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Preface

This report embodies the findings and recommendations of an international peer review of Tilburg Law School undertaken on October 3 and 4 and on December 2, 2016.

The assessments were based on a self-evaluation report provided by TLS. This review report is both prospective and retrospective and resulted in several recommendations.

As chair I wish to thank my fellow evaluators for their expert and sincere contributions to the discussions and final findings. The work was not only intense but also socially agreeable and academically rewarding.

We thank all members of TLS, staff, PhD students, researchers and professors, for their open and constructive participation in the review process.

We hope this report to be the beginning of another successful period of very good research and PhD education in TLS.

March 7, 2017

Prof. Paul van der Heijden
Chair
1. Introduction

1.1 The evaluation

All publicly funded university research in the Netherlands is evaluated at regular intervals in compliance with the national standard evaluation protocol (SEP 2015-2021), as agreed by the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU), the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) and the Netherlands Academy of Sciences (KNAW). The evaluation process, which is applied at the research unit level, consists of a systematic external peer review conducted every six years, based on an internal self-reflection, focused on what is achieved since the last external peer review.

The evaluation system aims to achieve three generic objectives:
- *improvement* in the quality of research through an assessment carried out according to international standards of quality and relevance;
- *improvement* in research management and leadership; and
- *accountability* to the higher management levels of the research organisations and to the funding agencies, government and society at large.

1.2 The assessment procedure

The evaluation procedures followed by the Review Committee were those set out in the NWO/VSNU/KNAW “Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021 for public research organizations” (SEP). The research is assessed on the three assessment criteria requested by the SEP: research quality, relevance to society, and viability. In the text, the most important considerations of the committee should be clarified, while the conclusion should be summarized in a single term according to a four-point scale (annex 1). The three criteria should always be reviewed in relation to the school’s mission.

The assessment was based on and supported by three main components of evidence:

- Self-evaluation reports detailing the operation, management, research activities, and SWOT analysis of the Tilburg Law School and of its 10 research programs; these self-evaluation reports were written as prescribed in the national standard evaluation protocol;
- An overview of the output of each research program to allow the Committee to examine the quality of the published work;
- Discussions with boards, researchers, PhD students and council, academic staff and research managers about the work programs, the aims and the strategy for the future of the research programmes.

The site visit was undertaken on October 3 and 4, 2016 and consisted of several components, which can be summarised as follows (see annex 2):

- Meeting with the Tilburg Law School Board and the Rector Magnificus of Tilburg University
- Meetings with 12 Program Managers
- Presentation Showcase TSPPA and CTLD
- Presentation Showcase ReflecT
- Meeting with JOB Committee
The Peer Review Committee comprised of:

- P.F. (Paul) van der Heijden, Chair, Leiden University, Faculty of Law
- K. (Kurt) Deketelaere, University Leuven, LERU
- M.W. (Mark) Janis, UCONN School of Law
- F.L. (Frans) Leeuw, WODC, Ministerie van Veiligheid en Justitie and Maastricht University
- S.F.M. (Sylvia) Wortmann, Raad van State
- F.A.J. (Frans) van Steijn acted as independent secretary to the committee.

Prof. Janis advised the committee in absence and visited Tilburg Law School separately on December 2 2016.

1.3 Results of the assessment

This report summarises the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the international peer review of the research programme of Tilburg Law School. The peer review covered the period between 2009 and 2015. The written and oral information permitted a good understanding of the research institute. The assessment was based and weighted according to the rationale explained in annex 1. The conclusions, as given in chapters 3 and 4 of this report, follow the structure and the criteria which are formulated in the Terms of Reference, annex 2. Chapter 3 elaborates on the performance of TLS research. Chapter 4 gives an impression of the PhD training programme and integrity policy of TLS.

1.4 Quality of the information

During the site visit, the committee was provided with additional information and with the presentations of selected research groups. The information consisted of:

- Self-assessment report by Tilburg Law School with comprehensive information on TLS (173 pages).

The following additional information was also provided

- Folder: Kernpublicaties Full text selected publications
- Folder: Publicatielijsten List of Publications
- Folder: TGLS (Tilburg Graduate Law School) List PhD's
- List Scientific Staff
- Disciplineprotocol evaluatie rechtswetenschappelijk onderzoek
- Programme site visit
During and after the site visit, the committee received upon request:
- Facts TLS tbv Visitatie
- TiU-regeling onderzoeksdatamanagement

The committee finds the information ample, honest and adequate.
2 Structure, organisation and mission of Tilburg Law School

2.1 Introduction
Research in the Tilburg Law School is organised in ten research programmes that address law in a global context. These programmes have international and multidisciplinary perspectives, as well as a focus on methodology. The research is rooted in the core areas of law and legal doctrine of international law, human rights law, criminal law, private law, company law, environmental, administrative and constitutional law, tax law and labour law. In addition to research concerning the different legal disciplines, TLS’s research is deliberately interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary orientated. Law and economics, law and technology, law and sociology, law and victimology are also considered as core research business. This is the basis on which research programmes and institutes have evolved and continue to evolve in new and innovative themes. This development has been dynamic and organic, and largely bottom up rather than top down. The competences of Tilburg Law School and the research climate enable them to develop and follow a responsive and innovative strategy to new societal challenges and developments, as for example, the newly launched research and education theme of Public Governance.

2.2 Management and organization
Since 2013, Prof. Corien Prins has been Dean of the Tilburg Law School. Her predecessor was Prof. Randall Lesaffer (2009–2012). The research organisation is headed by the Academic Director, Prof. Ton Wilthagen, who as Vice-Dean for Research and Valorisation is also a member of the Faculty Board. Prof. Ton Wilthagen was preceded by Prof. Han Somsen (2011-2015) and Prof. Jonathan Verschuuren (2008- 2011). The Faculty Board consults with the research programme managers and research coordinators on strategic and financial issues relating to research several times a year.

Research in TLS is organised in ten research institutes, centres or groups, each with its own research programme and each led by a programme manager and a research coordinator. Coordination is ensured through regular consultation of the research coordinators and programme management including the heads of department. Tilburg’s relatively large research capacity is based on a business model that has been successful in attracting significant external funding.

Research Institutes/Programmes/Centres
- Centre for Transboundary Legal Development (CTLD) – Prof. Jonathan Verschuuren
- Tilburg Institute for Private Law (TIP) – Prof. Vanessa Mak
- Research Group of Criminal Law – Prof. Tijs Kooijmans
- Research Group Constitutional Dialogues - Prof. Anne Meuwese
- Tilburg School of Politics and Public Administration - Prof. Frank Hendriks
- Tilburg Institute for Law, Technology and Society (TILT) - Prof. Ronald Leenes
- Centre for Company Law (CCL) - Prof. Peter Essers and Prof. Joe McCahery

1 Text based on the TLS Self-assessment report
The International Victimology Institute Tilburg (INTERVICT) and the Tilburg Law and Economics Centre (TILEC) have been granted the status of Centre of Excellence by the Executive Board of Tilburg University with the objective of continuing to be leaders nationally and internationally in their research areas. Research is carried out in an organisation and environment that fosters diversity. As well as legal scholars, researchers from other disciplines, including economists, sociologists, psychologists, ethicists, and philosophers participate in the various programmes in the research centres and groups. Many researchers come from other countries in Europe and from countries around the world.

Tilburg Graduate Law School (TGLS) is responsible for the training and supervision of PhDs and Research Master’s students.

2.3 Mission and strategy of Tilburg Law School

Tilburg Law School (TLS) was established in 1963 as a faculty in the Roman Catholic Business School (Roomsch-Katholieke Handelshoogeschool) founded in 1927 by the priest-economist Martinus Cobbenhagen. The new faculty offered a broad curriculum covering all legal disciplines and including mandatory training in philosophy. The inclusion of philosophy is distinctive of the Tilburg approach, with a strong focus on the foundations of law and legal systems. The DNA of the TLS embodies Martinus Cobbenhagen’s vision and mission of a strong orientation to society and societal issues, and a quest to balance efficiency and equity. The new law faculty included the discipline of social law. This profile has been further strengthened over the last 50 years with significant growth in student numbers, international students and research capacity.

In 1991, the research and research strategy were institutionalised and further professionalised with the launch of the Schoordijk Research Centre, which was also responsible for PhD education and training. These responsibilities have now been taken over by Tilburg Institute for Legal Research (TIRO) and Tilburg Graduate Law School (TGLS).

Strategic choices since the late 1980s have led to an increasing focus on internationalisation and comparative legal studies. This strong emphasis results from growing awareness of the impact of international legal orders and jurisprudence on Dutch legal order and legal practice. Recent interest in the emergence, nature and operation of global legal systems is exemplified in the initiative of faculty members to launch the Global Law Series with Cambridge University Press in 2015.

The TLS approach has a sharp focus on research methodology. A transition has been made from methodological monism that is suitable for research on traditional national dogmatic law to methodological pluralism needed for dealing with different legal systems with the aid of different disciplines. This transition has led to the strategic promotion of an interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approach to law, as reflected in the multidisciplinary research
centres and centres of excellence. These centres include INTERVICT for the study of victimology, and TILEC for the study of law and economics. In Tilburg, sound methodology and a broader multidisciplinary and empirical approach to legal science are considered essential to gaining insight into the fundamentals of law and governance. A methodological and multidisciplinary approach is also required in international comparisons to gain an understanding of the circumstances that lead to differences and similarities among legal systems and cultures. TLS is strongly research driven with ample capacity for fundamental research. TLS research profile is also maintained and developed in the PhD education, support and monitor system in the Graduate School, and in the Research Master’s in Law. The research master’s degree is a joint initiative with KU Leuven Faculty of Law School, where a core activity is the development of research skills and the application of sound methodology. TLS offers support for personal grant applications through the Dutch Scientific Research Council NWO (Veni, Vidi, Vici), European Research Grants and tenders for EU programmes, such as Horizon 2020.
3 Assessment of Tilburg Law School research

University
Research Institute
Leaders research institute
Research input tenured staff 2015

Tilburg University
Tilburg Law School
Prof. Corien Prins, Prof. Ton Wilthagen
54.15 FTE (154 researchers)

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

3.2 Research quality
With its currently ten research programmes, TLS forms a relatively large law research facility—compared to other law schools in the Netherlands—that achieves overall and on average very good results. The ten programmes are described in more detail below.

The committee supports fully the strategic choices TLS has made: focus on methodology and methodological strictness and emphasize international and inter- and multidisciplinary research. However, in her discussions with the programme leaders the committee was not convinced that methodology is consistently at the forefront of each researcher and addressed thoroughly in every research design. The methodological challenge posed by the imminent availability of big data and data-related new analytical tools is recognized by TLS, but is yet insufficiently incorporated throughout TLS research.

Inter- and multidisciplinarity appears more in TLS research as a challenge than as an achievement so far. Carrying out research across more disciplines than law is a commendable, but not easily achieved objective; TLS must strive for more visible results in this respect.

TLS’ ten research programmes run the ‘risk of fragmentation and vulnerability’ as the self-assessment admits on page 14. The committee advises TLS to confront this risk in internal open discussions to take steps that go further than those already taken after the mid-term review in 2013. The relative lack of focus and coherence, and the large diversity, are conceivably the result of the at TLS cherished bottom-up research policy approach in which ‘1000 flowers may blossom’. This leads to a number of very good research groups, but also to some who do not fully merit that qualification. The committee recommends to choose more vigorously for those research areas where TLS already is very strong. That might mean less bottom-up decision making and a more top-down approach, the pros and cons of which must be weighed carefully.

The faculty’s research quality assurance mechanism Competitieve Onderzoeks Financiering, Competitive Research Funding (COF) is applied by the Jury voor de Onderzoeks Beoordelingen (JOB, Jury for Research Evaluations). The committee was impressed with the transparent and rigorous way the JOB operates in assessing the academic qualities of all individual researchers in TLS on a four-year basis. The JOB appears well equipped to recognize international, interdisciplinary contributions in high quality journals, but the committee advises
to take this one step further by identifying those journals in a list of high quality journals, to be used as a strong indication not as an obligation.

On average 8% of TLS funding consisted of research grants in the review period: five NWO Veni grants, three Vidi and one Vici grant, one NWO Aspasia grant, four Marie Skłodowska Curie fellowships (EU) and one Lorentz fellowship (NIAS). The committee feels that—given the quality and size of the TLS research activities—more concerted actions might result in a greater success in the European research grant programmes.

3.3 Relevance to society

Tilburg Law School operates well within the Tilburg tradition of concern for societal needs. TLS’ efforts to be relevant for society are solid and TLS’s research has a substantial and noticeable impact. TLS recognizes the possibilities for legal innovation, national and global, and acts accordingly in research programme policies and with an impressive variety of outreach activities of high quality. The committee has doubts whether this very good societal relevance stature should be defined further by the narrower concept of ‘valorisation’, especially when this is implemented on the level of the individual researchers. The committee recommends that TLS implement ‘relevance’ or ‘impact’ as a research policy on the macro-level of TLS, or the meso-level of the research programmes.

3.4 Viability

Tilburg Law School has shown to be innovative e.g. with introducing global law and big data science. TLS’s viability is definitely very good, and bears possible excellence. The way it reacts to developments in legal research, in societal and technological innovations and in demands for academic education (e.g. global law), is probably too much bottom-up, following the choices and appointments of individual researchers. For TLS to become really excellent, it must focus rigorously on those areas and research tracks, where it may become really excellent.

3.5 TLS research programmes

Tilburg Institute for Law and Technology (TILT)

TILT focuses on understanding the mutual shaping of regulation, technology and normative notions. This is also the title of two research programs that are relevant for the assessment. The research questions studied are descriptive (like: what are the processes underlying the interaction of legislation, other rules, technologies, norms, values, behaviour), explanatory (when, why and how do new rules or technologies develop) and design-oriented (how to develop answers for the interplay between variations of rules, technologies and normative notions). Three spearheads are, within this context, developed: privacy and data protection, cyber-crime and cyber security and e-health and e-coaching. The logic underlying the research programme, core questions, spearheads and societal relevance is well articulated and persuasive.

The programmes are impressive in their societal and scientific relevance, the studies published, grants obtained and international collaboration. The case study presented to the committee (Vici-grant on privacy protection in the 21th century where new types of privacy and the ‘cybernetic home’ were articulated and researched), was very informative. TILT’s NWO grants (Vici and Veni) and Marie Curie fellowship are worth mentioning.
TILT has been a forerunner in the domain of law and technology and is with its several dozens of staff a key player in the field. It is to be expected that given developments around the Internet of Things, robotization, interactions between brain and cognition research and cyber developments (e.g. brain jacking; medical cyber-crimes) there will be many crucial future challenges to be investigated by TILT. Given the centre’s capacity to obtain funds for applied and more curiosity driven studies over the last years, continuation of the excellent level of work is to be expected. The committee suggests that given Tilburg’s orientation on linking Big Data (Analytics/ Developments) to the Law, together with TuEindhoven, further investing in TILT as University/Faculty would be an excellent choice.

Tilburg Law and Economics Centre (Tilec)
The Tilburg Law and Economics Centre (Tilec) dates to 2003 and is recognized by The Tilburg University Board as Centre of Excellence. And rightly so. Tilec has an outstanding record of past assessments and could continue its excellence over the period 2009-2016. Research output takes place in well-known top journals in the field and the publications are frequently a co-production of lawyers and economists, as you may expect of an interdisciplinary research centre. Not clear however is what policy has been developed on the issue of co-production. Is co-production of lawyers and economists a coincidence or is there a strong policy in place to stimulate these co-productions. For a real interdisciplinary centre, such a policy is of vital significance
Tilec succeeded in achieving NWO Grants, like Veni, Vidi and Vici. As the only Research Centre of TLS, it managed to win each of these. Missing here unfortunately are grants from the ERC like Starting Grants and/or Advanced Grants. Those are missing signs and tokens of international excellence. Societal relevance is very high, as the Centre rightly observes in its self-assessment. Many researchers are participating in policy debates and development.
Concerning viability Tilec is mentioning in its self-assessment various critical points. Specifically, the challenges to be a fully interdisciplinary centre in a still monodisciplinary environment are tough. Also, the mentioned fatigue of older researchers in fighting for interdisciplinary results is worrying. As the overall policy of TLS is engaging in interdisciplinary research a new élan is needed for Tilec here.

Public Law, Legal History and Jurisprudence
Public Law is a relatively small research group with a research programme titled “Constitutional Dialogues”. This research programme is the follow up to the now-dissolved Centre for the Study of Legislation (Centrum voor Wetgevingsvraagstukken).
“Dialogue” is a rather vague and broad concept, encompassing all the research done within this group. This does not diminish the quality of research done; to the contrary, the research is sometimes of excellent quality. But it does mean that the rather broad concept lacks focus, with the result that coherence between the research projects is difficult to find.

---

2 This remark reflects the situation in the reviewed period. In January 2017 TILEC researchers Delimatsis and Suetens received an ERC Consolidator Grant.
According to the committee, the small size of the research group in combination with the breadth of research programme focus threatens the viability of the group. The group itself recognizes it is essential to join forces with other public law related research groups in TLS. The committee stresses the need for the joining of forces.

**Tilburg School of Politics and Public Administration (TSPPA)**

TSPPA is ‘in an excellent position to combine theories and findings from multiple disciplines’ (see p. 102 Self-assessment). How true this may be, it was not clear to the committee how deep and wide the collaboration is and has been with other centres of TLS. The ‘big ambitions and the small staff’- weakness (p. 105) may increase this problem as there is a risk that researchers focus more on their ‘own problems’ than on issues that regard TLS and its (innovation) agenda in general. The show case on ‘Best Persons’ presented to the committee raised concern. Questions asked on how the Best Persons project, its methodology and approach and its data were linked to overarching questions of TLS, to innovation (as articulated by the Rector and Dean) remained unclear. The societal role of one of the professors is important, high-level and innovative.

**Reflect & Labour Law and Social Policy (LLSP)**

This research centre on Labour Market Dynamics, Employment Regulation and Flexicurity Outcomes started a new program under the above-mentioned title in 2014. Before 2014 Reflect on the one hand and Labour Law at the other were separate departments.

As from 2014 the two groups finally agreed upon a joint research program, which is an important and necessary step to achieve the goal of real interdisciplinary research between (mainly) social sciences and labour/social security law. The start of the new joined program is promising, but it is early day’s to really assess the research results.

Based on the strong scientific reputation of the researchers involved, high hopes are well based. Also, the output of research in the period 2009-2016 is of high quality, but, understandably, not so much interdisciplinary. It will require strong leadership to achieve the ambitious goals of the program.

Societal relevance of the group is very high. Members of the research centre are actively and heavily involved and participating in the development of social policy in the region, the country and the EU. It seems a challenge to save time for research on top of the time spent to societal policy development. And apart from time that must be dedicated to education, where in the self-assessment is the heavy teaching load is mentioned.

Concerning viability much will depend on the leadership. The program is sound, the researchers are of very high quality, but organising real interdisciplinary and satisfying progress in achieving the goals set, will be a huge challenge if the planned interdisciplinary top research comes on top of many other activities. Focussing, time management and extension of human resources seems of utmost importance here.

**Centre for Company Law (CCL)**

The Centre for Company Law (CCL) is a research centre that combines research in the fields of corporate, securities, and tax law. Its current research program is focused on developing a coherent system of business law from the perspective of private law and tax law. The program has five research lines.
The CCL has indeed a strong output in research quality and quantity as it observes itself in the SWOT analysis. Given the well-known difficulties at the labour market specially to attract and keep high level tax lawyers and company lawyers it is quite an achievement to reach these outstanding academic research results.

The CCL is very internationally orientated and active. It participates in various high level international research groups. It also cooperates successfully with the Tilburg economics department and its management school.

Societal relevance of the centre is high, and based upon firm and steady contacts with the relevant players in the field, as e.g. the DNB, leading law and tax firms etc.

Concerning the viability of the research program is not much to say, given the end of it in 2016 and lack of knowledge in the committee about a new program. Based on past performance the committee has high confidence in the continuation of the very high level of the research.

**Centre for Transboundary Legal Development (CTLD)**

CTLD is a big research centre with almost 50 scholars and covering a very broad set of research topics. The present research program “Charting the Global Legal Pathways” (2013-2016) focuses on the study of law in an era of globalisation, in which traditional state-centred paradigms of national and international law are no longer perceived as the main loci of regulatory actions. This research program is divided into four substantive domains: environmental law; global justice and human rights; innovation and competition in an EU context; nature of legal order.

Based on the size of the research staff and the number of topics covered, the committee wonders to what extent one or more of the substantive domains should not be transferred to another research programme like, e.g., Constitutional Dialogues or Law and Economics. Achieving coherence and cooperation of the large number of participating researchers, has proven to be a challenge and a weakness of CTLD. At the same time, this broadness and diversity of topics (and their often fast development) also questions the unique research profile of CTLD, and the depth of the ongoing research. Focus and priority setting is a necessity.

CTLD is, across the board, delivering very good, internationally recognised research. It is fair to say that the group on environmental law is probably (becoming) one of the most influential research groups in the world in its domain.

CTLD researchers have yielded an impressive number of publications in international and European law journals and with international academic publishers. Several of them are also on the editorial boards of leading journals, and have obtained significant amounts of European or national research funding, and (supra)national research awards.

Regarding the publications, it is however not always clear or manifest to what extent they are fully multidisciplinary and functional, being the two methodological starting points for the CTLD research. Sometimes the publications are outstanding but disciplinary and traditional legal.

Most of the CTLD research makes a very good contribution to society. Membership of public institutions, involvement in societal debates on grand societal challenges, and specific contract research by CTLD researchers, guarantees a significant societal relevance of the research work done.
As such, CTLD is very well equipped for the future: there is a strong group of researchers, a strong record of PhD defences, a large number of publications, and there is a significant success in obtaining external research funding. Nonetheless, as indicated above, CTLD could perform even stronger and be even more viable if it prioritises and deepens its research activities and investments. By way of example, nothing prevents the environmental law group to become a world leading group, if this prioritisation and deepening takes place.

**Tilburg Institute for Private Law (TIP)**

TIP was established in 2015 – at the end of the review period. TIP replaces TISCO (Tilburg Institute for Interdisciplinary Studies of Civil Law and Conflict Resolution Systems). As of 2016, TIP has been merged with the research group on Methodology of Law and Legal Research (RGMLL). The committee strongly supports the merger of TIP and RGMLL to strengthen the methodological profile of the group. The research group itself recognizes the threat posed by the merging of the two groups. The committee emphasises this threat. The narrative on how this merger will be established is not clear. The research output quality and quantity has been very good, and sometimes even excellent, especially in the fields of doctrinal research on Dutch Law and methodology of Law and Legal Research. The research approach on methodological questions, with focus on empirical and interdisciplinary research, has not been apparent in the achievements in the reviewed years. For the coming years, this focus is a huge challenge. Furthermore, for the coming years the TIP research programme will focus on the interplay of Dutch private law order with international legal orders, addressing questions on the responsiveness of the private law system. This is a broad mandate. An increased focus provides an opportunity to join forces, aiming at achieving excellence in this research.

**International Victimology Institute Tilburg (Intervict)**

Without doubt, Intervict has been an innovative, agenda-setting institute. Its current research program ("Examining Injustice: homogeneity and heterogeneity in experience of and reaction to victimisation by crime") is an important field of study. However, as across jurisdictions the position of victims in criminal justice is becoming a more prominent social concern (p. 56 of the self-assessment) while in several jurisdictions the victim’s position indeed has been strengthened, the challenge for Intervict to continue as an innovative centre of excellence is serious. Somewhat related to this point is that, as the self-assessment indicates, incorporating insights from different disciplines, appears to be restricted to law and social sciences. However, over the last five years, attention to brain & cognition studies, social neurosciences, including bio-markers research, has become more and more important, also in the field of victimisation, resilience, stress etc. The committee has not perceived the relationship with these developments. What appears to be a special focus of Intervict, to follow a more qualitative research approach (‘stories’; ‘narratives’) is not explained. The presentation of the showcase of Intervict to the committee was interesting, but not convincing in terms of its methodology. The future of Intervict may be complicated, with scholars like Letschert and Van Dijk having left and because of budgetary problems, notwithstanding the group’s success in attracting a Veni and Vici grant. The committee strongly recommends the institute to rethink (implicit) methodological choices, broaden the victim’s
approach to also the cyber world and link with new social neurosciences insights, methods and theories.

**Criminal Law**

The research program ("fading boundaries in the Dutch criminal justice system") covers many disciplines. Changes over the last years have been taking place (like adding a new focus on financial criminal law and environmental crime). Studies of rather different nature are carried out under this heading. The focus in terms of methodology is on qualitative studies. The committee is critical regarding the coherence of this program; the reasons why problems are studied (like match fixing) are not very clear, nor how they are related to overarching questions within criminology/criminal justice research and societal demands. The committee also wondered why –apparently- attention paid to cyber-crime (a serious topic of TILT) is not at all mentioned and/or discussed by the Criminal Law group. As this field is rapidly increasing in societal relevance and in need of more high-quality research by criminal legal scholars, the committee considers this a serious point of critique. The committee also noticed that links with another rapidly developing and relevant field (that of theories, research and methods applying insights from social neurosciences and recent empirical studies in this field), are missing as a point of reference.

Neither is the committee convinced that a focus on qualitative methods is productive, given the more general, overarching attention TLS pays to working with Big Data. The committee has the impression that in criminology research methodological choices are based on individual competences instead on what is needed from a primarily methodological perspective.

Claims regarding the interdisciplinary character of the program have not convinced the committee. In the SWOT analysis, the relative smallness of the research staff is mentioned as a threat. It would have been wise to join forces (intellectual and in terms of work capacity) with TILT and others, when criminal justice and (cyber) crime are at stake. Now the development of crime and penal justice work largely remains an ‘island’.

Page 44 claims that the program now is "less fragmented and more streamlined" since 2011. The committee found no evidence underpinning this claim.

**3.6 Scope of the assessment and recommendations**

The committee was asked to evaluate the research performance of Tilburg Law School—as one institute—as well as its strategic targets and the extent to which it is equipped to achieve them (see the Terms of Reference, Annex 2). The site visit was arranged accordingly and therefore included interviews with the research managers/group leaders in a collective setting only. Nevertheless, since TLS’ research is organized and planned in its ten research programmes/centres, the committee includes brief evaluations of these ten programmes to assess the extent to which TLS’ objectives are achieved. These goals were: to operate in an interdisciplinary setting, to conduct research in an international perspective, to be highly responsive to societal questions and needs, and to conduct research with methodological rigour. The committee found that these objectives and strategic choices by TLS, commendable as they are, were achieved mainly through the choices and performance of individual researchers, rather than through a consistent policy, required and implemented by TLS as an institute. The institute lacked clear-cut goals to be achieved over the review period of 6 years, so the committee was not able to assess to what extent TLS has lived up
to its expectations. The committee strongly advises to formulate TLS-wide objectives for the next 6 years, which by nature implies an implementation strategy that exceeds individual or exclusively programme-related choices. The committee recognizes this would imply another balance between top-down and bottom-up strategic processes. The objectives for the next 6 years that the committee recommends are: to become truly interdisciplinary, to conduct research that is relevant both in a national and an international context, and to implement an institute-wide methodological vision on legal research (empirical and normative). TLS is recognized for its societal relevance, also by the committee, but the overall lack of focus—in research themes, programmes and relevant societal strata—requires a stronger programming, strategy and choices. TLS should therefore restrict its research rather to half of the present number of programmes/themes, than continuing its ‘1000 flower’ policy.
4 Performance of Tilburg Graduate Law School

4.1 Research School

Tilburg Graduate Law School (TGLS) is responsible for the PhD programmes at TLS. The School is headed by the Director of Studies, who is supported by two PhD coordinators/PhD Deans (0.9 FTE) and three support staff (1.5 FTE). The PhD students themselves are embedded in the research groups. The PhD Council of Tilburg Law School represents the PhD’s; the council has a separate budget for its activities.

TGLS appears a well-managed graduate school that forms its policies and conducts on well-designed studies. Assessments are carried out by competent experts resulting in recommendations for TLS-wide policies and guidelines for supervisors.

4.2 The research environment for the PhD programme

The committee recognizes the TLS research programmes as a stimulating environment for PhD research projects. PhD students are generally well supervised and coached by their—obligatory—two supervisors, but where they may need expertise and coaching from outside the law school, they sometimes encounter obstacles. In a few cases, PhD students criticize their supervisor(s), but changing their supervisory arrangement appears difficult.

4.3 PhD training and education programme

Of the 85 PhD’s who started their doctoral project between 2007 and 2014, less than half had done their undergraduate studies in Tilburg (48%), and 25 had completed the Tilburg Research Master’s in Law (30%). Of these cohorts, 41% of PhD’s came from countries outside the Netherlands, and 90% wrote their dissertation in English. The gender balance of PhD’s has been roughly equal in recent years (53% men and 47% women).

A major challenge inherent to the PhD programme is the variety of entry qualifications of the candidates. Some have completed a research master’s degree while others, notably the international scholarship holders, are accepted based on their talent and potential. The current curriculum emphasizes transferable and generic skills. In addition, the curriculum includes substantive law courses, although the range is limited and subject to change. The school is currently developing a new and more robust range of courses. TGLS is developing a curriculum for external PhD’s, scholarship holders and PhD’s without a research master background.

Not much more than half of the PhD’s will have an academic career, so TGLS also prepares the PhD-students for labour markets outside the universities. The completion rates of TGLS’s PhD’s within 5 years are somewhat above 50% (except for the 2009 cohort, only 30%), which seems satisfactory, but still needs improvement. The committee advises to articulate a clear objective for the completion rates of the PhD’s for the next review period of 6 years.

4.4 Recommendations

The committee proposes that TLS implement the recommendations of the TGLS Board in the research groups with more firmness. ‘Supervising the supervisors’,
however difficult this sometimes may prove, will require interventions not only from the graduate school board, but also from the TLS leadership. The committee endorses TGLS’s plans to involve outside (methodologic) expertise in earlier stages of the PhD research trajectory to avoid problems at the end of the PhD projects.

4.5 Research integrity

Tilburg Law School conforms to the Tilburg University and national policies with respect to research integrity issues. As of 2016, all members of the academic staff sign a statement declaring their commitment to the national code of conduct for scientific practice. The research jury JOB inspects overall the TLS output and emphasises quality above quantity, thereby reducing the chances of inappropriate research and publication conduct.

Recently, Tilburg University started designing a guideline for correct management of research data to fulfil integrity and open access requirements. By the end of 2017 all Tilburg University researchers must have adopted these new guidelines.
Annex 1 Criteria and scores of national protocol SEP

Criterion 1: Research quality
The committee assesses the quality of the institute’s research and the contribution that research makes to the body of scientific knowledge. The committee also assesses the scale of the research results (scientific publications, instruments and infrastructure developed by the institute, and other contributions to science). The following elements are to be considered in assessing this criterion:
- scientific quality
- productivity to the scientific community (in relation to the volume of the tenured scientific staff)
- the academic reputation of the institute
- the strategy to provide the output at the highest relevant level possible

Criterion 2: Relevance to society
The committee assesses the quality, scale and relevance of contributions targeting specific economic, social, or cultural target groups, of advisory reports for policy, of contributions to public debates, and so on. The point is to assess contributions in areas that the institute has itself designated as target areas. The following elements are to be considered in assessing this criterion:
- a narrative in which the group demonstrates its relevance for society
- research products for societal target groups
- use of research products by societal groups such as patents, licences, training courses; projects in cooperation with societal partners (European Union, Topsectoren, international funds); contract research (including consultancies), also co-publications and use of facilities; present jobs of alumni
- demonstrable marks of recognition by societal groups such as demonstrated by: advisory reports for the government; media exposure as presentations on radio / TV, invited opinion articles etc.; membership societal advisory boards

Criterion 3: Viability
The committee assesses the strategy that the institute 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. It also considers the governance and leadership skills of the institute’s management.
The meaning of the scores for the three main assessment criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Research quality</th>
<th>Relevance to society</th>
<th>Viability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Excellent / world leading</td>
<td>One of the few most influential research groups in the world in its particular field</td>
<td>An outstanding contribution to society</td>
<td>Excellently equipped for the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>Very good, internationally recognized research</td>
<td>A very good contribution to society</td>
<td>Very well equipped for the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good research</td>
<td>Makes a good contribution to society</td>
<td>Makes responsible strategic decisions and is therefore well equipped for the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Does not achieve satisfactory results in its field</td>
<td>Does not make a satisfactory contribution to society</td>
<td>Not adequately equipped for the future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2 Terms of Reference

The board of Tilburg University hereby issues the following Terms of Reference to the assessment committee of Tilburg Law School, chaired by Professor P.F. van der Heijden.

You are being asked to assess the quality and relevance to society of the research conducted by Tilburg Law School as well as its strategic targets and the extent to which it is equipped to achieve them. You are asked to do so by judging the unit’s (i.e. Tilburg Law School) performance on the three Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) assessment criteria (a. to c.) below. Please be sure to take into account current international trends and developments in science and society in your analysis.

a. Research quality
b. Relevance to society
c. Viability

For a description of these criteria, see Section 2 of the SEP. In addition to the SEP there is a discipline protocol for the Law Schools. Please provide a written assessment on each of the three criteria and assign Tilburg Law School to a particular a category (1, 2, 3 or 4) in each case, in accordance with the SEP guidelines. Please also provide recommendations for improvement. In this protocol, indicators of research quality explicitly include such output as instruments and infrastructure developed by the research unit.

We ask you to pay special attention to the two aspects below in your assessment:

1. Internationalization and international position of TLS’ research
2. Multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary nature of research organization and research output
3. Knowledge valorization (also in relation to societal organizations, institutions and companies)

In addition, we would like your report to provide a qualitative assessment of Tilburg Law School as a whole in relation to its strategic targets and research mission and to the governance, leadership skills of its management. Please also make recommendations concerning these two subjects.

In accordance with the SEP, please also reflect on the following two aspects in your report:

a. PhD programs
b. Research integrity

Documentation
The necessary documentation will be available on the secure website https://surfdrive.surf.nl/ no less than 8 weeks prior to the site visit.
The documents will include at least the following:
- self-assessment with appendices
- description of the research programs within TLS
- previous external evaluations

Site visit
The site visit at Tilburg Law School will take place on October 3th and 4th 2016. We will contact you about logistical matters and the programme for the site visit.
Statement of impartiality
Before embarking on your assessment work, you will be asked to sign a statement of impartiality. In this statement, you declare that you have no direct relationship or connection with Tilburg Law School.

Assessment report
We kindly ask you to report your findings in an assessment report drawn up in accordance with the SEP guidelines and format. We expect the draft report to Tilburg Law School no more than 8 weeks after the site visit. Tilburg Law School will check the report for factual inaccuracies; if such inaccuracies are detected, we will see that they are corrected and return the draft report to you. We then ask you to send the final version of the assessment report to the board.
### Annex 3 Research data Tilburg Law School

#### Research Staff (FTE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors (HGL)</td>
<td>19,37</td>
<td>18,63</td>
<td>18,92</td>
<td>17,93</td>
<td>20,29</td>
<td>19,62</td>
<td>20,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professors (UHD)</td>
<td>9,52</td>
<td>8,24</td>
<td>7,56</td>
<td>8,36</td>
<td>6,44</td>
<td>6,56</td>
<td>7,12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors (UD)</td>
<td>12,4</td>
<td>11,96</td>
<td>11,60</td>
<td>11,24</td>
<td>11,52</td>
<td>11,20</td>
<td>12,84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>26,68</td>
<td>24,24</td>
<td>18,76</td>
<td>19,28</td>
<td>17,84</td>
<td>54,66</td>
<td>54,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total staff + researchers</td>
<td>66,97</td>
<td>63,07</td>
<td>56,84</td>
<td>56,81</td>
<td>56,09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PhD students (#)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhD students</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Research Output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book chapters</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD theses</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. publications</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General public publ.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total publ.</td>
<td>1112</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Research Funding (x € 1000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct funding</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res. grants</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract res.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PhD success rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male #</th>
<th>Female #</th>
<th>Total #</th>
<th>Grad ≤4</th>
<th>Grad ≤4.5%</th>
<th>Grad ≤5%</th>
<th>Grad ≤5.5%</th>
<th>Grad ≤6%</th>
<th>Grad ≤6.5%</th>
<th>Grad ≤7%</th>
<th>Grad ≤7.5%</th>
<th>Grad ≤8%</th>
<th>Not finished %</th>
<th>Not finished</th>
<th>Discontinued %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 4 Programme site visit Tilburg Law School

Site Visit Tilburg Law School, 3 and 4 October 2016 (Montesquieu Building, Rooms 10.01 and 10.03)

Monday 3 October 2016
10:00-11:30 Preparatory meeting of the committee
11:30-12:30 Meeting with the Tilburg Law School Board
Prof. Emile Aarts (Rector Magnificus)
Prof. Corien Prins (Dean)
Prof. Ton Wilthagen (Vice-Dean for Research)
Miranda Noordermeer, MA (Managing director)
Bob Soolingen (Student Advisor)
12:30-14:00 Lunch at the Faculty Club
14:00-15:15 Meeting with Program Managers [Cluster 1]
Prof. Hans Lindahl (CTLD)
Prof. Tijs Kooijmans (Criminal Law)
Prof. Anne Meuwese (Public Law, Jurisprudence and Legal History)
Prof. Frank Hendriks (TSPPA)
Prof. Antony Pemberton (INTERVICT)
15:15-15:45 Presentation Showcase TSPPA and CTLD
15:45-16:00 Coffee/Tea Break
16:00-17:15 Meeting with Program Managers [Cluster 2]
Prof. Ronald Leenes (TILT)
Prof. Vanessa Mak (TIP)
Prof. Panos Delimatsis (TILEC)
Prof. Ruud Muffels (ReflecT)
Prof. Mijke Houwerzijl (Labour Law and Social Policy)
Prof. Joe Mc Cahery (CCL)
Prof. Peter Essers (CCL)
17:15-17.45 Presentation Global Law League
17:45-18:00 Recapitulation First Findings day 1 (committee members)
18:00-18:30 A drink with the members of the Tilburg Law School Board
18:30-20:30 Dinner at Auberge du Bonheur (only committee members)
Tuesday 4 October 2016
09:00-09.30 Preparatory meeting of the committee members
09:30-10:15 Meeting with JOB Committee
  Prof. Maurice Adams
  Prof. Bert Jaap Koops
10:15-10:45 Presentation showcase TILT
10:45-11:00 Coffee/Tea Break
11:00-11:45 Meeting with Key Persons Tilburg Graduate Law School
  Dr. Hervé Tijsse
  Dr. Hans Sonneveld
  Dr. Leontien van der Knaap
  Koen van der Krieken
11:45-12:30 Meeting with PhD students
  Anne de Vries
  Jurgen Braspenning
  Thomas van Golen
  Ave-Geidi Jallai
  Koen van der Krieken
  Jana Verschoor
  Han Zhai
12:30-14:00 Lunch at the Faculty Club
14:00-14:30 Presentation Data Science (Daf Technology Lab)
14.30-14.45 Short Break (walk to the Faculty Lounge)
14:45-15:00 Presentation Intervict
15:00-15:30 Meeting with Valorization team
  René Voogt
  Marieke Schoots
  Ton Wilthagen
15:30-15:45 Coffee/Tea Break
15:45-16.15 Presentation Showcase ReflecT/TILEC
16:15-17:15 Preparation of First Findings by the committee members
17:15-18:00 Presentation of First Findings in Faculty Lounge

Friday 2 December 2016
14:00-17.00 Meeting committee member Mark Janis with:
  TLS Board
  Programme leaders
  PhD students
Annex 5 Curricula vitae of the Committee members

P.F. (Paul) van der Heijden (Chair)
Leiden University

Paul van der Heijden (1949) is professor of International Labour Law at Leiden University and visiting fellow of The Hague Institute for Global Justice. Since 2002 he is independent President of the ILO Governing Body Committee on Freedom of Association (CFA). From 1995 till 2001 he was head of the Dutch delegation to the International Labour Conference and in 1998 and 2000 Chair of the ILO Conference Committee on the Application of Standards (CAS). Van der Heijden chaired several High-Level Missions of ILO to member states with a view on better implementation and enforcement of ratified Conventions. Van der Heijden made a career as legal scholar at the Universities of Leiden and Amsterdam. He was professor of Labour Law at Amsterdam University from 1990 till 2007. He was co-creator and Chair of the interdisciplinary Amsterdam Institute for advanced labour studies. He also held the Jean Monnet Chair on European Employment Law at University of Bielefeld, Germany. He published several books and many articles, extensively in Dutch (labour) law journals, magazines and newspapers, and was editor-in-chief of several Dutch law journals. He commented regularly on radio and television about industrial relations, labour law, strikes etc.

He was also labour law adviser of the European Commission and published internationally on labour law, e.g. Beyond Employment, Changes in Work and the Future of Labour Law in Europe, Oxford University Press, 2001, together with Alain Supiot and others.

Van der Heijden is fellow of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences.
K. (Kurt) Deketelaere  
University Leuven, LERU

Kurt Deketelaere (1966) is since July 2009 the Secretary-General of the League of European Research Universities (LERU), an association of twenty-one leading research-intensive universities which promotes the interests of frontier research with the EU institutions. For his exemplary leadership of LERU, he is awarded a doctorate honoris causa by the University of Edinburgh in July 2017. Before joining LERU, he was the chief legal advisor (2004-2007) and the chief of staff (2007-2009) of the Flemish Minister for Public Works, Energy, Environment and Nature. Since 1995, he is also a professor of law (on part-time leave since 2007) at the University of Leuven, the university where he studied law (1984-1989), obtained his PhD in Law (1989-1995) and spent (until now) his whole academic career. Furthermore, he is an honorary professor of law at the University of Malta and the University of Dundee, was awarded the Hou-De Honorary Chair at the National Tsing Hua University in Taiwan, and has been a visiting professor of law at the Universities of London, Sydney, Singapore, Keio and Chuo. He is a member of the International Advisory Board of IE University (Madrid) and Humanitas University (Milano), the High Level Advisory Board of the Insight Foresight Institute (Madrid) and the International Leadership Advisory Board of the Centre for Learning Innovations and Customized Knowledge Solutions (Dubai). Upon the invitation of the European Commission he is a member of the Open Science Policy Platform and the ABS Consultation Forum. Kurt published extensively in the field of EU Environmental, Energy and Climate Change Law, and is the editor of several leading book series and journals in that field. Finally, he chairs the Board of Directors of the Flemish Energy Regulator (VREG), is chair of the Flemish Environmental Damages Commission, co-chair of the Malta Legal Forum on Adaptation to Climate Change, and is on the board of a number of profit (MRBB, AIF, AVEVE) and non-profit (I-Cleantech, VVBBCI) organisations in Belgium.

M.W. (Mark) Janis  
University of Connecticut School of Law

Mark Weston Janis (1947) is presently William F. Starr Professor of Law at the University of Connecticut School of Law and Visiting Fellow & Formerly Reader in Law at the University of Oxford. Born in Chicago and raised in Illinois and Michigan, he studied International Relations at Princeton (AB 1969), Jurisprudence at Oxford (BA 1972), and Law at Harvard (JD 1977). After service as a US Naval Officer (1972-1975), he was admitted to the New York Bar and practiced international financial and corporate law with Sullivan & Cromwell in New York and Paris (1977-1980). Alongside his permanent academic positions at Oxford and Connecticut, he has been a visiting professor at Cornell University, UCLA, the University of Paris I & XIII, the University of Aix-en-Provence, Tilburg University, the Max Planck Institute, the University of Muenster, the University of Mannheim, the Riga Graduate School of Law, and the University of International Business & Economics (Beijing). He is the author of more than twenty books, including International Law (7th ed. 2016), European Human Rights Law with Kay & Bradley (3d ed. 2008), International Law Cases & Materials with Noyes (5th ed. 2014), Religion and International Law with Evans (2d ed. 2004), and America and the Law of Nations (2010), and over 50 academic articles. He is editor-in-chief with Guilfoyle, Simma & Trapp eds. of the new multi-volume
series from Oxford University Press, Elements of International Law. He has served as Director of Graduate Studies (Research Degrees) at Oxford and Director of International Legal Programs at Connecticut. He is on the editorial or advisory boards of several journals, including Netherlands International Law Review, Oxford Journal of Law and Religion, International Community Law Review, and Jus Gentium. He has served on the councils of several international law organizations including the Section of International Law of the American Bar Association, the American Society of International Law, the Association of American Law Schools, the International Law Association, and the American Law Institute. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations in New York.

**F.L. (Frans) Leeuw**
WODC, Ministerie van Veiligheid en Justitie and Maastricht University (Chair: Law, public policy and social science research).


**S.F.M. (Sylvia) Wortmann**
Raad van State

Sylvia Wortmann (1956) studied law at Leiden University and graduated in notary law in 1979 and Dutch law in 1981. She is member of the Council of State of the Netherlands (appointed in 2004). Advising on Bills of Parliament in all fields of law and furthermore exercising a judicial function in administrative law matters and hearing higher appeals. From 1982 to 2005 she was counsellor of legislation in the legislative office of the Ministry of Justice. In the last five years of that period she was responsible for twenty-five employees drafting legislation in the field of criminal law. Between 1997-1999 she was senior legal counsellor in the field of family law. From 1982 to 1997 she prepared legislation in diverse fields of private law, from 1990 onwards as legal counsellor. In that capacity, she negotiated company law directives on behalf of the Netherlands.
From 1979 to 1982 she was tutor at the University of Leiden. Ancillary functions are: Ancillary judge at the Court of Appeal in Amsterdam and Editor-in-chief of various legal publications.

**F.A.J. (Frans) van Steijn**
Secretary

Frans van Steijn (1949) studied physics (BSc) at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and philosophy (MA) at the University of Amsterdam. He received a PhD at the UvA on a thesis "The Universities in Society; a Study of part-time professors in the Netherlands" (1990). Since 1996 Frans was senior advisor at Vereniging van Universiteiten (VSNU) the Association of Universities in the Netherlands. He was Secretary to the Board of VSNU and secretary to the Rector’s Conference. His expert fields are quality assurance, research policy and research integrity. In September 2014, he retired from VSNU and established an independent office for consultancy and project management, specialized in quality assurance in universities and research organisations.