability of a research unit. However, in the case of UCERF, the fact that a key member of staff, Prof. Boele-Woelki, took up employment at another university has not had this negative impact. The number of ftus has not been reduced as a result of her departure, and Prof. Boele-Woelki has been appointed as honorary professor at UU and continues to be involved in UCERF via the Commission on European Family Law. Moreover her management function as Head of UCERF has been taken over by the very competent, talented, dedicated and enthusiastic Prof. Schrama. Furthermore, the composition of the remainder of the group has remained relatively constant. Another indicator of continued viability of UCERF is that it includes both young and experienced researchers.

The need to generate research funding from non-university sources and especially from contract research also has not affected the quality or quantity of UCERF's research. Although the main source of UCERF's funding is the government, the Centre has succeeded in obtaining indirect funding and contract funding (for example, from the EU, WODC, vFAS). UCERF has been in charge of the coordination of the European Commission's European network of legal experts in the field of gender equality during the period under review. This EU Equality Network also generates a substantial financial sum every year. It is the view of the Committee that UCERF has a healthy mix of funding and is financially very viable.

UCERF has many successful networks and international collaborations which are set to continue. Several of UCERF's researchers are members of boards of international scientific organizations and international committees, and are involved in important European projects such as the Commission on European Family Law and the EU Equality Network. UCERF also has an active policy for attracting visiting scholars and regularly invites international lecturers. The impressive list of visitors included in the self-assessment report illustrates UCERF's international relations. The Committee views the international reputation of UCERF as exceptional. UCERF's levels of national and European cooperation and networking are excellent. This not only contributes to the quality of UCERF's research, but also improves the viability of UCERF due to strong local and international links being created and maintained.

The Committee is very optimistic about the viability of UCERF. The excellent outcomes of the past are likely to continue well into the future. UCERF is a well-functioning, well-funded, well-managed, cooperative, enthusiastic research team that is dedicated to high-quality, socially relevant, multidimensional research.

In conclusion, the Committee is of the opinion that UCERF is very well equipped for the future.

Score: 2

3. Recommendations

The Committee is of the view that UCERF's key publications should be published in or be translated into English to make them more accessible internationally.

The Committee also recommends that the number of PhD candidates should be increased.

Appendices

1. Appendix 1: Curricula vitae of the Committee members

Taru Spronken (chair) is Advocate General at the Supreme Court of the Netherlands since September 2013 and part-time Professor of Criminal Law and Criminal Procedure at Maastricht University. Following her graduation from Utrecht University in 1979, she worked as a defence counsel in private practice in Maastricht. From 1987 onwards she was a lecturer in Criminal Law at the University of Maastricht in which capacity she founded an independent law firm within Maastricht University in which students of Maastricht University assist with cases. She developed a practice in human rights and acted as counsel in many cases before the former European Commission and current European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg as well as the Human Rights Committee in Geneva. After finishing her doctoral thesis on criminal defence in 2001, she became Professor of Criminal Defence and in 2005 Professor of Criminal Law at the University of Maastricht. She has published extensively on criminal procedure and human rights, has been editor of various legal journals and is currently still member of the editorial board of the *Nederlands Juristenblad* and the *Nieuwsbrief Strafrecht*. In her research she developed an international comparative research-line and network of researchers from various European countries and China that have been involved in ten international comparative research projects she has initiated and coordinated from 2002-2015. She has always combined research with practice, and next to being a defence counsel, she has been a substitute judge at the Court of Appeal in Arnhem and the Court of Appeal in Den Bosch. She has been vice-dean of the Faculty of Law in Maastricht (2004-2006) and head of the department of Criminal Law and Criminology of the Maastricht Law Faculty (2012-2013).

Jacqueline Heaton is Professor of Law at the University of South Africa. She received an LLB from the University of Pretoria, cum laude, and an LLM from the University of South Africa, cum laude. She is the author and co-author of eleven law books (some in their fourth edition), more than thirty chapters in law books, and numerous articles in law journals. She holds a National Research Foundation rating as an established researcher with considerable international recognition for her high-quality recent research outputs. She has supervised many postgraduate students, including doctoral candidates, to completion. She is a member of the Advisory Committee of the South African Law Reform Commission for the project on Revision of Legislation Administered by the Department of Home Affairs, an editor of the *South African Law Journal*, a former editor of the *Annual Survey of South African Law*, and a peer-referee for many accredited legal journals. She also is a former member and Deputy Chairperson of the Broadcasting Complaints Commission of South Africa, and a former Rapporteur of the Family Law Committee of the International Law Association.

Luc Lavrysen is a judge in the Belgian Constitutional Court and part-time professor teaching European and national environmental law at Ghent University. He is Director of the Environmental and Energy Law Centre of that University, editor-in-chief of the *Tijdschrift voor Milieurecht*, a Flemish Environmental Law Review and member of the Belgian Federal Council for Sustainable Development, a multi-stakeholder advisory body. He was a member of the Inter-University Commission for the Revision of Environmental Law in the Flemish Region. As a judge he is involved in UNEP's Global Judges Project on Sustainable Development and the Role of Law. He is also a founding member of the European Union Forum of Judges for the Environment and President of it, since 1 January 2008. He published many books and articles on environmental law in Dutch, French and English.

Christiaan Timmermans (Ph.D, University of Leiden 1973) was a judge of the Court of Justice of the European Union from 2000 to 2010 and president of a chamber of five judges from 2003 to 2009. He was Deputy Director-General of the Legal Service of the European Commission (1989-2000), Professor of European law at the University of Groningen (1977-1989). He held a chair in European Judicial Protection law at the University of Amsterdam (1997-2004) and was visiting professor at the University of Cambridge and Fordham Law School (New York). From

1966 to 1969 he worked as a legal secretary at the Court of Justice, subsequently as an official of the European Commission (1969-1977). From 2010 to 2012 he held the Pieter Sanders chair at the Law Faculty of the University of Rotterdam, in 2011 he stayed at the European University Institute (Florence) as a Fernand Braudel Fellow. Since 2014 he is a member of the 255 Committee, the committee to be consulted on candidatures put forward by EU Member States for nomination at the EU Court of Justice.

Alois Van Oevelen (Ph.D. University of Antwerp, 1984) is full professor in Law of Contracts at the Faculty of Law of the University of Antwerp. He is the author of 12 law books and more than 300 chapters in law books and articles in law reviews. He is the (co-)editor of 17 law books. He is the supervisor of 8 defended Ph. D. theses. From 1997 to 2001 he was the dean of the Faculty of Law at the University of Antwerp. In the academic year 2005-2006 he was visiting professor at the Faculty of Law of the University of Groningen. In 2007 he was member of the Committee of Search of the Faculty of Law of the University of Leyden. Since 1998 he is chief editor of the *Rechtskundig Weekblad*, the most important Dutch-language legal review in Belgium. Since 2006 he is chairman of the Mediation Commission of the financial sector.

Appendix 2: Explanation of the SEP criteria and categories

Extended description of the 4-point scale for categorizing the quality along three criteria

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

Appendix 3: Programme of the site visit

Wednesday 9 November, Day 1, location: hotel Dom, Domstraat 4

- 15.00-16.00 **Preparatory meeting Chair Committee and Secretary**
(Prof. dr. T.N.B.M. [Taru] Spronken en Dr. J. [Jetje] de Groof)
- 16.00-17.00 **Welcome to Committee**
(Committee (Mw. prof. dr. T.N.B.M. [Taru] Spronken [chair], Prof. mr. L. [Luc] Lavrysen, Prof. mr. C.W.A. [Christiaan] Timmermans, Prof. dr. A. [Alois] van Oevelen, Prof. J. [Jacqueline] Heaton en Dr. J. [Jetje] de Groof), Prof. mr. R.J.G.M. [Rob] Widdershoven en Prof. mr. dr. A.M. [Ton] Hol)
- 17.00-20.00 **Preparatory meeting Committee**
(Committee)
- 20.00 **Dinner**
(Committee)

Thursday 10 November, Day 2, location: Toon Peterszaal, Achter Sint Pieter 200

- 9.00 -10.00 **Interview session with Management**
(Committee, management (Prof. mr. R.J.G.M. [Rob] Widdershoven en Prof. mr. dr. A.M. [Ton] Hol) policy officer research (Drs. M.G.A. [Matthias] Jorissen)
- 10.00 -10.15 **Review and writing by Peer Review Committee**
- 10.15 -11.15 **Interview session UCWOSL**
(Committee, members of the research group (Prof. mr. H.F.M.W. [Marleen] van Rijswijk, Prof. dr. A.G. [Alex] Oude Elferink), UHD (Mr. dr. F.A.G. [Frank] Groothuijse), UD (Prof. mr. dr. ing. E.J. [Erik] Molenaar) en postdoc (Mr. dr. A. [Anoeska] Buijze)
- 11.15 -11.30 **Review and writing by Peer Review Committee**
- 11.30-12.30 **Interview session UCERF**
(Committee, members of the research group (Prof. mr. W.M. [Wendy] Schrama), UHD (Dr. S.D. [Susanne] Burri), UD (Dr. M. [Marjolein] van den Brink), postdoc (Mr. dr. M. [Merel] Jonker)
- 12.30-13.30 **Lunch and review**
- 13.30-14.30 **Interview with PhD students:**

Name	Member of	Discipline	Research programme	Research School	Start date
Mr. S. (Soraya) Bou-Sfia		Molengraaff Institute for Private Law	Family and Law (UCERF)	Human Rights	Maart 2016
Mr. drs. E.C. (Ellen) Gijsselaar		Willem Pompe Institute for Criminal law and Criminology/ Molengraaff Institute for Private Law	Accountability and Liability Law (UCALL)	Human Rights/ Ius Commune	September 2013
J.T. (Jacqueline) Gray LLM		Molengraaff Institute for Private Law	Family and Law (UCERF)	Ius Commune	December 2012
Mr. H.A.M. (Hilke) Grootelaar BA	Member of PhD council	Institute of Constitutional, Administrative Law and Legal Theory	Montaigne Centre for Judicial Administration and Conflict resolution	Ius Commune	November 2014
S.W. (Sim) Haket LLM	Chair of PhD council (till summer 2016)	Institute of Constitutional, Administrative Law and Legal Theory	Montaigne Centre for Judicial Administration and Conflict resolution	Ius Commune	September 2014
A.N. (Arron) Honniball LLM		International and European Law	Water and Sustainability (UCWOSL)	Ius Commune	January 2014
Mr. W.A. (Willem) Janssen		International and European Law	Regulation and Enforcement in Europe (Renforce)	Ius Commune	Sept 2012

<i>Drs. K.(Kai) Liu</i>		<i>Labour Law and Social Security Law</i>	<i>Regulation and Enforcement in Europe (Renforce)</i>	<i>Ius Commune</i>	<i>Sept 2013</i>
<i>Mr. dr. P.E. (Paulien) de Morree</i>	<i>Former chair of PhD council</i>	<i>Institute of Constitutional, Administrative Law and Legal Theory</i>	<i>Montaigne Centre for Judicial Administration and Conflict resolution</i>	<i>Ius Commune</i>	<i>March 2012- March 2016 (graduated on 21th October 2016)</i>
<i>Mr. W.S. (Wouter) de Zanger</i>		<i>Willem Pompe Institute for Criminal Law and Criminology</i>	<i>Utrecht Centre for Accountability and Liability Law (UCALL)</i>	<i>Human Rights</i>	<i>June 2013</i>

- 14.30-14.45 **Review and writing by Peer Review Committee**
14.45-15.45 **Interview Rechtspleging en Conflictoplossing**
(Committee, members of the research group (Prof. dr. Ph.M. [Philip] Langbroek, Prof. mr. E. [Eddy] Bauw), HGL (Prof. dr. A. [Antoine] Buyse), UHD (Dr. M.M. [Miranda] Boone), postdoc (Dr. mr. M.A. [Marc] Simon Thomas) UD (Mr. dr. W.B. [Bas] van Bockel)
- 15.45-16.00 **Dean for the Ph.D's** (Dr. R.S.B. [Renée] Kool)
16.00-17.30 **Review and writing by Peer Review Committee**
- 19.00 **Dinner** *(committee)*

Friday 11 November, Day 3, location: Toon Peterszaal, Achter Sint Pieter 200 (Van Genugten present)

- 10.00-11.00 **Interview Renforce**
(Committee, national reviewer/coordinator, members of the research group (Prof. mr. L.A.J. [Linda] Senden, Prof. dr. J.A.E. [John] Vervaele), UHD (Mr. dr. A. [Ton] van den Brink), postdoc (Dr. M. [Mira] Scholten), UD (Dr. I. [Ingrid] Koning)
- 11.00-11.30 **Review and writing by Peer Review Committee**
11.30-12.30 **Interview UCALL**
(Committee, national reviewer/coordinator, members of the research group (Prof. mr. I.[Ivo] Giesen, Prof. mr. F.G.H. [François] Kristen), UHD (Dr. L.F.H. [Liesbeth] Enneking), postdoc (Dr. E.R. [Elbert] de Jong) en UD (Dr. E. [Eelke] Sikkema)
- 12.30-13.00 **Lunch**
13.00-13.45 **Review by Peer Review Committee**
13.45-14.30 **Interview management remaining questions**
(Committee, management (Prof. mr R.J.G.M. [Rob] Widdershoven en Prof. mr. dr. A.M. [Ton] Hol), policy officer research School of Law (Drs. M.G.A. [Matthias] Jorissen)
- 14.30-16.30 **Internal meeting of the committee: review, writing and preparation preliminary findings**
16.30-17.00 **Presentation of preliminary findings** (in the Faculty Club, Academiegebouw – 7 minutes walk)
(Committee, members of the delegation the committee met during the site visit, vice dean faculty Law, Economics and Governance [prof.dr. J. [Janneke] Plantenga, policy officer research faculty Law, Economics and Governance, drs. L.L.T [Lolita] van Toledo)
- 17.00-18.00 **Drinks**

Appendix 4: Quantitative data

1. School of Law

Table 1. Research staff (numbers/fte)

	2013	2014	2015
Professor # /fte	42 / 10,25 fte	50 / 12,22 fte	43 / 10,74 fte
Associate Professor # /fte	18 / 5,62 fte	11 / 3,93 fte	18 / 6,36 fte
Assistant Professor # /fte	38 / 11,58 fte	48 / 12,72 fte	55 / 12,09 fte
JUDs # / fte	21 / 5,27 fte	18 / 3,19 fte	19 / 2,59 fte
Post-docs ^{c)} # /fte	9 / 5,72 fte	5 / 3,7 fte	11 / 6,43 fte
PhD candidates (AIOs) ^{d)} # / fte	40 / 22,65 fte	44 / 24,38 fte	42 / 23,42 fte
Bursalen #	26	27	24
Buitenpromovendi #	5	11	9
PhD candidates total # / fte	71 / 22,65 fte	82 / 24,38 fte	75 / 23,42 fte
Honorair medewerkers #	16	32	36
Total Research Staff # /fte	215 / 61,09 fte	246 / 60,14 fte	257 / 61,81 fte

Table 2. Main categories of research output

		2013	2014	2015	Total
Refereed articles		121	172	124	417
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	59	67	51	177
	<i>Internat.</i>	62	105	73	240
Non-refereed articles		29	42	37	108
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	19	22	20	61
	<i>Internat.</i>	10	20	17	47
Sum of refereed and non-refereed scientific articles		150	214	161	525
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	78	89	71	238
	<i>Internat.</i>	72	125	90	287
Books		22	20	28	70
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	16	12	15	43
	<i>Internat.</i>	6	8	13	27
Book chapters		151	136	160	447
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	56	45	34	135
	<i>Internat.</i>	95	91	126	312
PhD thesis		17	9	15	41
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	12	4	2	18
	<i>Internat.</i>	5	5	13	23
Scientific Conference contribution		0	1	1	2

		2013	2014	2015	Total
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	1	0	1
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	1	1
Conference Participation		142	124	173	439
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt
	<i>Internat.</i>	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt
Professional publications (excl. case notes and conf. contr.)		202	249	225	676
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	153	205	163	512
	<i>Internat.</i>	49	44	62	155
Case notes (Prof publications)		63	100	67	230
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	62	97	61	220
	<i>Internat.</i>	1	3	6	10
Professional conference contribution		0	5	0	5
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	1	0	1
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	4	0	4
Publications aimed at the general public:					
Popular articles		4	11	25	40
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	3	11	23	47
	<i>Internat.</i>	1	0	2	3
Popular books		0	0	0	0
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	0	0
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Popular bookchapters		0	0	2	2
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	2	0
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Popular blogs		6	17	48	71
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	2	11	32	45
	<i>Internat.</i>	4	6	16	26
<u>Total publications</u>		757	886	905	2548 (incl. conf. partic.)
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	382	476	403	1261
	<i>Internat.</i>	233	286	329	848

Table 3. Funding

	2009		2010		2011		2012		2013		2014		2015	
	ftu	%	ftu	%	ftu	%	ftu	%	ftu	%	ftu	%	ftu	%
Direct funding	55,86	73%	51,86	73%	49,86	69%	40,75	61%	37,27	61%	33,42	56%	34,51	56%
Research grants	7,74	10%	8,24	12%	9,64	13%	11,36	17%	8,04	13%	11,04	19%	9,57	15%
Contract research other	12,98	17%	11,39	16%	12,57	17%	14,55	22%	15,76	26%	15,15	25%	17,95	29%
Total funding	76,58	100%	71,49	100%	72,07	100%	66,66	100%	61,07	100%	59,61	100%	62,03	100%
Personnel costs first flow of funds	5.428	56%	5.808	81%	5.182	78%	4.394	73%	3.900	57%	3.909	55%	3.958	51%
personnel costs second, third flow of funds	3.604	37%	1.070	15%	1.212	18%	1.426	24%	1.623	24%	2.005	28%	2.198	29%
Other costs	608	6%	294	4%	272	4%	189	3%	1.316	19%	1.216	17%	1.549	20%
Total expenditures	9.640	100%	7.172	100%	6.666	100%	6.009	100%	6.839	100%	7.130	100%	7.705	100%

Table 4. Success Rates, conform SEP based on defence date

Enrollment			Success rates						
Starting Year	Enrollment (male/female)		Total (M+F)	Graduated after 4 years	Graduated after 5 years	Graduated after 6 years	Graduated after 7 years	Not yet finished	Discontinued
2007	3M	10F	13	4/31%	2/15%	2/15%	2/15%	1/9%	2/15%
<i>Reg. Phd</i>	<i>2M</i>	<i>10F</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Burs. Phd</i>	<i>1M</i>		<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>					
2008	5M	9F	14	3/22%	7/50%	1/7%			3/21%
<i>Reg Phd</i>	<i>4M</i>	<i>7F</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>1</i>			<i>3</i>
<i>Burs phd</i>	<i>1M</i>	<i>2F</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>				
2009	3M	3F	6	1/17%	1/17%	2/33%			2/33%
<i>Reg Phd</i>	<i>2M</i>	<i>3F</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>			<i>1</i>
<i>Burs phd</i>	<i>1M</i>		<i>1</i>						<i>1</i>
2010	4M	5F	9	1/11%	5/56%				3/33%
<i>Reg Phd</i>	<i>4M</i>	<i>5F</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>5</i>				<i>3</i>
<i>Burs phd</i>									
2011	7M	6F	13	3/24%	2/15%			6/46%	2/15%
<i>Reg Phd</i>	<i>4M</i>	<i>3F</i>	<i>7</i>		<i>2</i>			<i>4</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Burs Phd</i>	<i>3M</i>	<i>3F</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>3</i>				<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>
Success Rate	22M	33F	55	12/22%	17/31%	5/9%	2/4%	7/12%	12/22%
<i>Reg Phd</i>	<i>16M</i>	<i>28F</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>7/16%</i>	<i>15/34%</i>	<i>5/11%</i>	<i>2/5%</i>	<i>5/11%</i>	<i>10/23%</i>
<i>Burs Phd</i>	<i>6M</i>	<i>5F</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>5/46%</i>	<i>2/18%</i>			<i>2/18%</i>	<i>2/18%</i>

Table 5. Success rate of PhD students started in 2012 (and graduating in 2012, outside of the review period)

Enrollment			Success rates						
Starting Year	Enrollment (male/female)		Total (M+F)	Graduated after 4 years	Graduated after 5 years	Graduated after 6 years	Graduated after 7 years	Not yet finished	Discontinued
2012	6M	13F	19	6/ 32%	2/11%			11/58%	
<i>Reg Phd</i>	<i>3M</i>	<i>7F</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>2</i>			<i>4</i>	
<i>Burs Phd</i>	<i>3M</i>	<i>6F</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>2</i>				<i>7</i>	

Table 6. Table success rate PhDs after correction for pregnancy, illness etc.

Enrollment			Success rates						
Starting Year	Enrollment (male/female)		Total (M+F)	Graduated after 4 years	Graduated after 5 years	Graduated after 6 years	Graduated after 7 years	Not yet finished	Discontinued
2007	3M	10F	13	6/46%	3/23%		1/8%	1/8%	2/15%
<i>Reg. Phd</i>	<i>2M</i>	<i>10F</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>5/42%</i>	<i>3/25%</i>		<i>1/8%</i>	<i>1/8%</i>	<i>2/17%</i>
<i>Burs. Phd</i>	<i>1M</i>		<i>1</i>	<i>1/100%</i>					
2008	5M	9F	14	10/71%	1/7%				3/21%
<i>Reg Phd</i>	<i>4M</i>	<i>7F</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>8/73%</i>					<i>3/27%</i>
<i>Burs phd</i>	<i>1M</i>	<i>2F</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>2/67%</i>	<i>1/33%</i>				
2009	3M	3F	6	4/67%					2/33%
<i>Reg Phd</i>	<i>2M</i>	<i>3F</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>4/80%</i>					<i>1/20%</i>
<i>Burs phd</i>	<i>1M</i>		<i>1</i>						<i>1/100%</i>
2010	4M	5F	9	3/33%	3/33%				3/33%
<i>Reg Phd</i>	<i>4M</i>	<i>5F</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>3/33%</i>	<i>3/33%</i>				<i>3/33%</i>
<i>Burs phd</i>									
2011	7M	6F	13	3/23%	2/15%			7/54%	1/8%
<i>Reg Phd</i>	<i>4M</i>	<i>3F</i>	<i>7</i>		<i>2/29%</i>			<i>4/57%</i>	<i>1/14%</i>

<i>Burs Phd</i>	<i>3M</i>	<i>3F</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>3/50%</i>				<i>3/50%</i>	
Success Rate	22M	33F	55	26/47%	9/16%		1/2%	8/15%	11/20%
<i>Reg Phd</i>	<i>16M</i>	<i>28F</i>	<i>44</i>	<i>20/45%</i>	<i>8/18%</i>		<i>1/2%</i>	<i>5/11%</i>	<i>10/23%</i>
<i>Burs Phd</i>	<i>6M</i>	<i>5F</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>6/55%</i>	<i>1/9%</i>			<i>3/27%</i>	<i>1/9%</i>

2. Montaigne

Table 7. Research staff

	2013	2014	2015
Professor # /fte	16 / 2,89 fte	19 / 3,58 fte	16 / 3,04 fte
Associate Professor # /fte	6 / 1,35 fte	2 / 0,15 fte	6 / 1,41 fte
Assistant Professor # /fte	6 / 1,6 fte	10 / 1,91 fte	7 / 1,34 fte
JUD # / fte	6 / 1,66 fte	6 / 0,82 fte	6 / 0 fte
Post-docs ^o # /fte	1 / 0,47 fte	1 / 0,7 fte	3 / 2,5 fte
PhD candidates (AIOs) ^o # fte	13 / 6,43 fte	11 / 5,96	9 / 5,25 fte
Bursalen #	5	3	4
Buitenpromovendi #	0	3	2
PhD candidates total # / fte	18 / 6,43 fte	17 / 5,96 fte	15 / 5,25 fte
Honorair medewerkers #	2	7	11
Total Research Staff # /fte	55 / 14,4 fte	62 / 13,12 fte	64 / 13,54 fte

Table 8. Main categories of research output

		2013	2014	2015	Total
Refereed articles		32	43	25	100
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	21	19	11	51
	<i>Internat.</i>	11	24	14	49
Non-refereed articles		13	17	8	38
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	7	9	6	22
	<i>Internat.</i>	6	8	2	16
Sum of refereed and non-refereed scientific articles		45	60	33	138
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	28	28	17	73
	<i>Internat.</i>	17	32	16	65
Books		8	2	5	15
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	6	2	4	12
	<i>Internat.</i>	2	0	1	3
Book chapters		46	26	35	107
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	19	12	11	42
	<i>Internat.</i>	27	14	24	65

		2013	2014	2015	Total
PhD thesis		8	2	4	14
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	5	0	0	5
	<i>Internat.</i>	3	2	4	9
Scientific Conference contribution		0	1	0	1
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	1	0	1
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Conference Participation		27	32	58	117
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt
	<i>Internat.</i>	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt
Professional publications (excl. case notes and prof. confer. Contr.)		59	90	59	208
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	54	82	52	188
	<i>Internat.</i>	5	8	7	20
Case notes (Prof publications)		34	38	13	85
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	34	38	13	85
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Professional conference contribution		0	0	0	0
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	0	0
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Publications aimed at the general public:					
Popular articles		1	3	10	14
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	1	3	10	14
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Popular books		0	0	0	0
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	0	0
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Popular bookchapters		0	0	0	0
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	0	0
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Popular blogs		1	0	14	15
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	1	0	11	12
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	3	3
<u>Total publications</u>		229	254	231	714
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	148	166	118	432
	<i>Internat.</i>	54	56	55	165

Table 9 Funding

	2013		2014		2015	
	Fte	%	Fte	%	Fte	%
Direct funding	7,59	53%	8,12	62%	7,61	56%
Research grants	2,29	16%	1,96	15%	3,23	24%
Contract research	4,52	31%	3,01	23%	2,7	20%
other						
Total funding	14,4	100%	13,09	100%	13,54	100%
	€ x 1000					
Personnel costs first flow of funds	756	53%	844	69%	777	58%
personnel costs second, third flow of funds	392	28%	272	22%	367	27%
Other costs	274	19%	112	9%	198	15%
Total expenditures	1.422	100%	1228	100%	1342	100%

3. UCALL**Table 10. Research staff**

	2013	2014	2015
Professor # /ftu	9 / 1.85 ftu	10 / 2.45 ftu	9 / 2.27 ftu
Associate Professor # /ftu	3 / 1.02 ftu	2 / 0.85 ftu	3 / 1.85 ftu
Assistant Professor (UD) # /ftu	9 / 2.63 ftu	10 / 3 ftu	9 / 2.20 ftu
JUDs # / ftu	4 / 1.01	3 / 0.36 ftu	4 / 0.70 ftu
Post-docs ^{c)} # /ftu	1 / 0.06 ftu	0	0
PhD candidates (AIOs) ^{d)} # / ftu	7 / 4.16 ftu	9 / 5.5 ftu	8 / 4.97 ftu
Bursalen #	1	1	0
Buitenpromovendi #	0	0	1
PhD candidates total # / ftu	8 / 4.16 ftu	10 / 5.5 ftu	9 / 4.97 ftu
Honorair medewerkers #	7	9	9
Total Research Staff # /ftu	41 / 10.73 ftu	44 / 12.16 ftu	43 / 11.99 ftu

Table 11. Main categories of research output

		2013	2014	2015	Total
Refereed articles		26	32	20	78
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	12	18	13	43
	<i>Internat.</i>	14	14	7	35
Non-refereed articles		4	4	2	10
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	4	3	1	8
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	1	1	2
Sum of refereed and non-refereed scientific articles		30	36	22	88
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	16	21	14	51
	<i>Internat.</i>	14	15	8	37
Books		5	2	6	13
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	5	1	5	11
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	1	1	2
Book chapters		22	22	22	66
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	16	16	6	38
	<i>Internat.</i>	6	6	16	28
PhD thesis		4	1	1	6
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	4	1	0	5
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	1	1
Academic Conference contribution		0	0	0	0
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	0	0
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Conference Participation		15	9	15	39
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt
	<i>Internat.</i>	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt
Professional publications (excl. case notes and conf. contr.)		41	42	32	115
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	34	35	19	88
	<i>Internat.</i>	7	7	13	27
Case notes (Prof publications)		6	18	3	27
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	5	18	3	26
	<i>Internat.</i>	1	0	0	1
Professional conference contribution		0	0	0	0
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	0	0
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Publications aimed at the general public:					
Popular articles		2	0	4	6

		2013	2014	2015	Total
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	2	0	2	4
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	2	2
Popular books		0	0	0	0
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	0	0
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Popular bookchapters		0	0	0	0
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	0	0
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Popular blogs		0	17	27	44
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	11	17	20
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	6	10	12
<u>Total publications</u>		125	147	132	404 (incl. conf. participation)
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	82	103	66	251
	<i>Internat.</i>	28	35	51	114

Table 12 Funding

	2013		2014		2015	
	ftu	%	Ftu	%	Ftu	%
Direct funding	8.57	80%	7.74	64%	6.96	58%
Indirect funding	2.01	19%	3.33	27%	2.53	21%
Contract funding	0.15	1%	1.09	9%	2.58	21%
Other						
Total funding	10.73	100%	12.16	100%	12.07	100%
Personnel costs direct funding	642	68%	717	60%	681	56%
personnel costs indirect and contract funding	134	14%	341	28%	271	22%
Other costs	164	17%	142	12%	255	21%
Total expenditures	940	100%	1200	100%	1207	100%

4. RENFORCE

Table 13. Research staff

	2013	2014	2015
Professor # /fte	13 / 3,98 fte	16 / 4,19 fte	13 / 3,62 fte
Associate Professor # /fte	7 / 2,24 fte	5 / 1,83 fte	6 / 2,1 fte
Assistant Professor # /fte	10 / 2,27 fte	15 / 4,26 fte	20 / 3,44 fte
JUDs # / fte	6 / 1,02 fte	4 / 0,48 fte	4 / 0,2 fte
Post-docs ^{c)} # /fte	2 / 1,20 fte	0	2 / 0,39 fte
PhD candidates (AIOs) ^{d)} # fte	9 / 5,62 fte	10 / 5,56 fte	13 / 7,14 fte
Bursalen #	19	21	18
Buitenpromovendi #	0	1	1
PhD candidates total # / fte	28 / 5,62 fte	32 / 5,56 fte	32 / 7,14 fte
Honorair medewerkers #	4	4	6
Total Research Staff # /fte	70 / 16,33 fte	75 / 16,32 fte	77 / 16,89 fte

Table 14. Main categories of research output

		2013	2014	2015	Total
Refereed articles		46	47	35	128
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	22	18	19	59
	<i>Internat.</i>	24	29	16	69
Non-refereed articles		3	13	13	39
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	2	5	6	13
	<i>Internat.</i>	1	8	7	16
Sum of refereed and non-refereed scientific articles		49	60	48	157
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	24	23	25	72
	<i>Internat.</i>	25	37	23	85
Books		6	11	11	28
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	3	5	2	10
	<i>Internat.</i>	3	6	9	18
Book chapters		49	41	62	152
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	8	9	7	24
	<i>Internat.</i>	41	32	55	128
PhD thesis		3	3	3	9
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	1	2	0	3
	<i>Internat.</i>	2	1	3	6
Scientific Conference contribution		0	0	1	1
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	0	0

		2013	2014	2015	Total
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	1	1
Conference Participation		54	15	36	106
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt
	<i>Internat.</i>	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt
Professional publications (excl. case notes and prof. conf. contr.)		32	36	56	124
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	16	23	37	76
	<i>Internat.</i>	16	13	19	48
Case notes (Prof publications)		4	14	9	27
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	4	11	9	24
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	3	0	3
Professional conference contribution		0	3	0	3
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	0	0
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	3	0	3
Publications aimed at the general public:					
Popular articles		0	5	11	16
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	5	11	16
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Popular books		0	0	0	0
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	0	0
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Popular bookchapters		0	0	0	0
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	0	0
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Popular blogs		1	1	7	9
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	4	4
	<i>Internat.</i>	1	1	3	4
<u>Total publications</u>		198	189	245	632 (incl. conf. participation)
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	56	78	95	229
	<i>Internat.</i>	88	95	114	297

Table 15. Funding

	2013		2014		2015	
	Fte	%	Fte	%	Fte	%
Direct funding	13,34	75%	10,43	66%	11,72	64%
Indirect funding	0,03	0%	0,83	5%	0,89	5%
Contract funding	4,36	25%	4,56	29%	5,61	31%
Other						
Total funding	17,73	100%	15,82	100%	18,22	100%
	€ x 1000					
Personnel costs direct funding	883	69%	986	73%	1032	67%
personnel costs indirect and contract funding	203	16%	225	17%	307	20%
Other costs	198	15%	144	11%	207	13%
Total expenditures	1.284	100%	1.355	101%	1.546	100%

5. UCWOSL**Table 16. Research staff**

	2013	2014	2015
Professor # /fte	3 / 1,1 fte	4 / 1,3 fte	4 / 1,34 fte
Associate Professor # /fte	1 / 0,31 fte	1 / 0,4 fte	1 / 0,6 fte
Assistant Professor # /fte	8 / 2,28 fte	8 / 2,35 fte	12 / 3,41 fte
JUDs # / fte	4 / 1,34 fte	4 / 1,3 fte	4 / 0,57 fte
Post-docs ^{c)} # /fte	4 / 3,47 fte	3 / 2,3 fte	5 / 2,94 fte
PhD candidates (AIOs) ^{d)} # fte	6 / 3,17 fte	9 / 4,72 fte	8 / 4,67 fte
Bursalen #	1	2	2
Buitenpromovendi #	5	7	5
PhD candidates total # / fte	12 / 3,17 fte	18 / 4,72 fte	14 / 4,67 fte
Honorair medewerkers #	3	12	10
Total Research Staff # /fte	47 / 11,67 fte	50 / 12,37 fte	49 / 13,53 fte

Table 17. Main categories of research output

		2013	2014	2015	Total
Refereed articles		12	41	35	88
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	2	6	5	13
	<i>Internat.</i>	10	35	30	75
Non-refereed articles		8	6	11	25
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	5	4	5	14
	<i>Internat.</i>	3	2	6	11

		2013	2014	2015	Total
Sum of refereed and non-refereed scientific articles		20	47	46	113
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	7	10	10	27
	<i>Internat.</i>	13	37	36	86
Books		2	3	4	9
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	1	2	3	6
	<i>Internat.</i>	1	1	1	3
Book chapters		25	28	22	75
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	7	5	2	14
	<i>Internat.</i>	18	23	20	61
PhD thesis		2	1	5	8
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	2	1	2	5
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	3	3
Scientific Conference contribution		0	0	0	0
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	0	0
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Conference Participation		32	52	41	125
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt
	<i>Internat.</i>	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt
Professional publications (excl. case notes & prof. conf. contr.)		48	60	64	172
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	37	48	45	130
	<i>Internat.</i>	11	12	19	42
Case notes (Prof publications)		18	29	40	87
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	18	29	34	81
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	6	6
Professional conference contribution		0	2	0	2
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	1	0	1
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	1	0	1
Publications aimed at the general public:					
Popular articles		1	2	0	3
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	2	0	2
	<i>Internat.</i>	1	0	0	1
Popular books		0	0	0	0
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	0	0
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Popular bookchapters		0	0	2	2
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	2	2

		2013	2014	2015	Total
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Popular blogs		3	0	0	3
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	1	0	0	1
	<i>Internat.</i>	2	0	0	2
Total publications		151	224	224	599 (incl. conf. participation)
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	73	98	98	269
	<i>Internat.</i>	46	74	85	205

Table 18. Funding

	2013		2014		2015	
	Fte	%	Fte	%	Fte	%
Direct funding	3,48	30%	3,76	30%	4,97	37%
Research grants	2,21	19%	3,48	28%	2,48	18%
Contract research	5,88	51%	5,12	41%	6,07	45%
other						
Total funding	11,57	100%	12,36	100%	13,52	100%
Personnel costs first flow of funds	376	36%	420	46%	497	48%
personnel costs second, third flow of funds	497	48%	366	40%	340	33%
Other costs first flow of funds	162	16%	127	14%	191	19%
Total expenditures	1.035	100%	913	100%	1028	100%

Figure 1. UCWOSL research areas



6. UCERF

Table 19. Research staff

	2013	2014	2015
Professor # /ftu	1 / 0.7 ftu	1 / 0.7 ftu	2 / 0.57 ftu
Associate Professor # /ftu	1 / 0.7 ftu	1 / 0.7 ftu	1 / 0.3 ftu
Assistant Professor # /ftu	5 / 1.2 ftu	5 / 1.2 ftu	7 / 2.3 ftu
JUDs # / ftu	1 / 0.24 ftu	1 / 0.23 ftu	0
Post-docs ^{c)} # /ftu	1 / 0.53 ftu	1 / 0.7 ftu	1 / 0.12 ftu
PhD candidates (AIOs) ^{d)} # / ftu	5 / 3.27 ftu	5 / 2.64 ftu	3 / 1.39 ftu
Bursalen #	0	0	0
PhD candidates total # / ftu	5 / 3.27 ftu	5 / 2.64 ftu	
Honorair medewerkers #	0	0	1/0
Total Research Staff # /ftu	14 / 6.64 ftu	14 / 6.18 ftu	14 / 4.68 ftu

Table 20. Main categories of research output

		2013	2014	2015	Total
Refereed articles		5	9	9	23
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	2	6	3	11
	<i>Internat.</i>	3	3	6	12
Non-refereed articles		1	2	3	6
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	1	1	2	4
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	1	1	2
Sum of refereed and non-refereed scientific articles		6	11	12	29
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	3	7	5	15
	<i>Internat.</i>	3	4	7	14
Books		1	2	2	5
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	1	2	1	4
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	1	1
Book chapters		9	8	19	36
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	6	3	8	17
	<i>Internat.</i>	3	5	11	19
PhD thesis		0	0	2	2
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	0	0
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	2	2
Scientific Conference contribution		0	0	0	0
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	0	0
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0

		2013	2014	2015	Total
Conference Participation		14	16	23	53
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt
	<i>Internat.</i>	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt	Nvt
Professional publications (excl. case notes & prof. conf. contr.)		22	21	14	57
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	13	17	10	40
	<i>Internat.</i>	9	4	4	17
Case notes (Prof publications)		1	1	2	4
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	1	1	2	4
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Professional conference contribution		0	0	0	0
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	0	0
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Publications aimed at the general public:					
Popular articles		0	1	0	1
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	1	0	1
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Popular books		0	0	0	0
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	0	0
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Popular bookchapters		0	0	0	0
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	0	0
	<i>Internat.</i>	0	0	0	0
Popular blogs		1	0	0	1
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	0	0	0	0
	<i>Internat.</i>	1	0	0	1
<u>Total publications</u>		54	60	74	188 (incl. conf. participation)
<i>Of which:</i>	<i>NL</i>	24	31	26	81
	<i>Internat.</i>	15	13	23	51

Table 21. Funding

	2013		2014		2015	
	Ftu	%	Ftu	%	Ftu	%
Direct funding	4.29	65%	3.37	55%	3.25	69%
Research grants	1.5	23%	1.44	23%	0.44	9%
Contract research	0.85	13%	1.37	22%	0.99	21%
Other						
Total funding	6.64	100%	6.18	100%	4.68	100%
Personnel costs government funding	311	50%	347	47%	321	48%
Personnel costs indirect funding and contract funding	171	27%	268	36%	134	20%
Other costs	143	23%	127	17%	210	32%
Total expenditure	625	100%	742	100%	665	100%