

**Research Evaluation
Faculty of Law
VU University Amsterdam**

15 March 2017

Report on the research evaluation at the Faculty of Law at VU University Amsterdam

Contents

Report on the research evaluation at the Faculty of Law at VU University Amsterdam	2
Preface	3
1. The assessment committee and the review procedures	4
2. Research assessment VU Faculty of Law	6
2.1. Strategy and targets	6
2.2. Qualitative and quantitative assessment	7
2.3. PhD programmes	10
2.4. Research integrity policy	12
3. The research programmes	13
3.1. Amsterdam Centre for Comprehensive Law	14
3.2. Amsterdam Centre for Family Law	16
3.3. Boundaries of Law	18
3.4. Empirical and Normative Studies	20
3.5. Fundamental Rights, Regulation and Responsible Government	22
3.6. Migration Law	24
3.7. Public and Private Interests in Finance and Business Law	26
3.8. Public Contracts: Law & Governance	28
4. Recommendations	30
Appendices	31
Appendix 1: Curricula vitae of the committee members	32
Appendix 2: Programme of the site visit	34
Appendix 3: Quantitative data	36
Appendix 4: Explanation of the SEP scores	45

Preface

This report summarises the results of the peer review assessment of the research programmes of the Faculty of Law at VU University Amsterdam.

The committee wants to express its gratitude for the efforts made by all involved to provide the necessary documentation, before and during the site visit. This documentation contained valuable information and formed a very useful basis for an objective evaluation procedure. The committee also wishes to acknowledge the constructive atmosphere of the discussions during the site visit. All representatives were willing to share their opinions and concerns in a very open manner.

As Chair of the committee I would like to thank my fellow committee members for their commitment and dedication to this evaluation process. We have been working together as a real team, open-minded and thoughtful. We all realised the challenge of this task, and I am pleased to be able to conclude that this report reflects the common opinion of the committee.

Paul Torremans,
Chairman of the committee

1. The assessment committee and the review procedures

Scope of the assessment

The assessment committee was asked to assess the research conducted by the Faculty of Law at VU University Amsterdam. The review of the research unit includes both the faculty level and the following research programmes:

- Amsterdam Centre for Comprehensive Law
- Amsterdam Centre for Family Law
- Boundaries of Law
- Empirical and Normative Studies
- Fundamental Rights, Regulation and Responsible Government
- Migration Law
- Public and Private Interests in Finance and Business Law
- Public Contracts: Law & Governance

The assessment covers the research in the period 2009-2015. In accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021 (SEP) for research reviews in the Netherlands, the committee's tasks were to assess the quality, the relevance to society and the viability of the scientific research at the research unit as well as the strategic targets and the extent to which the unit is equipped to achieve these targets in terms of governance and the leadership skills of its management. The Terms of Reference explicitly asked the committee to pay special attention to (1) internationalisation, in terms of publications as well as alliances, and (2) multidisciplinary. Furthermore, a qualitative review of the PhD training programme and the research integrity policy is part of the committee's assignment.

Composition of the committee

The composition of the committee was as follows:

- Prof. dr. Paul Torremans, Professor of Intellectual Property Law, University of Nottingham, United Kingdom, Chair;
- Prof. dr. Stephan Kirste, Professor of Legal and Social Philosophy, Universität Salzburg, Austria;
- Prof. dr. Paul Ponsaers, Professor of Criminology and Sociology of Law, Ghent University, Belgium;
- Prof. dr. Vincent Sagaert, Professor of Private Law, University of Leuven, Belgium;
- Prof. dr. Michiel Scheltema, Emeritus Professor of Administrative Law, Groningen and Utrecht University, the Netherlands.

A profile of the committee members is included in Appendix 1.

Dr. Marianne van der Weiden acted as secretary to the committee.

Independence

All members of the committee signed a statement of independence to safeguard that they would assess the quality of the VU Faculty of Law and its research programme in an unbiased and independent way. Any existing personal or professional relationships between committee members and the research unit(s) under review were reported and discussed in the first

committee meeting. The committee concluded that there were no unacceptable relations or dependencies and that there was no specific risk in terms of bias or undue influence.

Data provided to the committee

The committee has received the following documentation:

- the Terms of Reference;
- the SEP 2015-2021;
- the self-assessment report 2009-2015, with appendices;
- copies of key publications of the research programmes;
- self-assessment report *Intersections* (covering the period 2009-2011);
- report mid-term review *Reflections on Intersections* (2012);
- summary of the report of the Koers Committee *Quality & Diversity* (2009);

Procedure followed by the committee

The committee proceeded according to the SEP. Prior to the first committee meeting, all committee members independently formulated a preliminary assessment of the research programmes. The final assessments are based on the documentation provided by the VU Faculty of Law, the key publications and the interviews with the management and with the leaders, researchers and PhD candidates of the programmes. The interviews took place on 24-25 October 2016 (see the schedule in Appendix 2) in Amsterdam. Due to illness professor Stephan Kirste was unable to come to Amsterdam and participate in the site visit. The committee used his preliminary written comments in the interviews and deliberations. After the site visit, the chair brought prof. Kirste up to date by telephone and discussed the outcomes with him.

In a preparatory meeting on the first day of the site visit, the committee discussed the preliminary assessments and decided upon a number of comments and questions. The committee also agreed upon procedural matters and aspects of the assessment. After the interviews, conducted on the second day, the committee discussed the scores and comments and wrote the assessment report. Draft versions were discussed through e-mail. The final version was presented to the VU Faculty of Law, for factual corrections and comments. The comments were discussed in the committee. The final report was then submitted to the faculty for formal acceptance.

The committee used the rating system of the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021 (SEP). The meaning of the scores is provided in Appendix 4.

No comparison between Dutch law schools is intended. The sole idea is an assessment per law school on an independent basis, with as comparators the SEP and the international expertise of the members of the committee.

2. Research assessment VU Faculty of Law

2.1. Strategy and targets

The VU Faculty of Law states in its self-assessment report that it strives for outstanding scientific research that addresses fundamental legal concepts and issues, explores new approaches to legal doctrinal work, employs new methods and enhances the understanding of the legal discipline in the academic arena. It aims to be agenda-setting nationally and internationally and to use a range of strategic partnerships with government authorities, private businesses and civil society groups to analyse fundamental dilemmas of contemporary society and bring about changes in the policy arena. Through the link of research and teaching it seeks to educate the next generation of law and policy makers.

Based on the 2009-2011 mid-term review, the faculty identified three key objectives: (1) to enhance the profiling and valorisation of the faculty's research, (2) to continue to offer an inspiring environment for research talent from home and abroad in a changing national and international environment, and (3) to continue to create both domestic and foreign alliances at an institutional level. To achieve these objectives, the faculty (1) created more visibility in the media and the professional field as well as in the (inter)national academic arena by organising lectures and being active in open access platforms, (2) obtained increased funding from NWO and a range of external partners, which compensates the decreased direct funding of research, and (3) consolidated the institutional setting of the research by establishing the Kooijmans Institute in 2014 and broadening its participation in the A-LAB.

The faculty's research was reorganised in 2013. The overarching programme Balancing Public and Private Interests was split up in five smaller programmes: (1) Amsterdam Centre for Comprehensive Law, (2) Amsterdam Centre for Family Law, (3) Fundamental Rights, Regulation and Responsible Government, (4) Public and Private Interests in Finance and Business Law, and (5) Public Contracts: Law & Governance.

The research takes place under the umbrella of two central institutes. The Kooijmans Institute for Law and Governance is the faculty's own research institute and brings together research groups focusing on the relationship between law, politics and morality. The faculty is secretary of the interfaculty Amsterdam Law and Behavior Institute (A-LAB), a collaboration between the faculties of Law, Behavioural and Movement Sciences, Social Sciences, Economics and Business Administration, and the Netherlands Institute for the Study of Crime & Law Enforcement (NSCR). A-LAB conducts multidisciplinary research in the area of law and behaviour. The research institutes function as platforms and meeting places across the research programmes and scientific disciplines. The individual research programmes, however, form the basis of the research work. All researchers are part of a research programme, a few are part of more than one programme. Each programme has a thematic focus and allows the researchers to carry out individual and joint research projects, exchange ideas and develop new plans and networking activities. Five programmes are embedded in the Kooijmans Institute: Boundaries of Law, Fundamental Rights, Regulation and Responsible Government, Migration Law, Public and Private Interests in Finance and Business Law, and Public Contracts: Law & Governance. The Amsterdam Centre for Comprehensive Law and the Amsterdam Centre for Family Law are part of A-LAB. Empirical and Normative Studies participates in both institutes.

The faculty is largely dependent on direct funding for its research investments (PhD positions, partnerships, talent development, organisation of congresses and guest lectures, travel fund, language editing, grant officer, internationalisation director). Efforts to attract NWO grants have been fairly successful. The faculty currently seeks to attract grants at EU level as well. The faculty also aims to be more active in the field of contract research, which has led to good results for e.g. the programme Public and Private Interests in Finance and Business Law. The

short-term nature of contract research does not allow the establishment of long-term research lines and PhD projects. Therefore, the faculty matches these funds with money from direct funding.

For the years to come, the faculty aims to (1) further develop and broaden its multidisciplinary research topics and methods, (2) keep its focus on policy-based research with societal impact, and (3) establish additional links with international partners and consortia. Opportunities are identified in the combination of law and criminology within the faculty, the open-minded research community (the intersection of private and public law and the cooperation with social and political sciences, economics, history and theology) and the growing experience and expertise in empirical legal studies, especially with NSCR. Investment priorities are in the collaboration in A-LAB (on PhD research, summer schools and grant proposals) and in other interdisciplinary networks.

Assessment

The committee observes that the faculty has formulated and implemented a consistent strategy, directed at strengthening the quality and relevance of its research. The strategy is based on two approaches: (1) creating research programmes as coherent home bases for all researchers, and (2) intensifying the multidisciplinary approach by including interdisciplinary approaches into its legal doctrinal research. In addition, concerted efforts are pursued to become less dependent on direct funding. The committee recognises the consistency of the multidisciplinary approach over the years and the results of this policy (see 2.2.5). The committee thinks that funding remains vulnerable. Some research programmes are quite small and the committee is unsure if these have sufficient capacity to invest in grant applications. The committee is aware that a larger programme has been split up in the past to provide more internal cohesion, but thinks that this process may have been taken too far in order to guarantee a long term viability.

The committee strongly recommends that the umbrella function of the institutes be used to provide support for the submission of grant applications and for the search for funding in general, and is pleased to see that the faculty already sees a role for the institutes in this area.

2.2. Qualitative and quantitative assessment

2.2.1. Research quality

In the self-assessment report the faculty states that results in the achievement of research quality are for an important part measured in the publication of refereed articles in leading journals and books with leading publishers at the national and international level. In addition, obtaining research grants at national and EU level, memberships and leading positions in academic societies, invitations for lectures and keynotes, and memberships and editor-in-chief positions in editorial boards of leading journals are seen as indicators of research quality. Since 2009, the number of refereed articles has increased from 95 to 125 in 2015. PhD theses have increased from 9 (2009) to 17 (2015) and conference papers from 52 (2009) to 141 (2015). In the interviews the committee was informed that a harmonised reference list of journals and publishers, approved by the deans of law faculties at the universities of Groningen, Nijmegen, Tilburg, Amsterdam and VU Amsterdam, helps researchers to identify the top journals that uphold minimum quality standards through a strict review system. The faculty applies a strategic personnel policy. The board regularly reviews the competences and quality of staff in order to identify talented researchers whom it wants to keep attached to the faculty, e.g. by offering a tenure track.

Assessment

The committee assesses the research quality of the individual research programmes in chapter 3. Overall, this quality is very good. In this paragraph, the committee focuses on the added

value of the faculty level (board, institutes, graduate school) to achieve this quality. Based on the interviews during the site visit, the committee concludes that the faculty has been able to build a coherent profile and create an inspiring environment, both of which support the individual researchers in their work. A personnel policy and a publication strategy, both focusing on quality, are in place. Initiatives at faculty level such as a budget for conferences and travel costs and matching external funds to achieve longer-term (PhD) projects are a good incentive to enhance high-quality research.

Other organisational measures are still quite recent and need further consolidation. The institutes are intended to facilitate cooperation and networking across research programmes. It appears from the interviews that most substantive meetings take place at the level of the individual programmes, e.g. at lunch meetings, and that some issues are best discussed at the faculty level, such as academic integrity. Interfaculty cooperation is said to be easier within A-LAB than without it. The Kooijmans Institute provides opportunities to get in touch with colleagues from other programmes and to exchange ideas and good practices, e.g. by organising lectures and conferences. The institutes assist in the administration and preparation of grant applications, which is especially helpful for the smaller programmes but have not yet been fully developed at this stage. Implementation of these activities is still at an early stage. The graduate school, too, has been established recently and should address the low PhD completion rates (see also 2.3). The committee considers this a positive step, but finds it too early to assess its effect.

Summarising, the committee assesses the role of the faculty to stimulate research quality as very good. The faculty policy has resulted in a substantial growth of high-quality output and prestigious grants. Further development of the role of the institutes and the graduate school is recommended and is expected to contribute to further success.

Quantitative assessment: very good

2.2.2. Relevance to society

The faculty describes in the self-assessment report that it contributes to the development of law in the society domain by providing advice to law and policy makers, influencing the decision-making of judges through talks, lectures, publications and case comments, organising conferences on current societal and legal problems, and running student law clinics. Researchers are often members of advisory bodies. The requests for contract research from government institutions, private businesses, law firms and civil society groups are indications of the societal relevance and appreciation of the faculty's research. The number of professional publications has decreased from 232 in 2009 to 87 in 2015, but reports are up from 15 (2009) to 38 (2015) and media appearances have increased from 6 (2009) to 186 (2015). In the years to come, the faculty aims to continue translating fundamental research into professional publications, participating in advisory boards and ancillary positions, offering post-academic education and disseminating research results in the media, lectures, open access repositories and legal clinics.

Assessment

The committee notes that the faculty has formulated and implemented a valorisation policy that works out well. Moreover, the combination of eight research programmes covers a broad range of subjects, including topical issues such as migration, liability, criminology, finance and allocation of contracts. A subdiscipline that is less strongly developed is the study of classic private law. The combination with empirical research produces a wealth of factual material that contributes to the faculty's participation in current debates in society. This wide range leads to a strong role of the faculty's research in the society domain: the faculty can be approached for advice or explanation on almost every topic related to law. Attracting contract research per programme is evidently supported by the general reputation of the VU University and its

Faculty of Law as a place for socially relevant research. The committee, therefore, assesses the relevance to society as very good.

Quantitative assessment: very good

2.2.3. Viability

The self-assessment report contains a SWOT analysis. The faculty identifies a number of possibilities to build on its strengths and counter its weaknesses. The ambition is to be more firmly embedded in international networks and research consortia that can be used to apply for European grants, to strengthen empirical legal studies together with NSCR, to organise teaching-free periods for researchers to allow a focus on research despite the intensification of education, to develop the graduate school into a stimulating platform for debate and to expand the range of post-academic education in collaboration with the faculty of Social Sciences and the faculty of Economics and Business Administration.

Assessment

The committee notes that the faculty is well aware of its position and has formulated realistic ambitions for the future. Funding, however, remains a serious threat. The committee observed in the interviews that this does not lead to a defeatist attitude in the various programmes, but rather to an active approach of seeking new opportunities, stimulated by the faculty board. It is as yet unclear whether this dynamic attitude of staff and the supporting role of the faculty will be sufficient to counter the external developments. The faculty's method to calculate teaching time for full, associate and assistant professors and to ensure 35 per cent research time for these categories, does not seem realistic. Hours between classes cannot reasonably be planned for research, which makes it virtually impossible for teachers to finish their doctoral research (see also 2.3). The threat of decreased funding is countered by income from other sources. More than sixteen per cent of the budget comes from other sources than direct funding, research grants or contract research, but the long term stability of these other forms of funding remains an open question and this hinders long term planning. It is also not clear whether further decreases in direct funding, were they to happen, could be countered by yet more funding from other sources.

Quantitative assessment: good

2.2.4. Internationalisation

In the review period the faculty has been successful in attracting research grants at a national level. It now aims to gather expertise and broaden the range of strategic collaborations to also obtain a strong position in international consortia and attract money from European research funds. The research programme Empirical and Normative Studies has already been successful in two Horizon 2020 submissions and Migration Law is part of a consortium that will submit a proposal in 2017 or 2018. To increase the international networking activities across all research groups, the faculty has appointed a director of internationalisation in 2015. His charge is to expand collaboration with universities in other countries, encourage PhD candidates to increase their international contacts through conferences, publishing and study periods abroad, and to bring visiting researchers into contact with the faculty community. From 2017, the faculty will make € 100,000 available annually for contributions to the organisation of international conferences and meetings with potential consortium partners and for the participation in ACCESS Europe as a portal for European networking activities.

Assessment

During the site visit the committee observed that an international outlook (publishing in English-language journals and cooperation with partners abroad) is clearly visible in some programmes. This is, however, an organic part of their research approach rather than the result of a deliberate strategy at programme, institutional or faculty level. The committee notes that

the faculty has recently formulated a comprehensive strategy and has appointed a director of internationalisation. The committee expects that this strategy will be successful, since it builds on the faculty's expertise in attracting national grants and all staff members are aware of the importance of international cooperation in research.

2.2.5. Multidisciplinarity

Programmes participating in A-LAB conduct multidisciplinary research in the area of law and behaviour. A major and natural external partner in A-LAB is NSCR, operating under the auspices of NWO. Other partners on the VU campus are (1) the Migration & Diversity Centre (MDC), a collaboration between the faculties of Law, Humanities and Social Sciences, (2) the Network Institute, with researchers in the field of exact sciences and economy, focusing on cybersecurity, and (3) CLUE+, the interfaculty Research Institute for Culture, History and Heritage. Off campus the faculty cooperates with the Netherlands Institute for Law and Governance (NILG), with the University of Amsterdam in ACCESS Europe, with legal practitioners from international law firms in the Zuidas Institute for Financial and Company Law (ZIFO) and with other law schools in the international Ius Commune Research School. The faculty brings together lawyers and social scientists, particularly in the field of criminology. This not only offers the opportunity of developing multidisciplinary lines of research, it also broadens the repertoire of methodological expertise in the faculty. Accordingly, empirical legal studies are seen as a promising field for future research initiatives in many research programmes.

Assessment

The committee is impressed by the open-minded approach, the competence in methodological questions of interdisciplinarity and the readiness to work together across disciplines. The committee has seen convincing cases of cooperation between law and social sciences in the Amsterdam Centre for Comprehensive Law, the Amsterdam Centre for Family Law, Empirical and Normative Studies and Migration Law, leading to new and innovative insights. Other programmes express their intentions to further engage in empirical multidisciplinary research projects in the next six years: Fundamental Rights, Regulation and Responsible Government and Public and Private Interests in Finance and Business Law. The latter has set up (per September 2015) a new Master track 'Law, Markets and Behaviour', combining legal, economic and behavioural perspectives. Noteworthy, too, is the cooperation between public and private law in Public Contracts: Law & Governance.

The committee appreciates that multidisciplinarity and collaboration are seen as a means to an end, and not enforced for topics and researchers where this would be less appropriate or useful. Within the legal discipline, too, cooperation between subdisciplines is useful.

2.3. PhD programmes

Per 2016, the faculty has 51 researchers with a PhD position. Fifteen of these have received NWO funding, twenty are fully or partly funded by public or private organisations. Twenty-one members of the regular staff have a position which, besides teaching obligations, comprises PhD research. In addition, a substantial number of non-funded PhD candidates (100-120) has been accepted for guidance and supervision, upon a positive appraisal of their quality and chance of successful completion.

The number of PhDs that can be attracted on direct funding has decreased since 2012. The faculty compensates this decline by matching PhD projects that are partly externally funded, for which € 50,000 is made available annually. To enhance the chances of success in acquiring external funds, the faculty has set up the PhD Scholarship Initiative. Promising candidates for NWO Research Talent Subsidies receive a scholarship for finalising their grant proposal in cooperation with a professor of the faculty.

Candidates are recruited in a three-step procedure, based on the quality and feasibility of the project and the quality of the candidate. Upon appointment, supervision is organised on the basis of the training policy of the faculty's Graduate School (GS). The GS seeks to offer an inclusive and stimulating environment where PhD students are encouraged to share their work and contribute to the research culture. Each candidate must acquire a total of 30 EC in training during their PhD project. Courses are provided on internationalisation, methodology, presentation and writing skills, and candidates can acquire the Basic Teaching Certificate. An Academic Integrity component is under way. It will consist of a series of workshops. The first workshop was organised in February 2016. PhD candidates must sign the Netherlands Code of Conduct for Scientific Practice.

Each candidate is supervised by one full professor and another staff member (assistant, associate or full professor). The GS director monitors the individual PhD projects. After ten months, the GS director assesses a PhD project individually and discusses its continuation or discontinuation with the candidate and the supervisors. In addition, the GS offers a peer-based supervision model by bringing together candidates with different expertise and from different legal departments.

PhD candidates can either write a dissertation or write articles. In the latter case, a candidate needs to write at least four articles, of which two or more are submitted to a refereed or peer-reviewed journal. The average duration of the PhD projects is long. Almost all candidates with a dedicated PhD position need more than the standard period of four years to complete their thesis. Even graduation after five years is exceptional, and quite a few are not yet finished after seven or more years.

Assessment

The committee was deeply worried by the disappointing completion rate of PhD projects and tried to discover its causes in the various interviews. In its meeting with the PhD candidates the committee noted a large difference in completion rate and appreciation of the PhD track between the group specifically funded to complete a PhD project and the group of teacher-researchers, who combine their PhD research (forty per cent) with teaching obligations (sixty per cent). Those with a dedicated PhD position were satisfied with their supervision and the chances they were given. They were confident that they would be able to graduate within four or five years and assured the committee that this was also the case for their colleagues. On the other hand, the teacher-researchers found that the allocation of forty per cent research time was not realised in practice, because teaching always demands more than sixty per cent of their time. They told the committee that candidates in this group are only able to graduate when they are exempted from their teaching tasks for a significant period of time, which apparently can be arranged in a number of cases.

The committee recommends more intensive guidance and monitoring for both groups. Currently, the monitoring is intensive during the first year, but much less in later years. Even when supervisors are quite accessible, as was indicated by the PhD students, the committee believes that a fallback structure is needed for cases where the relationship between supervisor and supervisee is less positive. A suggestion could be to organise annual interviews of the candidate by two professors who are not involved in the project, to discuss the project's progress. The committee expects that the Graduate School can play an active role in this area.

For the group of teacher-researchers, specifically, the committee advises providing funds that will allow these staff members to be relieved from their teaching obligations for a specific period. The committee feels that completion of their PhD research is not realistic without such measures.

Notwithstanding the disappointment about the completion rate, the committee is positive about the faculty's PhD programme. The interviews with those undertaking a PhD without teaching

obligations show that the current generation is much more geared up to on time completion and feels they are given the support that is necessary to achieve this. The very disappointing completion rates for this group may therefore become a thing of the past and the introduction of the GS is clearly a positive step in this respect. The committee appreciates the faculty's creativity in securing and matching external PhD funding and the training and monitoring activities of the recently established Graduate School. PhD candidates are given ample opportunity to attend conferences, spend time abroad or follow courses on or off campus. Each candidate has a designated budget of € 5,000 for this.

2.4. Research integrity policy

VU University, including the Law Faculty, subscribe to the rules of the Netherlands Code of Conduct for Academic Practice and the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. The Academic Integrity Committee of VU University and the VU University Medical Center deals with complaints concerning integrity issues and gives advice. Researchers can contact confidential counsellors who are trained by the university for their task. In 2010, the Ethics Committee for Legal and Criminological Research (CERCO) was established for research which involves ethical aspects. The responsibility to submit research proposals lies with the researchers. In early 2016, the VU University adopted a Policy on Research Data Management. The Data Centre of the VU library supports researchers in planning, managing, analysing and securely archiving research data. The faculty is working on the implementation of this policy.

The self-assessment report describes that the prevailing research culture is that researchers comment on each other's papers and research proposals. This facilitates openness and optimises the quality of the papers. The graduate school and the research programmes organise regular meetings in which current research is discussed. Academic integrity is also a regular topic of discussion in the faculty. The subject was discussed in the last annual research study day. The graduate school organises seminars around academic integrity for both PhD candidates and senior researchers. So far, the faculty has not been involved in integrity issues. The faculty is confident that ethical and integrity dilemmas are recognised at an early stage and that appropriate steps can be taken before dilemmas become serious issues.

Assessment

The committee discussed the research integrity policy in the interviews. The PhD candidates mentioned the obligatory seminar organised by the graduate school. The self-assessment report states that this will be expanded to an Academic Integrity component, consisting of a series of workshops. The committee also discussed the combination of legal practice and academic work which is sometimes very far-reaching, e.g. in Public and Private Interests in Finance and Business Law. The committee was reassured that the staff members are aware of potential integrity issues and strictly separate the academic work from their legal practice. The committee concludes that the faculty has a well-considered integrity policy and that both junior and senior staff are sufficiently aware of integrity issues.

3. The research programmes

The committee assessed the research conducted at the VU Faculty of Law as follows:

		Research quality	Relevance to society	Viability
	Faculty level	very good	very good	good
1	Amsterdam Centre for Comprehensive Law	good	very good	good
2	Amsterdam Centre for Family Law	very good	very good	very good
3	Boundaries of Law	very good	very good	very good
4	Empirical and Normative Studies	excellent	very good	excellent
5	Fundamental Rights, Regulation and Responsible Government	very good	very good	good
6	Migration Law	excellent	excellent	very good
7	Public and Private Interests in Finance and Business Law	very good	very good	excellent
8	Public Contracts: Law & Governance	excellent	very good	very good

The detailed assessment per research programme follows in the next section of this report.

3.1. Amsterdam Centre for Comprehensive Law

Programme manager: Professor Arno Akkermans

Research staff: 3.68 FTE

Strategy and targets

ACCL only started in 2013 and was formerly embedded in a larger programme, which was the largest programme of the Faculty, but struggling for coherence. The reorganisation in smaller units was considered as a way to strengthen the coherence. The actual programme covers five research lines, with 'Compensation Health Research' as focus, which indeed is innovative, and at the same time resulting in one of the smallest programme of the faculty in FTE (3.68 FTE, which stands for 5.45% of the total capacity FTE of the faculty in 2015). The narrowly defined topic is well chosen, but it is doubtful that this will be sufficient for the future in terms of viability.

Research quality

The output in terms of publications, certainly of English publications, is limited. ACCL produced 4 refereed articles in 2015. The output is stable since 2013 and does not indicate growth. In 2015 the programme realised 4.5% of the global output of the faculty, while the capacity in FTE's amounts to 5.45% of the faculty. Even if quality prevails, the output could be more important.

Relevance to society

ACCL has very socially relevant research lines. The importance could be more visible externally. The programme realises good scores for 'professional papers', 'reports' and 'books', but has limited skills in PR. Nevertheless, stakeholders ask research and are willing to fund this, which demonstrates the good position of the group in the research domain, as well as the fact that society notices the relevance of its work.

Viability

While the internal direct funding is decreasing, the programme compensates this by means of the acquisition of contract research. The (small) staff of the programme seems more or less stable. The acquisition in NWO grants is modest and international funding is absent. The programme has a low absolute number of PhD's. A clear strategy of valorisation of contract research in subsequent PhD-trajectories is not visible.

Internationalisation

ACCL is involved in important international collaborations (INLAR, CHR, International Network on Therapeutic Jurisprudence). The programme has a limited capacity to extrapolate national research in international publications, which hinders international recognition.

Multidisciplinarity

The research within ACCL is interdisciplinary, with other partners outside the programme and the faculty and makes use of legal and empirical methods. There is a tendency to be involved in empirical legal research, which can be applauded.

Conclusion and recommendations

The programme must develop a broader strategy towards the future, being less dependent of the efforts of the senior scientific staff. The committee welcomes the broadening of research into "mediation" and "restorative justice". This indeed could strengthen the identity of ACCL and could lead to more international recognition. Given the practical relevance of the project, more articles addressed to the general public and to professionals could help disseminate the findings of this group and meet public interest in them.

Assessments: Research quality: good
Relevance to society: very good
Viability: good

3.2. Amsterdam Centre for Family Law

Programme manager: Professor Masha Antokolskaia

Research staff: 3.51 FTE

Strategy and targets

The programme has a sharp focus and this is to be saluted. The aim is to do research in the area of divorce and the consequences that flow from it, but to see that topic in a broad sense and to approach it from an interdisciplinary social sciences perspective. There is a lot of interaction with relevant groups in society, which enriches the research, and also brings in a valuable source of funding. With this strategy comes a clear work ethos that focuses both on a high volume and excellent quality of outputs.

Research quality

The committee observed an impressive volume of the research output, especially when one takes into account that the programme is small in terms of FTE (5% of the total FTE capacity of the faculty in 2015). The programme exploits very well its small size to build a mutually supportive research team with the unique combination of expertise both in family law and in the social sciences. There is a sharp focus on the general theme of 'Divorce and its Consequences'. All this leads to impressive research output of a very high quality. In this context long term external partners and a carefully planned training for new researchers also play an important role in providing and maintaining an environment that is most conducive to high quality research.

Relevance to society

The programme has clearly become a key player in its area of expertise. The various groups in society readily find their way to the programme and benefit from its expertise. The fact that the programme can select the projects in which it participates in function of its own research interests and ongoing research activities demonstrates its relevance and its position of strength in this respect. Its interdisciplinary focus and approach also strengthen and broaden its relevance to society.

Viability

There is a clear strategy to exploit primary funding to the maximum extent possible, e.g. by adding a minor with NSCR and criminology. In terms of secondary streams of funding the programme has now become eligible for VENI grants and plans to apply for these. This is complemented by a significant amount of contract funding, and the strong reputation of the programme means it can select those projects that fit in with the overall research strategy and the specific plans of the programme. Staff time and the preservation of the PhD work of the doctoral students are also vital elements in this respect. In combination with the strong mutual support within the programme and a clear focus on two research themes under the overall umbrella of 'Divorce and its Consequences', this leads the committee to the conclusion that there is a clear and feasible strategy and policy to guarantee the viability of the programme.

Internationalisation

The nature of the research is primarily national in nature, but the centre has built up a strong international reputation and it forms part of well established international networks in its area of expertise. PhD students benefit from the Ius Commune Research School research training and there are research publications in English to complement the output in Dutch.

Multidisciplinarity

Multidisciplinarity is engrained in the DNA of the programme, as it comprises both experts in family law and experts in social sciences such as sociology, development psychology and criminology. Most of the programme's researchers are trained in the methodology of comparative law and the methodology of empirical research (A-LAB). All this means the

programme is interdisciplinary by nature and excellent results have been achieved already on this point.

Conclusion and recommendations

Despite the committee's initial worries about the small size of the programme, the committee was ultimately impressed by the sharp focus of the research, its high volume and quality of work and the fact that the programme has a clear strategy in terms of viability. The research is also entirely relevant to society. By way of recommendations the committee encourages the programme to explore secondary streams of funding and hopes that the faculty can offer administrative support in this respect. It is also vital that the programme continues to take care of its members, whose workload is high. The risk of burn-out needs to be minimised. The general theme of 'Divorce and its Consequences' should continue to be approached in the broadest possible way.

Assessments:	Research quality:	very good
	Relevance to society:	very good
	Viability:	very good

3.3. Boundaries of Law

Programme manager: Dr. Lyana Francot

Research staff: 12.03 FTE

Strategy and targets

The traditional boundaries of law are being shifted by developments and processes that are commonly denoted as 'globalisation', 'functional differentiation' and 'social acceleration'. The programme aims to provide an understanding and guidance for an effective response to these contemporary challenges. This involves understanding fundamental questions and seeing the ultimate practical implications of this development. The programme aims to approach its research from an interdisciplinary perspective.

Research quality

The overall research quality of the programme is very good. This is a larger programme, and there is a matching high volume of research output, despite the fluctuation in the types of output. 2013 seems to have been a very productive year, but, since then, there has been a significant decrease in publications in peer reviewed articles. The committee attaches value to the use of these outlets for publication and would like to see figures go up again in the coming years. This may be a matter of timing, for staff said that a number of publications, including books, are in the pipeline. The committee acknowledges a high volume of conference papers and contracts with leading publishers when it comes to books. The programme is interdisciplinary by nature. What is even more important: it does not only practice interdisciplinarity as many projects do, but also investigates the preconditions for this kind of research in jurisprudence. However, there is a risk that in terms of output these various disciplines merely work next to one another. It does, however, allow for broad coverage and the combination of expertise, which is visible in a number of publications.

Relevance to society

The research theme of this programme is very topical. Its work addresses fundamental questions in our fast evolving society and it provides guidance at a fundamental and structural level to achieve an understanding of these contemporary challenges. It therefore comes as no surprise that the programme is well anchored into various concrete societal projects.

Viability

In terms of financial means the programme scores well in each of the three income streams and it seems well equipped to attract research grants and contract research in the future.

The committee is slightly more worried by the very diverse research interests of the members of the programme. Developing a truly interdisciplinary approach that on the one hand leaves every member free to engage in his or her specific area of interest, whilst at the same time offering enough added value and cohesion at programme level is likely to remain a major challenge. The committee sees a strong enthusiasm and motivation, though, to address this challenge effectively.

Internationalisation

There are various international members of the programme and the topic lends itself well to international cooperation. Internationalisation is clearly still work in progress but opportunities are being taken and a network is being developed.

Multidisciplinarity

The committee is happy to acknowledge that the programme is composed of a very dynamic group of researchers, with very different theoretical approaches but also with many overlapping and joint interests. This is a very enriching environment to work in. A multidisciplinary approach is therefore part of the essence of the programme. Achieving a truly integrated interdisciplinary approach is, however, a major challenge and the current output merely shows juxtaposition of approaches rather than integration. This is an interesting first step and it is

valuable as such, as long as work can be done around common themes. But work remains to be done in this area and there is a significant risk that the various disciplines and pillars in the programme will in the end merely exist independently side by side. Integrating and keeping them all together by offering added value in the programme will remain a major challenge, given the diverse interests of the members of the programme, but the committee is convinced that it can be achieved and that there is a clear willingness to do so.

Conclusion and recommendations

Overall, this is a strong programme. The main research issues are extremely valuable for society and there is a clear strategy to address these in an interdisciplinary way. This is a laudable ambition, but one that will require a sustained effort to integrate the various disciplines and interests. Offering added value at programme level for all involved, irrespective of the topic of their research or their approach to it, will be key in this respect.

Assessments:	Research quality:	very good
	Relevance to society:	very good
	Viability:	very good

3.4. Empirical and Normative Studies

Programme manager: Professor Edward R. Kleemans

Research staff: 16.76 FTE

Strategy and targets

The programme has four research lines, which are reflected in the master programme of the Department of Criminal Law and Criminology. Research is strongly focused on the core issues of the programme. The acquisition of research funds is impressive. While the internal direct funding is decreasing, the research staff is increasing, mainly due to additional research funding (Horizon 2020, several NWO grants, contract research). The programme approaches research from an interdisciplinary perspective. This strategy leads to a high volume of output and to an excellent quality of publications, competing for international readership.

Research quality

The programme realises world leading quality and an impressive number of publications in high ranked refereed, often international, journals, frequently with a high impact factor. The programme realises 47.2% of the refereed articles of the whole faculty, with 24.8% of FTE capacity in research in 2015 (doubled since 2009); the committee also sees high scores for books, chapters and PhD theses. All this leads to impressive research output of a very high quality. In this context, long term external partners and a carefully planned training for new researchers also play an important role in providing and maintaining an environment that is extremely conducive to high quality research.

Relevance to society

Members of the programme have joined highly relevant and innovative projects. Stakeholders know the researchers, read them and consult them. Nevertheless, professional publications are at a somewhat lower level than the other outputs.

Viability

The increase in the number of PhDs is substantive. The synergy between research and teaching is good. The proximity of and the collaboration with the NSCR, centre of excellence in the research domain, creates important synergies. A number of NSCR members are also staff members of the programme, without creating significant overlap. This assures a solid basis for growth. NSCR also provides access to their databases. This construction not only delivers positive effects on the specific programme, but also on the broad strategy at faculty level. Overall the programme's viability is more than secured and it occupies an excellent and enviable position on this point.

Internationalisation

The majority of the output is international (in English, often theory-driven) and referenced in international literature. A strong involvement in high quality partnerships and international networks can be observed: CIROC, EUROCC, CICJ & GCN. The programme reaches a high international quality level.

Multidisciplinarity

The title of the programme expresses clearly the ambition and the daily practice to combine empirical (with different disciplinary background) and normative judicial research. This ambition is visible in the whole programme. The programme delivers intensive coaching of PhDs from multidisciplinary angles.

Conclusion and recommendations

This is a highly valuable programme for the VU Law Faculty, which is nationally and internationally well established in the scientific community and has, therefore, the capacity to grow further towards the study of new problems and their internationalisation. The programme

has the capacity to continue to perform on a high international level. Encouraging visiting researchers to participate in the programme could be a useful tool to realise this.

Assessments:	Research quality:	excellent
	Relevance to society:	very good
	Viability:	excellent

3.5. Fundamental Rights, Regulation and Responsible Government

Programme manager: Professor Willemijn Roozendaal

Research staff: 4.46 FTE

Strategy and targets

The research group gathers – in spite of its small financing (4.46 FTE) – a large group of researchers and covers a large research scope: the quality of regulation, the rule of law and respect for fundamental rights within the welfare state, encompassing several fields of law (education law, international social law, human rights, etc.). Although this can contribute to cross-fertilisation of research themes, it is a challenge to guard internal links and the consistency between the several subthemes. The combined expertise in social and regulatory law is essential for the programme, which is more restricted than the title of the program would suggest. It is unclear whether the programme invests in applications for European or other international grants.

Research quality

The research quality of the programme is to be appraised. Since 2016, two researchers of the programme have been financed by the NWO through a VENI grant (1.2 research-FTE). Another researcher has obtained the Levenbach award. Although these grants are awarded on an individual basis, they reflect the overall high quality of the researchers within the programme. Many researchers are on the editorial boards of leading national journals and/or on the boards of directors of specialist organisations. They are also embedded in research networks on several levels and dimensions.

Relevance to society

The research topic of the programme is by its nature highly relevant to society. The programme aims to be visible in societal debates and attract contract research for societal groups. The programme is able to reach a good valorisation of its activities through professional publications, media appearances and consultancy for local and national governments and participation in contract research or inquiry committees. This reflects the high quality of the programme, but these results would be optimised if this consultancy also contributes to long term fundamental research.

Viability

The programme is relatively small and the number of junior researchers within the programme is rather limited. The viability of the programme is guaranteed through the work of the senior researchers. A further decline of the funding source could endanger the viability of the programme. A further development in contract research is necessary, but should be bridged with output on a fundamental scientific level. It is good that the programme keeps investing in applications for NWO funding.

Internationalisation

The programme mainly aims at studying issues of Dutch law and at providing high-quality output in the Dutch law areas of their expertise. However, the research topics are most suitable to develop a more international profile for the programme and the committee recommends that the programme actively explore these opportunities.

Multidisciplinarity

The programme largely contributes to multidisciplinary research on a high level and has to be applauded for that. It overcomes the *summa divisio* between public law and private law.

Conclusion and recommendations

The programme can build upon high quality research which is recognised by external funding organisations and reflected in individual grants. This research is mostly multidisciplinary in its approach or – at least – in its outlook and components and is highly relevant to society. The programme is confronted with the sometimes difficult tension between individual high quality research on the one hand and consistency of a research programme on the other hand.

Assessments:	Research quality:	very good
	Relevance to society:	very good
	Viability:	good

3.6. Migration Law

Programme manager: Professor Thomas Spijkerboer

Research staff: 8.24 FTE

Strategy and targets

For fifteen years, the programme has been one of the most prominent programmes in the area. With its focus on migration law in the broadest sense, the programme aims to maintain its high quality and its obvious relevance to society. The considerable attention for the topic of migration makes this strategy viable.

Research quality

The excellent quality of the programme is reflected in the two VICI grants from NWO. It is rather seldom and exceptional that this type of grants (of € 1.500.000) is awarded for research in a law faculty, so it is a sign of high scientific recognition that two of them were given to this research group. The interdisciplinary character of the research, with different disciplines represented in the group, might have contributed to this recognition. In PhD results, the programme has not been successful: no PhD was completed in the last three years. Two personal tragedies might have contributed to this. During the discussion with the committee the head of the programme presented initiatives for a better organisation of the PhD studies and announced that, in the near future, a number of PhD defences is expected. The new approach gives more confidence for better results. Nevertheless, clear attention should be given to this point.

Relevance to society

The relevance to society is clear, migration being one of the most difficult problems in the present world. The need for scientific background is obvious in a politically divided society. The research group is very visible in the public debate, and its members are actively participating in advisory committees to the government and in non-governmental organisations. Supporting legal practice in migration matters is part of the activities, and a Migration Law Clinic assists in important litigation cases. In this respect the programme occupies an enviable position of strength that puts it amongst the leading players in Europe.

Viability

The viability of the programme scores a little lower than its quality and relevance, since the programme is the victim of its own success: two VICI grants in the past cannot be easily replicated in the coming years. Since they are at the moment an important part of the financial means, other sources have to be found. The increase of steady income from augmenting teaching in the faculty programme and the new Master programme is important as a more stable basic source of income. The growing importance of the subject might support the research leader's conviction that there is no reason why the group will be less successful in getting funding than it was in the past.

Internationalisation

The programme has a very strong international orientation. Almost half of the foreign visiting researchers to the faculty have come for this programme. The staff itself reflects the international character of the research. The committee acknowledges that all of this indicates a very strong performance in this area. The committee trusts it will be continued.

Multidisciplinarity

Another strong point of the research is its interdisciplinary character. The research staff itself is multidisciplinary. The programme participates in the Migration and Diversity Centre, which is the platform for multidisciplinary cooperation of the Faculties of Law, Social Sciences and Humanities. New interdisciplinary themes are also developed in the research, e.g. the legal consequences of border policies for asylum seekers, for which a VICI grant was awarded.

Conclusion and recommendations

The programme is of great interest from a scientific point of view, and is also very relevant for society. Whilst the committee trusts this is already a point of attention, it urges that ongoing attention be paid to securing the long term funding of the programme.

Assessments:	Research quality:	excellent
	Relevance to society:	excellent
	Viability:	very good

3.7. Public and Private Interests in Finance and Business Law

Programme manager: Professor Lodewijk Smeehuijzen

Research staff: 12.20 FTE

Strategy and targets

The programme aims to contribute to the solution of topical problems of finance and business law. It is a relatively large programme with almost 13 FTE. It is also large in scope (encompassing tax law, intellectual property law, private international law, pension law and corporate contract law) and in terms of research topics. The aim is to achieve multidisciplinary approaches and cross-fertilisation between them. This is realised by having a central theme per year and by striving to organise an annual congress relating to that subject. Members also frequently meet with each other and with legal practice within ZIFO and in the master programme. Despite that, there is of course a certain tension between making a collective research programme on the one hand and the individual research conducted by staff members on the other hand.

Research quality

The committee is pleased to see strong results, both in terms of quality and in terms of quantity. Contract research is strongly present, but is turned into high quality output. Fundamental black letter law research is the weak point and is virtually absent. This is explained to a large extent by the high hurdles for secondary funding and the absence of alternative sources of funding for this area of research. There is a high output in the various subthemes of the programme. Bringing all of these together in a multidisciplinary context at a more conceptual level would be a useful step, but this remains a challenge. The regulatory component – and thus the public interest – could be developed further. It is nice to see, though, that, depending on the opportunities and the topics, sustained efforts are made to publish both in Dutch and in English and that sizable volumes are achieved in both languages.

Relevance to society

Much of the research is highly relevant to society. This is not surprising in view of the strong links with legal practice in the context of ZIFO (although the precise role and contribution of the programme in this Institute is not clear). The programme's members are keen to attract contract research in areas that are socially relevant and, in turn, the ZIFO partners bring their societal expertise and relevant research themes and angles into the project. All senior members hold positions in legal practice. The committee was pleased to be reassured that in terms of integrity and interests appropriate efforts have been made in order to avoid undue overlaps and interference in an environment where research and legal practice come so closely together. The committee agrees that it is important in this field of law to maintain the societal relevance and the links with legal practice, but the committee does not agree that 'business law cannot be object of fundamental research independently from legal practice'.

Viability

The committee was impressed by the programme's strategy and success in this respect. The master programme has been used to secure a viable direct income stream and the contract research and the ZIFO partnership have guaranteed sustainable additional sources of income for the years to come. The committee considers this to be evidence of a well-thought out long term strategy. This strategy seems strong enough to encompass all aspects of the widely diverse research programme. It also provides the seeds for those common elements, around the ZIFO project, that will keep the various research strains in the programme together in their diversity. In addition, the programme should invest in obtaining external funding for fundamental research additionally to its contract research.

Internationalisation

Members of the programme publish to a large extent in English and many of the ZIFO partners operate at international level. Particularly the international, rather than private law, part of the research lends itself to internationalisation. Most members of the programme are also part of international networks. Efforts to put the Faculty's internationalisation aim into practice are therefore well underway, even if much more can be achieved on this point, e.g. in terms of internationally funded projects. This is in other words work in progress, but there are significant opportunities and major efforts are already underway.

Multidisciplinarity

This is a broad programme and, in combination with the focus on economic aspects, many disciplines are involved. This has specifically given rise to empirical multidisciplinary projects. This is a good starting point, that can be further developed in the coming years.

Conclusion and recommendations

The committee was particularly impressed by the viability strategy of the programme. This is really outstanding and fairly unique. The ZIFO structure makes an essential contribution. The diversity of research is large and the level of the output is high. The programme is relatively successful in combining its rich individual diversity in terms of research areas with a sufficient degree of integration and interdisciplinarity. Keeping the very diverse programme together will remain a challenge, but the programme is well placed to achieve it. The committee recommends that efforts in the areas of interdisciplinarity and internationalisation be strengthened, and that opportunities for fundamental research in the context of an NWO application be used. This should – given the quality of the programme – be an ambition, at least, and could also contribute to an increase of the number of PhDs in the programme.

Assessments:	Research quality:	very good
	Relevance to society:	very good
	Viability:	excellent

3.8. Public Contracts: Law & Governance

Programme manager: Professor Frank van Ommeren

Research staff: 6.64 FTE

Strategy and targets

The coherence of this programme is very good and serves as a model for other research programmes. It combines both a general research theme and a certain divergence between the subthemes. The research programme is innovative because it puts on the agenda a new theme for research: the allocation of limited rights by the administration. This subject is related to the subject of public contracts, which is made clear in the programme. The programme also includes private law, both as a general theme and related with the subject of (public) procurement, which is governed by private law in Dutch law.

Research quality

The programme builds on high quality researchers, who have defined a common research theme from different approaches. The committee was very impressed by the sharp focus of the research, providing an innovative approach to the topic (that is gradually being accepted at international level) that combines the different strengths of the high quality researchers that make up the team. The output in high ranking publications is excellent and demonstrates the value of combining forces. The PhD results of the programme are very good in quantity and quality.

Relevance to society

Although the relevance for society is high and increasing, the translation of the results of the research into practice falls somewhat behind. In this respect the contract research, which is already undertaken and further striven for, can be of great help without neglecting the focus on fundamental research. The programme has a strong balance between carrying out both fundamental research and practice oriented research with stakeholders in society and focusing on both academic debate and legal practice.

Viability

The programme has been able to secure significant funding from contract research and the proceeds from post-academic teaching, which was a deliberate choice in 2012. With this income, young researchers could be appointed. In addition, these sources provide valuable contacts with legal practice. The programme invests part of the income from contract research into young PhD candidates, who contribute to fundamental research. Nevertheless, for a stronger viability, the committee recommends that more funding for fundamental research from scientific sources should be sought, in addition to the contract research activities. Contacts with practice are important and are useful to raise money for research, but the need to go into the more fundamental issues should not be neglected.

Internationalisation

The research group is building contacts at an international level and is active in a number of relevant networks. In many countries, the subject of allocation of limited rights is not yet recognised as a separate topic in research, which is connected to the way public contracts are dealt with in the various legal systems. The key publication on allocation of limited rights in the EU can be stimulating for further internationalisation. The theme is now recognised as an important one in Dutch legal research, and is beginning to gain international interest. The committee recommends the programme to further invest in the development of the international programme.

Multidisciplinarity

The programme bridges the distinction between public law and private law. However, interdisciplinary research is not done and not pursued. This is quite acceptable since not all

research has to be interdisciplinary. Nevertheless, some links with other disciplines (e.g. economics) might be fruitful.

Conclusion and recommendations

The scope and construction of this research group seem to have grown towards a natural convergence, in such a way that the theme of the programme is consistent and yet sufficiently large. The committee recommends that the programme apply for NWO grants to strengthen its fundamental research. Also, the committee advises further investments in the development of internationalisation and investigating the added value of links with other disciplines, such as economics.

Assessments:	Research quality:	excellent
	Relevance to society:	very good
	Viability:	very good

4. Recommendations

For further improvement of the research quality at the VU Faculty of Law the committee formulates a number of recommendations:

- The committee strongly recommends that the umbrella function of the institutes be used to provide support for the submission of grant applications and for the search for funding in general, in line with the role already given to the institutes in this area.
- The committee advises to not merely wait for the organic development of internationalisation in the research programmes, but recommends a purposeful further implementation of the internationalisation policy that was formulated recently.
- In order to improve the PhD completion rates, the committee strongly recommends more intensive guidance and monitoring for PhD candidates, using the active role of the Graduate School.
- The committee advises the Faculty to provide funds that will allow teacher-researchers to be relieved from their teaching obligations for a specific period in order to complete their PhD research.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Curricula vitae of the committee members

Prof. dr. Paul Torremans (Chair) holds degrees in law from the KU Leuven (Belgium) and the University of Leicester (UK). He is professor of intellectual property law at the School of Law, University of Nottingham (UK) and visiting professor at the Faculty of Law, Chiang Mai University (Thailand). His main research topics are intellectual property and private international law, and in particular the interaction between these two areas. He is a member of the executive committee of the Association Littéraire et Artistique Internationale and its UK branch BLACA. He is also a member of CREATE, the RCUK Centre for Copyright and New Business Models in the Creative Economy. His publications can be found at <http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/law/people/paul.torremans>. He is currently working on new editions of Cheshire, North & Fawcett, Private International Law (OUP) and P. Torremans (ed), Copyright Law: A handbook of contemporary research (Edward Elgar Publishing).

Univ.-Prof. dr. Stephan Kirste is university-professor for Legal and Social Philosophy at the Department for Economic and Social Sciences in the Faculty of Law of the Paris Lodron University of Salzburg, Austria. He is president of the German Section of the International Association for Legal and Social Philosophy (IVR). He studied law, philosophy and history at the University of Freiburg i.Br., where he was promoted Dr. iur. and received the *venia legendi* for public law, philosophy of law, history of public law and sociology of law on the basis of his second thesis on public administrative law at the University of Heidelberg in 2004. He became Professor in 2006 and received a call on a Chair for European Public Law and Legal Philosophy at the German Speaking Andrassy University Budapest in 2008, where he was Dean of the Faculty for Comparative Legal and State Sciences until his call to Salzburg in 2012. His fields of interest concern in particular: Theory of jurisprudence (esp. interdisciplinarity of the science of law); Theory of law (esp. law and time); ethics of law (esp. human rights, human dignity, justice); Comparative constitutional law (esp. Brazil, USA); history of legal thought. – His main publications can be found here: <https://www.uni-salzburg.at/index.php?id=31224>

Prof. dr. Paul Ponsaers graduated in Sociology and has a doctoral degree in Criminology. He is professor Emeritus at the department of Criminology, Criminal Law and Social Law, Faculty of Law, Ghent University (Belgium). He was head of the department and founder of his own research group. His main research topics are Analysis of Security and Crime, Police Studies, Sociology of Law and Methods of Criminological Research. For many years he was president of the 'Centre for Policing and Security'. He is member of the Steering Group of the international GERN network, where he animates the annual Summer School for PhD students. As an emeritus-professor, Paul Ponsaers continues to be active in research and publications, editorial work and international conferences. He published an important number of articles and papers in national and international journals and books. For the moment he concentrates on the project "Policing European Metropolises".

Prof. dr. Vincent Sagaert is a full Professor of Private Law at the University of Leuven. He has published many books and national and international publications in the field of property law, the law of obligations and the law of secured transactions. He has been Vice-Dean of his Faculty (2009-2016) and is now Director of Studies. He is a guest professor at University of Hasselt, Université du Burundi and Fellow of the South African Research Chair on Property Law (Stellenbosch). He is editor of several legal journals, e.g. co-Director of Tijdschrift voor Privaatrecht and co-editor of the International Encyclopedia of Property and Trust Law. For a more detailed bibliography, see <http://www.law.kuleuven.be/goederenrecht/personeel/vincent-sagaert>

Prof. dr. Michiel Scheltema holds degrees in law from Leiden University and Harvard Law School. He is emeritus professor of administrative law at the University of Groningen and was professor on the 'Wiarda chair' at the University of Utrecht. His publications deal with

administrative law and independent agencies. He was junior minister (staatssecretaris) in Van Agt II and III. From 1998-2014 he was chairman of the Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR). Since 1983 is he Royal Commissioner for the codification of the general part of administrative law. He served on the board of various periodicals and was chairman of the Asser Institute in the Hague.

Appendix 2: Programme of the site visit

24 October

12:30 – 2:00 pm Lunch & acquaintance
The Basket (campus restaurant, De Boelelaan 1109-b)

2:00 – 6:00 pm Deliberations
Structure of the report
Faculty and programmes

6:00 – 7:00 pm Drinks with the Faculty board

7:00 – 10:00 pm Dinner (committee members only)
Restaurant As, Prinses Irenestraat 19, Amsterdam

25 October

9:00 – 10:30 am Faculty board and Internationalization officer/Director Graduate School:
Prof. W.H.A.C.M. (Willem) Bouwens, Dean
Prof. M.R.F. (Martin) Senftleben, Director of research
Prof. H. (Hemme) Battjes, Director of education
Drs. M.J.J. (Michel) van Raaphorst, Managing director
Prof. W.G. (Wouter) Werner, Internationalization officer/ Director Graduate School

10:30 am – 12:30 pm Programme managers and Director of Research:
Prof. A.J. (Arno) Akkermans (Amsterdam Centre for Comprehensive Law)
Prof. M.V. (Masha) Antokolskaia (Amsterdam Centre for Family Law)
Dr. L.M.A. (Lyana) Francot (Boundaries of Law)
Prof. E.R. (Edward) Kleemans (Empirical and Normative Studies)
Prof. W.L. (Willemijn) Roozendaal (Fundamental Rights, Regulation and Responsible Government)
Prof. M.R.F. (Martin) Senftleben, director of research
Prof. T.P. (Thomas) Spijkerboer (Migration Law)
Prof. J.L. (Lodewijk) Smeehuijzen (Public and Private Interests in Finance and Business Law)
Prof. C.E.C. (Chris) Jansen & Prof. F.J. (Frank) van Ommeren (Public Contracts: Law & Governance)

12:30 – 1:30 pm Lunch in The Basket (campus restaurant)

1:30 – 2:30 pm PhD-students:
B. (Berber) Laarman (Amsterdam Centre for Comprehensive Law)
A.E. (Anne) Smit (Amsterdam Centre for Family Law)
L.J.M. (Lianne) Boer (Boundaries of Law)
A. (Annika) van Baar (Empirical and Normative Studies)
M.J.C. (Catherine) Stip (Fundamental Rights, Regulation and Responsible Government)
N. (Nadia) Ismaili (Migration Law)
K.H.M. (Koen) de Roo (Public and Private Interests in Finance and Business Law)
S. (Sophie) Prent (Public Contracts: Law & Governance)

2:30 – 3.30 pm	<p>Other researchers:</p> <p>A. (Annelies) Wilken (Amsterdam Centre for Comprehensive Law)</p> <p>G.C.A.M. (Geeske) Ruitenbergh (Amsterdam Centre for Family Law)</p> <p>B.C. (Britta) van Beers (Boundaries of Law)</p> <p>J.M. (Joke) Harte (Empirical and Normative Studies)</p> <p>K.M. (Karin) de Vries (Fundamental Rights, Regulation and Responsible Government)</p> <p>E.R. (Evelien) Brouwer (Migration Law)</p> <p>Prof. F.P.G. (Frank) Pötgens (Public and Private Interests in Finance and Business Law)</p> <p>A.R. (Richard) Neerhof (Public Contracts: Law & Governance)</p>
3:30 – 6:00 pm	Discussion
6:00 pm	Informal reception

Appendix 3: Quantitative data

Table 1. Research staff

	2009		2010		2011		2012		2013		2014		2015	
	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE
Faculty level														
Scientific staff	98	22.43	97	21.79	102	21.58	108	24.19	111	26.87	110	27.44	114	27.20
Post-docs	6	1.60	6	1.07	6	1.69	11	3.39	12	6.29	11	8.41	11	7.25
PhD students	36	17.34	39	21.84	46	25.10	52	27.01	58	31.25	54	29.38	48	21.72
Junior researchers	16	5.43	20	6.23	34	10.01	41	11.39	42	12.84	36	11.12	37	11.35
Total	156	46.80	162	50.93	188	58.38	212	65.98	223	77.25	211	76.35	210	67.52
Amsterdam Centre of Comprehensive Law														
Scientific staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	1.09	8	0.95	9	1.12
Post-docs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.69	2	0.34	1	0.01
PhD students	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.30	2	0.67	1	0.60
Junior researchers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2.01	5	1.17	6	1.95
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	4.09	17	3.13	17	3.68
Amsterdam Centre of Family Law														
Scientific staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	1.95	9	1.75	7	1.52
Post-docs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.06
PhD students	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1.06	5	1.88	3	1.21
Junior researchers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1.22	2	0.63	2	0.72
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	4.23	16	4.26	13	3.51
Boundaries of Law														
Scientific staff	17	4.88	15	4.86	16	4.95	17	5.14	19	6.03	19	5.66	19	6.01
Post-docs	1	0.71	0	0	0	0	1	0.25	1	0.50	1	0.95	1	0.95
PhD students	3	1.85	6	3.24	6	3.75	10	5.32	11	6.59	9	5.75	9	5.07
Junior researchers	1	0.20	1	0.33	1	0.40	1	0.13	1	0.27	0	0	0	0
Total	22	7.64	22	8.43	23	9.10	29	10.84	32	13.39	29	12.36	29	12.03
Empirical and Normative Studies														
Scientific staff	23	4.97	23	4.81	25	4.75	25	4.76	23	5.13	23	5.86	25	6.93
Post-docs	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.20	2	1.17	2	2.00	3	2.12
PhD students	8	2.91	11	6.13	11	7.46	14	6.91	17	9.49	15	8.35	12	5.35
Junior researchers	3	0.45	6	1.34	12	4.27	13	4.06	10	4.18	9	2.89	9	2.36
Total	34	8.33	40	12.28	48	16.48	53	15.93	52	19.97	49	19.10	49	16.76

	2009		2010		2011		2012		2013		2014		2015	
	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE	#	FTE
Fundamental Rights, Regulation and Responsible Government														
Scientific staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	3.10	17	3.39	18	3.22
Post-docs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PhD students	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.99	2	0.69	0	0
Junior researchers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1.29	5	1.58	5	1.24
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.38	24	5.66	23	4.46
Migration Law														
Scientific staff	4	1.33	4	1.04	4	1.27	6	1.72	7	1.80	7	2.05	6	2.08
Post-docs	2	0.67	2	0.84	3	1.47	4	1.97	5	1.93	4	3.12	3	2.57
PhD students	6	3.06	6	3.29	9	3.45	8	4.71	8	4.40	8	4.60	7	3.29
Junior researchers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.30
Total	12	5.06	12	5.17	16	6.19	18	8.40	20	8.13	19	9.77	18	8.24
Public and Private Interests in Finance and Business Law														
Scientific staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	3.61	20	3.49	19	3.17
Post-docs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2.00	2	2.00	2	1.54
PhD students	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.60	11	5.71	12	5.10
Junior researchers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	2.76	10	2.19	9	2.39
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	13.97	43	13.39	42	12.20
Public Contracts														
Scientific staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	4.16	17	4.29	19	3.15
Post-docs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PhD students	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2.82	4	1.73	4	1.10
Junior researchers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1.11	5	2.66	4	2.39
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	8.09	26	8.68	27	6.64
Balancing Public and Private Interests														
Scientific staff	55	11.25	56	11.08	58	10.61	61	12.57	0	0	0	0	0	0
Post-docs	3	0.22	4	0.23	3	0.22	5	0.97	0	0	0	0	0	0
PhD students	19	9.52	16	9.18	20	10.44	20	10.07	0	0	0	0	0	0
Junior researchers	12	4.78	13	4.56	21	5.34	27	7.20	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	89	25.77	89	25.05	102	26.61	113	30.81	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 2. Research output

Faculty of Law	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Refereed articles (evaluated by independent content experts)	95	70	96	91	142	112	125
Non-refereed articles (in non-refereed journals deemed important to the field)	108	109	108	106	147	117	127
Books	18	11	13	14	15	21	18
Book chapters	99	43	63	95	93	89	59
PhD theses	6	7	5	13	8	10	17
Conference papers	52	116	145	110	127	172	141
Professional publications (aimed at professionals in public and private sector)	232	195	189	178	161	161	87
Annotations	122	129	129	111	149	115	109
Publications aimed at the general public ('populariserende artikelen')	18	23	23	19	31	23	29
Reports	15	14	16	15	30	25	38
Total publications	765	717	787	752	903	845	750
Invited lectures	119	121	120	169	184	165	152
Media appearances (written media, television and radio)	6	26	25	23	53	96	186
Total output	890	864	932	944	1140	1106	1088
Amsterdam Centre for Comprehensive Law	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Refereed articles (evaluated by independent content experts)					4	3	4
Non-refereed articles (in non-refereed journals deemed important to the field)					8	6	10
Books					0	3	2
Book chapters					2	4	3
PhD theses					1	1	2
Conference papers					19	8	7
Professional publications (aimed at professionals in public and private sector)					8	8	1
Annotations					4	3	2
Publications aimed at the general public ('populariserende artikelen')					0	0	0
Reports					4	1	7
Total publications					50	37	38
Invited lectures					11	10	7
Media appearances (written media, television and radio)					2	2	4
Total output					63	49	49

Amsterdam Centre for Family Law	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Refereed articles (evaluated by independent content experts)					7	6	10
Non-refereed articles (in non-refereed journals deemed important to the field)					6	6	5
Books					1	0	0
Book chapters					0	15	1
PhD theses					1	0	2
Conference papers					10	4	6
Professional publications (aimed at professionals in public and private sector)					18	19	12
Annotations					6	1	1
Publications aimed at the general public ('populariserende artikelen')					1	1	2
Reports					4	1	1
Total publications					54	53	40
Invited lectures					0	10	6
Media appearances (written media, television and radio)					1	0	5
Total output					55	63	51
Boundaries of Law	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Refereed articles (evaluated by independent content experts)	17	9	14	14	31	23	15
Non-refereed articles (in non-refereed journals deemed important to the field)	13	14	11	11	11	9	14
Books	0	3	1	4	4	3	0
Book chapters	26	9	11	15	20	11	11
PhD theses	2	3	0	2	3	0	3
Conference papers	10	17	27	28	28	34	31
Professional publications (aimed at professionals in public and private sector)	40	33	19	23	8	14	6
Annotations	3	13	9	5	13	2	8
Publications aimed at the general public ('populariserende artikelen')	10	5	6	6	4	8	4
Reports	1	0	0	1	1	2	7
Total publications	122	106	98	109	122	105	99
Invited lectures	12	9	12	18	16	21	10
Media appearances (written media, television and radio)	3	8	5	10	3	10	10
Total output	137	123	115	137	141	136	119

Empirical and Normative Studies	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Refereed articles (evaluated by independent content experts)	25	26	44	36	50	40	59
Non-refereed articles (in non-refereed journals deemed important to the field)	25	18	21	30	37	36	24
Books	7	1	5	4	5	4	6
Book chapters	33	16	15	18	39	26	21
PhD theses	1	1	4	5	2	7	6
Conference papers	20	22	30	23	25	46	26
Professional publications (aimed at professionals in public and private sector)	39	20	22	25	16	9	7
Annotations	10	16	11	19	21	17	24
Publications aimed at the general public ('populariserende artikelen')	5	2	4	4	4	6	10
Reports	6	7	3	4	5	11	9
Total publications	172	129	159	168	204	202	192
Invited lectures	46	28	34	52	61	30	30
Media appearances (written media, television and radio)	1	6	12	4	19	44	67
Total output	219	163	205	224	284	276	289
Fundamental Rights, Regulation and Responsible Government	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Refereed articles (evaluated by independent content experts)					4	6	8
Non-refereed articles (in non-refereed journals deemed important to the field)					25	16	18
Books					2	1	3
Book chapters					3	6	2
PhD theses					0	1	1
Conference papers					6	5	10
Professional publications (aimed at professionals in public and private sector)					28	20	15
Annotations					18	8	5
Publications aimed at the general public ('populariserende artikelen')					6	0	3
Reports					7	6	8
Total publications					99	69	73
Invited lectures					13	9	27
Media appearances (written media, television and radio)					8	17	36
Total output					120	95	136

Migration Law	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Refereed articles (evaluated by independent content experts)	11	5	5	11	11	13	13
Non-refereed articles (in non-refereed journals deemed important to the field)	7	6	3	6	6	5	6
Books	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
Book chapters	2	4	4	7	7	5	4
PhD theses	0	1	0	2	0	0	0
Conference papers	4	13	19	20	20	29	32
Professional publications (aimed at professionals in public and private sector)	13	16	19	11	3	17	5
Annotations	52	34	37	31	32	50	37
Publications aimed at the general public ('populariserende artikelen')	2	1	4	7	7	5	7
Reports	0	2	2	1	8	1	1
Total publications	91	82	93	96	94	129	105
Invited lectures	12	13	9	23	9	19	15
Media appearances (written media, television and radio)	2	4	5	4	3	9	45
Total output	105	99	107	123	106	157	165
Public and Private Interests in Finance and Business Law	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Refereed articles (evaluated by independent content experts)					28	14	17
Non-refereed articles (in non-refereed journals deemed important to the field)					41	27	28
Books					2	5	5
Book chapters					17	19	13
PhD theses					0	0	2
Conference papers					18	25	19
Professional publications (aimed at professionals in public and private sector)					73	66	32
Annotations					32	18	14
Publications aimed at the general public ('populariserende artikelen')					7	3	2
Reports					1	6	3
Total publications					219	183	135
Invited lectures					51	59	34
Media appearances (written media, television and radio)					9	6	12
Total output					279	248	181

Public Contracts: Law and Governance	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Refereed articles (evaluated by independent content experts)					6	8	3
Non-refereed articles (in non-refereed journals deemed important to the field)					14	15	22
Books					2	2	2
Book chapters					6	6	5
PhD theses					1	2	1
Conference papers					7	23	11
Professional publications (aimed at professionals in public and private sector)					8	9	10
Annotations					23	17	18
Publications aimed at the general public ('populariserende artikelen')					2	0	1
Reports					2	1	4
Total publications					71	83	77
Invited lectures					24	9	23
Media appearances (written media, television and radio)					8	8	7
Total output					103	100	107
Balancing Public and Private Interests	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Refereed articles (evaluated by independent content experts)	41	30	33	30			
Non-refereed articles (in non-refereed journals deemed important to the field)	63	71	74	60			
Books	11	7	7	6			
Book chapters	40	14	33	55			
PhD theses	3	2	1	4			
Conference papers	18	64	69	39			
Professional publications (aimed at professionals in public and private sector)	141	128	129	119			
Annotations	57	67	72	56			
Publications aimed at the general public ('populariserende artikelen')	1	15	9	2			
Reports	8	5	11	9			
Total publications	383	403	438	380			
Invited lectures	49	71	65	76			
Media appearances (written media, television and radio)	0	8	3	5			
Total output	432	482	506	461			

Table 3. Research funding

Faculty of Law	2009		2010		2011		2012		2013		2014		2015	
	k€	%	k€	%	k€	%	k€	%	k€	%	k€	%	k€	%
<i>Funding</i>														
Direct funding	12,850	77.4	14,101	76.9	13,972	75.5	13,864	72.9	41,422	71.1	15,113	71.5	14,423	73.7
Research grants	385	2.3	613	3.3	847	4.6	981	5.2	1,281	6.3	1,762	8.3	1,158	5.9
Contract research	507	3.1	829	4.5	1,104	6.0	1,118	5.9	952	4.7	947	4.5	716	3.7
Post-academic & contract education	2,220	13.4	2,065	11.3	2,237	12.1	1,989	10.5	2,308	11.4	2,033	9.6	1,686	8.6
Top-up tuition fees*	172	1.0	118	0.6	25	0.1	671	3.5	731	3.6	620	2.9	682	3.5
Other **	473	2.8	602	3.3	331	1.8	389	2.0	597	2.9	649	3.1	906	4.6
Total funding	16,607	100	18,328	100	18,516	100	19,012	100	20,291	100	21,124	100	19,571	100
<i>Expenditures</i>														
Personnel costs	12,953	85.3	13,309	78.0	13,962	81.3	15,910	97.4	18,589	85.0	18,388	85.2	16,380	82.1
Other costs	2,223	14.7	3,748	22.0	3,211	18.7	432	2.6	3,275	15.0	3,187	14.8	3,566	17.9
Total expenditures	15,176	100	17,057	100	17,173	100	16,342	100	21,864	100	21,575	100	19,946	100

* Top-up tuition fees: tuition fees that the university/faculty receives apart from the tuition fees, for example tuition fees of students from non-EEG countries.

** Other: detachment of staff to external organisations, participation of staff members in external, paid (advisory) committees, advisory assessments for external organisations.

Table 4. PhD success rates

Enrollment				Success rates					
Starting year	Enrollment male	Enrollment female	Total	Graduated in year 4 or earlier	Graduated in year 5	Graduated in year 6	Graduated in year 7	Not yet finished	Discontinued
2007	2	2	4	0,0%	50,0%	50,0%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%
2008	2	8	10	0,0%	10,0%	10,0%	20,0%	50,0%	10,0%
2009	2	6	8	0,0%	0,0%	50,0%	12,5%	25,0%	12,5%
2010	3	5	8	12,5%	25,0%	37,5%	0,0%	12,5%	12,5%
2011	3	6	9	0,0%	11,1%	0,0%	0,0%	88,9%	0,0%
2012	3	11	14	7,1%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	78,6%	14,3%

Appendix 4: Explanation of the SEP scores

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

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

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

- Viability:
 - the strategy that the research unit intends to pursue in the years ahead and the extent to which it is capable of meeting its targets in research and society during this period;
 - the governance and leadership skills of the research unit's management.

Category and meaning	Research quality	Relevance to society	Viability
World leading/excellent (1)	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
Very Good (2)	The research unit conducts very good, internationally recognised research	The research unit makes a very good contribution to society	The research unit is very well equipped for the future
Good (3)	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
Unsatisfactory (4)	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