

MODEL FOR THE INTEGRAL QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF RESEARCH IN LAW

Content

1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. MODEL FOR INTEGRAL QUALITY ASSESSMENT	6
PART 1: RESEARCH PARAMETERS FOR BOTH LEVELS	7
1. Introduction	7
1.1. Definition of the research parameters	7
1.2. First level of the model: minima	7
1.3. Second level of the model: quality criteria	7
2. Research parameter publications	7
2.1. Context	7
2.2. Subparameters	8
2.3. Operating procedure	8
2.3.1. Possible assessment methods for articles in journals	8
2.3.2. Assessment of journal articles and notes	10
2.3.3. Assessment of books/contributions in books	11
2.3.4. Evaluation/assessment of PhD's	11
2.4. Quality criteria	11
Criterion 1: Scientific originality	12
Criterion 2: Thoroughness	13
Criterion 3: Transnationality and interdisciplinarity	14
Delineation A-B-C	14
2.5. International/foreign dimension	15
2.6. CV data	15
3. Research parameter projects	15
4. Research parameter lectures	16
5. Research parameter consultancy	18
6. Research parameter PhD-tutorship and involvement	19
7. Research parameter membership of editorial boards	19
8. Dimension international/foreign	19
9. Uniform CV-model	20
9.1. Research	20
9.1.1. Publications	20
9.1.2. Projects	20
9.1.3. Congresses and lectures	20
9.1.4. Consultancy	21
9.1.5. PhD-tutorship and involvement	21
9.1.6. Membership of editorial boards	21
9.2. Scientific support	21
9.3. Miscellanea	22
9.3.1. Scientific awards	22
9.3.2. Scholarships etc.	22
PART 2: MINIMUM SYSTEM FOR THE FIRST LEVEL	22
1. Publications	22
2. Projects and PhD-tutorship and involvement	23
3. Lectures	24
4. Overview of the model for the integral quality assessment of research in law	25

1. Introduction

History

During a meeting on the 14th of June 2002, the Flemish Interuniversity Council (VLIR) accepted that bibliometric study is a method that contributes to the evaluation of research in specific domains of (applied) sciences and biomedical sciences. For the domains where this approach is not applicable, an alternative instrument of assessment needs to be developed. The VLIR Research-study group was asked to propose an alternative for the assessment of research quality, taking as a starting point the case study of law.

During the meeting of the VLIR Research-study group on the 3rd of September 2002, it was suggested to carry out a study regarding the quality of research in law. The purpose of this study is to trace how universities (can) enhance the quality care in research in law. In this study, the most frequently used criteria of quality are looked into. Also, it aims to trace upon which methods and criteria of evaluation most unanimity exists.

This study has the advantage that universities can learn from the experience of others and find their inspiration in the elaboration of internal quality care of research (in law). The aim of this study is to provide an instrument that enables the universities to act internally on quality care, not to affect the autonomy of the institutions.

At the request of the VLIR Research-study group, the VLIR has founded at its meeting on October 8th 2002 the sub-study group 'Quality Care Research in Law' and has instructed it to propose an instrument for the quality assessment of research in law. The study group started its activities at the beginning of December 2002. After two plenary meetings, two think tanks were established, namely Matrix and Ranking. The conclusions of both think tanks were discussed on a regular basis during the plenary meetings.

On October 30th 2003, the first results of the study group were presented in the working note 'Towards an instrument for the assessment of research in law: state of affairs'. The president of the study group has explained the working note at the conference of deans and in December 2003 at the law faculty councils in Ghent, Brussels, Antwerp and Leuven and at the VLIR-council. Moreover, numerous written reactions were received, all of which have been put on the VLIR-website.

Taking into account all remarks and objections, the study group has gone on to refine and adapt the measuring-instrument. The results of this refinement were explained in the note 'Model for the integral quality assessment of research in law' of the 15th of June 2004. The note was elaborated from a draft composed by Danielle Gilliot, Jetje De Groof and Liesbet Stevens.

The working note of the 15th of June 2004 was published on the VLIR-website and was explained to the Conference of Deans, the Faculty Board in Brussels, Leuven, Ghent and Antwerp and to the rectors of the Flemish universities during the period June-July 2004. The written reactions to the note were also put on the VLIR-website.

All the visited Faculty Boards approved to start a testing phase of the model. The rectors reacted positively to the note and have expressed their willingness to finance the implementation of the model. The subgroup 'Quality Care Research in Law' was asked to draw up a budget proposal.

Given the criticism and comments, a number of adjustments to the note were proposed. The results of these adjustments are to be found in this adjusted note of the 22nd of September 2004. The fine-tuning of the note is a continuous process.

Composition of the study group

Prof. Alain Verbeke

K.U.Leuven, voorzitter

Prof. Frank Fleerackers

K.U.Brussel

Prof. René Foqué

K.U.Leuven (until December 2003)

Prof. Wouter Devroe

K.U.Leuven (from January 2004 onwards)

Dr. Liesbet Stevens

K.U.Leuven (until September 2004)

Prof. Daniël Cuypers

UA (until December 2003)

Prof. Thierry Vansweevelt	UA	(until December 2003)
Prof. Maurice Adams	UA	(from January 2004 onwards)
Prof. Patricia Popelier	UA	(from January 2004 onwards)
Prof. Michel Tison	UGent	
Prof. Yves Jorens	UGent	
Prof. Brice De Ruyver	UGent	
Prof. Alain De Nauw	VUB	(from January 2004 until September 2004)
Prof. Miguel De Jonkheere	VUB	(from January 2004 until September 2004)
Prof. Michel Magits	VUB	(until September 2004)
(three members with one vote, alternating)		
Prof. Koen Byttebier	VUB	(from September 2004 onwards)
Ms. Nadine Rons	VUB	
Ms. Danielle Gilliot	VLIR	
Ms. Jetje De Groof	VLIR	

During its first meeting on the 10th of December 2002 the subgroup Quality Care Research in Law decided to invite the members of the Interfaculty Commission 'Measurement of research in law' for the discussions in the VLIR-working group Quality Care Research in Law. Thus, the following persons are invited without obligations as external observers:

Prof. Herman Braeckmans	UA	(until December 2003)
Prof. Jan Velaers	UA	
Prof. Boudewijn Bouckaert	UGent	(until December 2003)
Prof. Philip Traest	UGent	(from January 2004 onwards)
Prof. Miguel De Jonkheere	VUB	(until December 2003)
Mr. Hervé Tijssen	University of Tilburg	

Activities of the think tank

All the reports of all the following meetings (plenary and think tanks) can be consulted on the VLIR-website: <http://www.vlir.be/vlir/01algemeen/04werkgroepen/02onderzoek/02kzrechten.htm>

Plenary meetings (president A. Verbeke)

-October 24 th 2002:	Acquaintance meeting with the VLIR Science-study group
-November 13 th 2002:	Discussion of the mission and the approach
-December 13 th 2002:	Discussion of the method of evaluation; Creation of two sub-think tanks, Matrix and Ranking
-April 2 nd 2003:	First plenary discussion of the findings of the think tank Matrix
-May 6 th 2003:	First plenary discussion of the findings of the think tank Ranking
-May 28 th 2003:	Second plenary discussion of the findings of the think tank Matrix and Ranking
-June 30 th 2003:	First plenary discussion of the note 'Towards an instrument for the assessment of research in law: state of affairs'
-July 7 th 2003:	Second plenary discussion of the note 'Towards an instrument for the assessment of research in law: state of affairs'
-October 18 th 2003:	Third plenary discussion of the note and its completion
-January 22 nd 2004:	Discussion of the reactions on the note and of the course of action
-March 30 th 2004:	Plenary discussion of the findings of the think tank Matrix and Ranking
-May 11 th 2004:	Plenary discussion of the findings of the think tank Matrix and Ranking and introduction of the 'Model for the integral quality assessment of research in law'
-June 2 nd 2004:	First plenary discussion of the new note 'Model for the integral quality assessment of research in law'
-June 8 th 2004:	Completion of the note 'Model for the integral quality assessment of research in law'
-July 6 th 2004:	Discussion of the reactions on the note and follow-up route.
-September 22 nd 2004:	Plenary discussion of the adjusted note of September 22 nd 2004 and of the uniform CV-model

Think tank Ranking (president F. Fleerackers)

-January 14 th 2003:	Determination of the procedure
-January 28 th 2003:	Determination of criteria (general)
-February 20 th 2003:	Delineation and refinement of criteria
-March 18 th 2003:	Delineation and refinement of criteria (continuation)
-April 1 st 2003:	First test
-June 4 th 2003:	Second test (6 journal issues)
-August 5 th 2003:	Extensive test of journals
-February 3 rd 2004:	Delineation and refinement of criteria for articles in journals, books and articles in books, PhD's
-March 2 nd 2004:	Delineation and refinement of criteria for articles in journals, books and articles in books (criteria contemplative/descriptive, thoroughness and transnationality and interdisciplinarity)
-March 9 th 2004:	Delineation and refinement of criteria and parameters for articles in journals
-April 13 th 2004:	Delineation and refinement of criteria contemplative/descriptive, thoroughness and transnationality and interdisciplinarity

Think tank Matrix (President Y. Jorens)

-January 21 st 2003:	Determination of (sub)domains of measurement (general)
-February 18 th 2003:	Definition and scaling of the domains of measurement publications and congresses
-March 10 th 2003:	Definition and scaling of the five remaining domains of measurement
-March 31 st 2003:	Determination of reference period, reference person and reference output
-May 7 th 2003:	First test of CV's
-May 21 st 2003:	Second test of CV's
-June 25 th 2003:	Differentiation of the matrix model
-August 20 th 2003:	Test of CV's and adaptation of the matrix model
-October 14 th -15 th 2003:	Extensive test of CV's
-February 11 th 2004:	Discussion of further approach, planning and course of action of the think tank
-March 1 st 2004:	Refinement of the domains of measurement projects and advices
-March 10 th 2004:	Refinement of the domains of measurement projects, advices and congresses and lectures
-March 18 th 2004:	Refinement of the domains of measurement projects, congresses and lectures, promotorship and membership of editorial boards
-April 21 st 2004:	Elaboration of the fork-system

Planning

As part of the implementation of the model, the study group Quality Care Research in Law prepares a CV-format in order to make the model implementable at the universities. This format will be delivered to the faculties of Law in September 2004.

A proposal concerning the financial aspects of the setting up of a first ranking of Flemish and bilingual Belgian legal journals and of legal books of researchers at Flemish faculties of Law was submitted to the VLIR.

According to the plan, a commission will draw up the first ABC-ranking of Flemish and bilingual Belgian legal journals before the end of 2004. The VLIR will appoint this commission in the autumn of 2004. An interuniversity, multidisciplinary and international composition is required. Editorial boards of journals and/or publishing houses will be invited to send a selection of journal issues. In a first phase, the ranking will be evaluated after two years, this is in the beginning of 2007. In a next phase, it is possible that the ranking will be reconsidered every three or four years.

The drawing up of a first ABC-ranking of legal books by researchers of the Flemish universities is planned in the spring of 2005. The VLIR will appoint a separate commission for the books. Here, an interuniversity, multidisciplinary and international composition is required. Books will be judged on a yearly basis during summer. The next evaluation would thus be during the summer of 2006.

Model

The subgroup 'Quality Care Research in Law' chooses for an instrument of assessment which emphasizes that for a good researcher in law it is not sufficient to have publications only, nor is it good to engage in projects only. He has to have a sufficiently complete profile, which does not prevent him from being able and even obliged to put his own thoroughgoing emphasis.

In this way a model for integral quality assessment has been elaborated, consisting of two levels. The first level is the minimal level which everyone has to satisfy, with fixed requirements, quantitative as well as qualitative, according to the academic degree of the persons concerned and starting from a position as a full-time academic. An academic with an appointment of at least 70% is considered full-time. Application of the model on part-timers is left to the evaluator or assessor. In order to meet the requirement of integrality, a minimum is required for three parameters of research which the researcher has to satisfy in a cumulative way. The parameters concerned are (1) publications, (2) projects and PhD-tutorship and -involvement (considered together) and (3) lectures.

At the second level, the quantitative approach according to a matrix model is abandoned completely. At this level, only an assessment of quality according to the ABC-criteria is used, without the parameters of research being balanced and without the imposition of a reference output according to a norm person. In this way, the current model emphasizes much more on quality than on quantity.

This model for integral quality assessment is a first attempt, which will be implemented in a testing phase. After a two-year testing phase, it will be evaluated and if necessary further refined.

The model intends:

- (1) an integral assessment of research for which*
- (2) a certain minimum norm (qualitative as well as quantitative) has to be obtained for three categories of research and for which*
- (3) for research in general and also outside of this minimum a level of quality is made perceptible through the use of ABC-criteria*

Starting points

- Model for a testing phase of circa two years, with re-evaluation and the possibility to adjust 'en cours de route';
- Model only for research, without taking other tasks like teaching and policy into account;
- Model starting from a position as a full-time academic, with a normal work load concerning teaching and management;
- Model useful for the assessment of individual researchers as well as research groups;
- Model for law could serve as a starting point for criminology, with deviations where necessary for the specific nature of criminology.

2. Model for integral quality assessment

The model for integral quality assessment aims to evaluate the quality of research in law on the basis of three parameters for a reference period of 5 years (3 years for the post-doctoral level), and proposes for a couple of or a combination of research parameters a **minimum** which every researcher at least has to satisfy. The quality of every individual researcher is further tested by means of qualitative criteria.

Thus, the model is a two-step-rocket, with a first level imposing qualitative and quantitative demands (see part II) and a second level enabling an ABC-quality analysis of the diverse research parameters.

PART I- RESEARCH PARAMETERS FOR BOTH LEVELS

1. Introduction

1.1. Definition of the research parameters

The model for integral quality assessment distinguishes between six research parameters:

- publications
- projects
- lectures
- consultancy
- PhD-tutorship and -involvement
- membership of editorial boards

In this note, every research parameter will be defined (see part I, 2→7).

1.2. First level of the model: minima

A **minimum** is proposed for three categories of research: (1) publications, (2) projects and PhD-tutorship and -involvement (together) and (3) lectures. These minima are differentiated on the basis of the phase in the academic career the researcher is in (post-doctoral, lecturer, senior lecturer, professor/full professor).

Two research parameters have not been included in the minima: consultancy and membership of editorial boards, since it is not absolutely necessary that a researcher engages in consultancy or is a member of editorial boards. Both elements are however appreciated positively when the complete CV is evaluated on the basis of the criteria supplied by the model.

An overview of the minimum system is included further in this note (see part II).

The reference period during which the minima have to be obtained, amounts to 5 years from the level of lecturer onwards, 3 years for post-doctoral researchers. If a researcher needs to be evaluated before having been at his current level for at least five years, the minima for the lower level are taken into account.

1.3. Second level of the model: quality criteria

Inside every single category it is subsequently possible to test the quality of every individual researcher by means of the ABC-quota that have been developed for most research parameters (see part I, 2→7). The minima and outputs of reference do not apply in this case.

The research performances can be judged on their merits without demanding quantitative requirements or without having to compare with a reference person. The advantage of this approach is that it does justice to the diversity of profiles, that quality takes precedence over quantity and that insight in the level of the research achieved is obtained easily by means of the ABC-criteria.

2. Research parameter publications

2.1. Context

Research in law, when compared with other domains of science, shows certain particularities. These do not allow to transpose the bibliometric assessment methods used in other domains to research in law just like that.

(1) Whereas in other scientific domains nearly all publications are in the form of articles in journals, in research in law a considerable part of the qualitatively high-principled publications are books (monographs, chapters in books). An adequate measuring instrument of the publication-output as a consequence has to take

books and chapters in books into account.

(2) Unlike other scientific domains, the PhD in law cannot be reduced to the compilation of (authoritative) articles in journals. It is the result of a long-term, factually founded and consistently drawn up research, which as a rule is best valorized by a publication in the form of a book. This implies that the PhD has to be given a place in the measurement of the quality of the research output, even if it is published in a non-peer reviewed journal.

(3) Research in law shows a national or regional dimension. The extent to which a discipline of law is suitable for comparative or international research moreover varies depending on the discipline. This national/regional dimension of research in law contrasts sharply with the bibliometric instruments offered by ISI, showing a marked American center of gravity (93 out of 106 law journals in ISI are focused only on the United States; only journals in English occur in the list). The use of bibliometric instruments in law can thus impossibly rely on the ISI-databases, as they are no sample selection of the research in law in Belgium and other European countries.

(4) Research in law has a fundamental as well as an applied dimension. The applied dimension does not deprive the research of its scientific nature, purely because of the fact that the 'users' of the research are not always researchers themselves, but professional practitioners in law. Insofar as, in research in law, one uses a scientific method, supporting often on compilation, processing and interpretation of documentary material, it will have to be accepted that this is indeed a research activity. The circumstance that certain journals are destined (primarily) for professional practitioners in law does not prevent its articles from being scientific.

2.2. Sub-parameters

Inside the research parameter publications a distinction is made between 4 sub-parameters, taking the specificity of research in law into account.

- Journal articles and notes
- Books
- Contributions in books
- PhD's

For every one of these categories a subdivision in three categories (A-B-C) will occur. The determination of the categories will happen according to a qualitative assessment (ABC-ranking) of the journals/books.

2.3. Operating procedure

2.3.1. Possible assessment methods for articles in journals

Theoretically, different methods can be used to assess articles in journals qualitatively. Roughly sketched a general division can be made between bibliometric and qualitative-content concerning assessment methods. The study group concludes that only an ABC-ranking of journals on the basis of a general analysis concerning content, applied to a sample selection of journals, is an efficient method for research in law.

Bibliometrical methods

Various methods can be used:

-Presence of a journal in ISI: we already indicated (see 2.1.3.) that the list of journals adopted in ISI in the domain of law is not representative for quality assessment of the Flemish research in law, given the strong Anglo-American preference of the ISI-list on the one hand, and the often strong regional dimension of research in law on the other hand.

In addition, work is being done at the moment at the level of the *European Science Foundation* (ESF) to achieve a ranking of journals in the humanities and the social sciences¹. This project does however not cover

¹ The European Science Foundation has proposed the following criteria to distinguish between A-B-C:
journals ranked A

law studies. Still, it is possible to follow the ESF-classification for the publications of researchers in law in non-legal scientific journals.

-Citations as a criterion: the quality of an article of a journal is assessed by the calculation of the amount of citations of this article/journal in scientific (law) journals. This method is faced with objections of a general as well as a practical nature:

- Law studies often lack a qualitatively founded citation culture: citations to legal doctrine are often inspired by motives of a 'documentary' nature: the researcher attempts to be exhaustive in the footnotes by giving a complete overview of all contributions (articles, contributions in books, books) that can serve as a relevant source in the given context, without making qualitative distinctions. As a consequence, a citation-analysis often is not representative of the quality of a certain scientific contribution but is also dependent on other circumstances: availability of source material for the researcher, inclusion of the concerned contribution in law databases etc.
- The measurement of the amount of citations is only possible if all the relevant primary material on the basis of which citation counts can happen, are included in a database. Until now, no such database exists in jurisprudence. One could, to be sure, draw up such a list, or rank articles/journals on the basis of a citation-analysis, applied to the *Social Sciences Index*. In the course of the latter activity, it could then be examined to what extent reference is made in *ISI* to journals/articles that have not been included in *ISI*. This method cannot be used for law studies due to the strong Anglo-American nature of the law journals included in *ISI*.

Qualitative methods

-Activities of the editorial staff as a criterion: the market structure for publications in law differs fundamentally from the situations in other scientific domains: also in the perspective of the strong orientation of research on legal practitioners, there is a global inclination to overcapacity on the market for books as well as journals. Not all editorial staffs of journals or series of books operate therefore according to strict selection criteria for the publication of articles or monographs, although almost all the editorial staffs will state that they indeed use peer review.

The majority of the researchers have no problems getting their articles published in a law journal. The degree of rejection of contributions in journals is generally extremely low.

-Quality assessment by the research community: the judicial research community could, through a large inquiry, be asked to carry out a ranking of the journals used in their domain of research, in order to come to a global ranking of law journals based on this information. This method, tried also in the Luwel report et al, has several weaknesses as well:

- the objectivity of the ranking given by the researchers will often be influenced by the fact that many researchers are either actively involved in the editorial board of journals in their field of research, or will be inclined to show a clear preference for journals in which they have already published.
- the ranking will be influenced by the degree of specialization of the journals, unless statistical corrections will be carried out: (possibly edifying) ultra specialized journals will only occur in the ranking of a limited amount of researchers and as a consequence they will get a bad global ranking, whereas the ranking will be to the advantage of (possibly average) general law journals.

-Quality assessment through external peer review: in order to counterbalance the deficiencies of editorial

i.e. high-ranking international publications that have a very strong reputation among researchers of the particular field in different countries and are regularly cited all over the world

journals ranked B

i.e. standard international publications that have a good reputation among researchers of the discipline in different countries

journals ranked C

i.e. scientific publications that have an important local significance and which can be occasionally cited outside the publishing country though their main target group is the domestic academic community

board peer review systems, a commission of external evaluators could be set up, assigned to assess individual journal articles on the basis of criteria determined in advance. The benefit of this model would be that a qualitatively edifying article, published in a mediocre journal, comes out well. This method is however unworkable in a practical sense, considering the enormous working volume such an individual assessment would imply with regard to all legal articles.

-Ranking of journals on the basis of an analysis of the average quality of judicial contributions through external peer review: the articles and/or notes published in a sample selection of journal issues, provided by the journal's editorial staff (e.g. at least five recent issues), are analyzed by a committee on the basis of criteria concerning content and each obtain a score. Next, the average score of all articles/notes in the examined journal issues is calculated. On the basis of this information, an ABC-ranking of the journals in three categories (A-B-C) is made. It is essential that this system does not require any further reading concerning content or any qualitative analysis of every individual article of a researcher, after the ranking has been drawn up. The ranking of the journal is the starting point, which is considered as some kind of a rough selection at the gate. To be said against this approach is that a 'bad' article in a 'good' journal will be rewarded, whereas on the other hand, a 'good' article in a 'bad' journal is penalized. This effect should however disappear after a while: on the one hand, researchers will aim to publish their 'good' contributions in A-journals. The ABC-ranking should on the other hand move the editorial staffs of the journals with a lower ranking to carry out a stricter quality assessment in order to obtain a higher classification.

While elaborating the ABC-ranking system, it is important that:

- there are a few A-journals, in Flanders as well as through the identification of international journals;
- sufficient incentive is given to a B-journal to evolve into an A-journal;
- researchers have to be encouraged to publish in journals with good quality;
- researchers have to be encouraged to work in a multidisciplinary and comparative way.

2.3.2. Assessment of journal articles and notes

Due to reasons of a practical nature, it is not possible to use the labour-intensive ranking method for all (non-) legal journals. Given the diversity of the output of publication in journals, a distinction can be made between:

- Flemish and bilingual-Belgian law journals: ABC-ranking on the basis of criteria concerning content
- French language Belgian and foreign/international law journals: ABC-ranking on the basis of enquiry
- Jurisprudential or multidisciplinary articles in non-legal journals: founded on possibly existing rankings of non-legal scientific journals.

Flemish and bilingual-Belgian law journals

In a first phase the drawing up of an ABC-ranking of the Flemish and bilingual-Belgian journals is brought into focus. Given the high degree of involvement of Flemish researchers in Flemish and bilingual (Belgian) journals, it is suggested to rank these journals on the basis of an analysis of average quality of law articles and notes. A journal receives two separate rankings: one for articles and one for notes. For journals with loose sheets, the same method of working will be used.

Non-legal articles in law journals are not considered in this analysis.

French-language Belgian and foreign/international legal journals

It is essential that in a next phase a system will be elaborated for the French-language Belgian and foreign/international journals.

Peer review of French-language Belgian and foreign/international journals according to the ABC-ranking method, with analysis of individual journal issues, would be very time consuming.

A valid alternative consists of the drawing up of a list of journal titles (French-language Belgian and foreign/international) in which Flemish researchers publish. A possible starting point could be the journals adopted in *ISI* and the *Index to Foreign Legal Periodicals*, possibly to be supplemented with other journals. The various Flemish faculties of law will be asked to attach an A-, B- or C-ranking to the journals not yet

ranked in *ISI* or elsewhere, taking into account the quality criteria for the ABC-ranking of Flemish or bilingual legal journals. An interuniversity committee compiles the different lists in a global list. In order to increase the legitimacy of the ranking, the lists have to be put to one or more foreign faculties or other international external entities.

Legal articles in non-legal scientific journals

This matter depends on the rankings current in the areas of research.

ESF (European Science Foundation) wants to establish a European database of scientific journals and books, arranged by discipline, in the domain of the humanities. The following procedure was established for journals:

- lists of journals were asked for in different European countries;
- expert groups of 3 to 5 scientists develop a methodology and screen the received lists of journals;
- a European Citation Index in Humanities (ECIH) is drawn up.

As part of this project, interuniversity think tanks are drawing up ranked lists of journals inside VLIR for various domains in the humanities.

2.3.3. Assessment of books/contributions in books

In the future, an interuniversity book committee will be put together based on quality criteria analogous to the ones proposed for the ABC -ranking (see part I, 2.4.) of Flemish and bilingual Belgian legal journals.

Thus, a distinction is made between A-, B- and C-books.

Works with loose sheets can be submitted once every three years.

Syllabi can also be submitted to the book committee.

Book reviews, codices (also annotated) and volumes of jurisprudence are considered as 'publications supporting research'. Contributions/articles in non-scientific journals, magazines and newspapers are also to be categorized as 'publications supporting research'.

Books that are not submitted to the book committee are automatically considered as C-books.

Books with different legal articles are allocated with a global assessment (A-B-C). These articles are not to be assessed separately.

If a book consists of articles from different disciplines, only the legal articles are to be considered for the global assessment of the book.

Whether a book is considered as a national or as an international/foreign publication is to be determined by the books committee.

2.3.4. Evaluation/assessment of PhD's

It is taken down in the CV, what the title of the PhD is and when and at what institute the PhD was obtained.

It is the responsibility of the PhD-jury to judge the quality of the PhD. No additional judgement is made by a committee.

A PhD that is published, in whatever form, is assessed by means of the ABC-assessment (for articles, books).

2.4. Quality criteria

A distinction is made between three categories:

- Scientific originality;
- Thoroughness;
- Transnationality and interdisciplinarity.

Criterion 1: Scientific originality

Scale:

Not scientifically original: 0 points

Descriptive: 1 point

Moderately scientifically original: 2 points

Strongly scientifically original: 4 points

Because the criterion of scientific originality is considered to be the most important criterion, it is proposed to attribute more points (4) to the criterion of scientific originality compared to the criteria of thoroughness and transnationality and interdisciplinarity (both 3).

Considering the limited amount of parameters of the criterion of scientific originality (two: originality and depth) and in order to distinguish clearly between a moderately original and a strongly original contribution, it is suggested to attribute two points to a moderately original contribution and four points to a strongly original contribution.

Definition:

The criterion of scientific originality is determined by the extent to which a text is reproductive, or rather whether it shows a marked extent of originality and depth.

Parameters:

Originality: the text shows the individual contribution of the author in the analysis of the question or the source material. The individual contribution can assume different forms:

-Originality concerning content

Contextualization/conceptualization:

Situation/location in a context: comparison within the same discipline (e.g. former jurisdiction, legislation).

Linking up with concepts/the elaboration of new concepts

Interpretation: critical evaluation building on contextualization

Development of theories: instigation of new thought frames, concepts or insights

-Structural originality: the described source material is being ranged in a consistent organization/structure. The organization/structure increases the accessibility/comprehensibility of the described sources for the reader.

Depth: the researched aspects of the research question are investigated in a profound manner, with sufficiently founded arguments, in order to come to scientific conclusions.

Reproduction: there is no originality if the text is limited to a descriptive account of primary source material (legislation, jurisdiction), possibly by means of essential resources (e.g. parliamentary preparations).

Explanation/clarification:

In order to clarify, it is now explained what is being understood as a non-scientifically original/descriptive/original contribution. A further distinction is made between notes and articles:

-*Non-scientifically original contribution*: the contribution is not founded on a scientific analysis of a research question or source material (e.g. editorial).

-*Descriptive note*: sheer reproduction, description of the problem and solution by the judge, without any notable contextualization or interpretation.

-*Moderately scientifically original note*: mainly reproductive, the originality is supplementary/inessential. Description of the problem and solution by the judge, with

contextualization and/or interpretation.

-Strongly scientifically original note: exhibits mainly originality regarding content. Description of the problem and solution by the judge, with contextualization and/or interpretation and leading to development of theories.

-Descriptive article: sheer reproduction. A limited and non-founded interpretation does not devalue the descriptive nature (e.g. in conclusion a superficial/shallow evaluation of a law or court decision is given). Examples: comment on law, chronicle of legislation, chronicle of jurisdiction... without any notable contextualization or interpretation.

-Moderately scientifically original article: mainly reproductive. The originality is supplementary/inessential and can be regarding content or structural in nature.

-Strongly scientifically original article: exhibits mainly originality regarding content. Example: a strongly scientific original doctrine:

- has a definition of a problem starting from a societal-policy research question or from a purely legal-theoretical research question;
- is a form of problem driven research
- executed on the basis of a scientific method adapted to the discipline (research of source material, empirical method, ...),
- by which contextualization and interpretation and a critically evaluating conclusion is achieved;
- leading to new thought frames, concepts or insights.

<i>Criterion 2: Thoroughness</i>

Scale:

Not thorough:	0 points
Moderately thorough	1 point
Thorough	3 points

Taking the limited amount of parameters of the criterion thoroughness into account (two, notably completeness and utilization of source material) and in order to distinguish clearly between a moderately thorough and a thorough contribution, it is suggested to attribute one point to a moderately thorough contribution and three points to a thorough contribution.

Definition:

The criterion thoroughness expresses the extent to which the contribution attains *completeness* within the discipline concerned in the answering of the research question and the extent to which it is supported by a sufficient amount of relevant *source material*.

It is essentially not the intention that, for the criterion of thoroughness, quantitative elements such as the length of the contribution and the amount of footnotes are taken into account.

Parameters:

- Completeness: the research question is researched in all relevant aspects concerning content.
- Utilization of source material: relevant source material (primary and secondary) is being consulted and used. The effective assimilation of the relevant source material in the contribution takes precedence over the exhaustivity.

Explanation/clarification:

In order to clarify, it is now explained what is being understood as a non-thorough/moderately thorough/thorough contribution:

-*Non-thorough contribution*: clearly incomplete, without assimilation of the relevant source material.

-*Moderately thorough contribution*: assimilation of the relevant source material, but without completeness

-*Thorough contribution*: assimilation of the relevant source material, with completeness

Criterion 3: Transnationality and interdisciplinarity

Scale:

Not transnational and interdisciplinary: 0 points
'Transnational and interdisciplinary' concerning 1 aspect (of 2): 1 point
'Transnational and interdisciplinary' concerning both aspects: 3 points

Taking the limited amount of parameters of the criterion 'transnationality and interdisciplinarity' into account (two, notably comparative in an external legal manner and external interdisciplinarity) and in order to distinguish clearly between a contribution 'transnationality and interdisciplinarity' concerning one aspect or both aspects, it is suggested to attribute one point to a contribution '**transnationality and interdisciplinarity**' concerning one aspect and three points to a contribution '**transnationality and interdisciplinarity**' concerning both aspects.

Definition:

In a contribution 'transnationality and interdisciplinarity', the concepts of different legal systems are connected with each other, the comparison being substantial and actual (no sheer side placing). 'Transnationality and interdisciplinarity' is possible concerning:

-External legal comparison: national legal systems dissimilar in time and/or space. To the extent that international/supranational law is a source of standardization of Belgian law, there is no 'transnationality and interdisciplinarity'.

-External interdisciplinarity: disciplines (with other scientific domains)

Parameters:

-External legal comparison: the research question is explored for different (national) systems.

-External interdisciplinarity: a substantial and actual comparison is built up using data from other scientific domains

Delineation A-B-C

On the basis of three criteria concerning content the articles and notes from at least five recent issues of Flemish or bilingual Belgian legal journals are analyzed.

The maximum score of a note/article is 10, as is showed in the calculation below:

4 strongly scientific original
3 thorough
3 'transnationality and interdisciplinarity' in all aspects

10 total (maximum)

Next, the average of all analyzed articles and notes of the explored journal is calculated.

On the basis of an average score of the analyzed articles and notes, the journal obtains two A-B-C-rankings, one for notes and one for articles. The distinction between A, B and C is determined as follows:

- For an A-appreciation, the average score is larger than or equals 6 or 7 (≥ 6 or 7) (to be determined by a commission)

- The B-appreciation implies that the average score is larger than or equals 4 and is smaller than 6 or 7 ($\geq 4 < 6$ or 7)
- For a C-appreciation, the average score is lower than 4 (< 4).

2.5. International/foreign dimension

An international/foreign journal is a journal more than half of the editorial staff of which is not Belgian. The editorial staff consists of those people meeting periodically and composing the journal in an active manner (to be distinguished from advisory boards or scientific committees).

The book commission, the formation of which is anticipated, will pronounce on the international/foreign dimension of books, as well as on their A-B-C-ranking.

2.6. CV data

For the sub-features of publications, the following data have to be taken down:

- articles in journals: author(s) + title + journal + year + amount of pages
- notes: author(s) + title + journal + year + amount of pages
- books: author(s) + title + amount of pages + publishing house + year + amount of pages
- contributions in books: editor(s) + publishing house + year + amount of pages
- editor of a book: editor(s) + publishing house + year + amount of pages
- PhD: title + institution at which obtained + subject + year of defence
If any publications result from the PhD (e.g. book or journal article), they have to be adopted in the CV as such (e.g. book or article in journal).
- scientific awards for publications: title award + date + place

Co-publications count for a fraction of the amount of people involved: $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{3}$, etc.

Book reviews, codices (also annotated) and compilations of jurisdiction are considered as publications supporting science.

3. *Research parameter projects*

Definition:

The following conditions have to be fulfilled:

- the project was awarded in competition after scientific screening by external (with regard to the applicant) scientific experts;
- the project has a length of one year and offers employment to $\frac{1}{2}$ FTE (on an annual basis);
- it concerns a research project (no education project).

An initial project and its extensions are counted as one project.

If the received project funds are meant specifically for the organisation of an international congress, they should be classified under the category of scientific support in the CV. At this, it can be indicated that a subsidy was received.

Categories (A-B-C):

It is suggested to distinguish between three categories (A-B-C) within the research parameter projects.

A-projects are GOA-, EK- and IUA-projects²
B-projects are

² Concerted Research Actions, European Research Framework Programme, Projects of the International Union of Universities

- Projects with FWO³ (projects as well as research assistantships), BOF⁴, OR-credits or VIS/COF as their source of funding;
- Projects with at least 1 FTE yearly

C-projects are projects with at least ½ FTE yearly.

Possible project types that, according to their budget, belong in the B- or C-category, are

Ministries of the federal government, Programmed Federal Government Service (POD)

Ministries of the Flemish government (exclusively IUAP⁵ & Exploratory International Cooperation (VIS)/Co-financing of a running EU-project (COF)

IWT-projects (Institute for the Encouragement of Innovation by means of Science and Technology in Flanders)

Brussels, the Capital region

Diverse foundations and funds with a scientific purpose

If a project has a budget lower than one equalling ½ FTE **yearly**, it is considered as advice.

If several applicants are involved in a project (coordinator, promoter, expert), the budget of the project (expressed in FTE) will be divided according to the formula $FTE/(x-1)$, x being the amount of applicants:

2 participants and ½ FTE = ½ FTE / 2-1 => project counts for ½ FTE per applicant (C-project if no international/foreign dimension, otherwise B-project)

2 participants and 1 FTE = 1 FTE / 2-1 => project counts for 1 FTE per applicant (B-project if no international/foreign dimension, otherwise A-project)

3 participants and 1 FTE = 1 FTE / 3-1 => project counts for ½ FTE per applicant (C-project if no international/foreign dimension, otherwise B-project)

3 participants and 2 FTE = 2 FTE / 3-1 => project counts for 1 FTE per applicant (B-project if no international/foreign dimension, otherwise A-project)

...

International/foreign dimension:

-An international/foreign project is a project written out by the EU or an international/foreign organization and granted after European c.q. international competition.

CV data:

In the CV, the following data concerning projects have to be reported: title/theme of the project, provider of subsidies/financer/commissioner (with indication of national/international/foreign), duration/period, project sum/ budget (expressed in FTE), number of persons employed (counting in months of work), individual or joint project (amount of applicants), role of the researcher in the project.

4. Research parameter lectures

In the research parameter 'lectures', only lectures that can be considered as research performances are to be adopted. Guest lectures, client seminars and certain professional seminars are to be categorized under research and provision of services respectively. In the CV, they have to be categorized clearly under these sections and not under research. Only the following ABC-lectures can thus be mentioned as research.

It is at the same time emphasized that it is possible that there is an important difference between the qualification of the lecture (e.g. C) and the publication following from it (possibly A).

Categories:

It is suggested to distinguish between three categories (A-B-C) in the research parameter lectures.

³ Fund for Scientific Research - Flanders

⁴ Special Research Fund

⁵ Interuniversity Poles of Attraction

For an A-B-C-lecture to count as research output, it is required that the main organizer is a non-profit organization, association or institution with a mainly scientific goal. Lectures organized by commercial organizations or firms can thus not be considered as research output. Although they can be interesting and important, they are considered as provision of services.

In addition to that, a number of special criteria determine the ABC-character of the lecture:

- (1) specialized or professional public
- (2) active participation of the public
- (3) publication follows

Active participation of the public means that the discussion time amounts to circa 40% of the total duration of the lecture.

A lecture meeting all three mentioned special criteria, is an A-lecture, insofar as the participants/respondents receive the text beforehand in order to be able to react.

A lecture meeting two of the mentioned special criteria, is a B-lecture.

A lecture meeting one of the three mentioned special criteria, is a C-lecture.

Co-lectures are considered for a fraction of the amount of people involved, 1/2, 1/3, etc.

Definitions:

A-lecture:

The main organizer is a non-profit institution.

Specialized or professional public.

The public participates in an active way and the participants/respondents have received the text beforehand in order to be able to react.

Publication follows..

B-lecture:

The main organizer is a non-profit institution.

Two of the following three criteria are to be met:

-Specialized or professional public.

-Active participation by the public.

-Publication follows.

C-lecture:

The main organizer is a non-profit institution.

One of the following three criteria is to be met:

-Specialized or professional public.

-Active participation by the public.

-Publication follows.

Are considered as teaching or scientific support activities:

- Teaching activities, the latter being classes for students, even on a doctoral level, at the own university as well as elsewhere, guest lectures included.
- Lectures not categorized as ABC, for example as part of client seminars, professional training within the framework of firms and the like. The difference with the ABC-categories is that their finality is different: although these lectures can be critically and scientifically well-founded, their central aim is not scientific. The organizer on the other hand does not have a scientific, but mainly a commercial goal (this is indicated in the statutory assignment of the organizing entity).
- Lectures for an interested public that is however specialized nor educated in the domain. The critical ability of the public is in this case general, and the public is not expert in the specific domain. The lecture itself can however be critical. Examples: a jurist speaking of general evolutions in the state reform for the readers of a newspaper and who is able to interpret these

evolutions critically. Lectures for the Humanistisch Verbond, Davidsfonds, Willemsfonds or Vermeylenfonds⁶ as well. The organizer possibly has a scientific goal (for example the Davidsfonds organizing an activity in cooperation with a scientific institution), but the activity as such in any case has no scientific goal.

- Lectures that are sheerly informative or descriptive, for example as part of a science week (for pupils of secondary schools).
- The organization of congresses.

International/foreign dimension

An international/foreign lecture is

- organized abroad
- or**
- is organized in Belgium, but
 - is not done in Dutch
- and**
- is attended by a predominantly international public.

CV-data:

In the CV, a distinction is made between an active lecture (speaker) and a less active participation as chair or panel member. Only giving a lecture as a speaker is taken into account for the first level (minima). The rest is of importance at the second level and is made clear in the CV.

In the CV, it is indicated first what the role of the researcher was at the congress: expert or speaker / organizer / panel member / chair.

For every lecture, the following is indicated:

- the title/theme of the lecture;
- the organizer of the congress (with the indication of international/foreign or national);
- the date/period and place of the congress;
- the scientific output: proceedings, report book, ...;
- whether it is an individual or a co-presentation (amount of participants).

5. Research parameter consultancy

The following conditions need to be satisfied:

- advice for an external client;
- advice for an organization aiming for the common good
- the scientist is asked on the basis of his own expertise;
- in academic capacity (meaning that the assignment passes off in the name of and for the account of the university / for an academic credit // a contract is not required);
- the advice leads to a report or document (minutes, parliamentary preparation, ...), which the submitter has to be able to put at the disposal of a possible evaluation- or assessment body.

Projects having less than ½ FTE budget on an annual basis are considered as consultancy.

CV-data:

The following data are necessary for the identification of advices:

- project- or contract number (of the university);
- reference for the report (author(s), amount of pages, title);
- subject of consultancy;
- client (with indication of international/national);
- period;

⁶ All four of them are Flemish cultural organizations.

Does it concern an assignment in the name of and for the account of the university / for an academic credit?
Has the advice led to a report or document (minutes, parliamentary preparation, ...)?

6. Research parameter PhD-tutorship and involvement

Categories:

- A promoter, co-promoter
- B everyone involved in another way (not as promoter or co-promoter) in the supervision of the PhD-student
It is opted for to work with one coarse B-category due to the fact that the supervision of PhD's is seen differently in every university (supervision committees, doctoral juries, reading committees, ...).

CV-data:

For every category, it has to be indicated when and at what institution the PhD was acquired, what the subject of the PhD was, and what the PhD-tutorship and involvement consisted of. The name of the PhD-student and the title of the PhD are also to be indicated. If the PhD has not yet been acquired, the starting date of the PhD has to be indicated.

7. Research parameter membership of editorial boards

Definition:

The research parameter membership of editorial boards is restricted to the membership of the editorial board of A- and B-journals.

CV-data:

- editorial board of A-journal: name journal, period
- editorial board of B-journal: name journal, period

8. Dimension international/foreign

The dimension international/foreign is also important for research in law. No quality judgement is attributed to this dimension. The quality criteria necessary to achieve an ABC-assessment are formulated for all research parameters, regardless of them being international/foreign.

For the first level of the 'Model for the integral quality assessment of research in law', the minimal requirements, the dimension international/foreign has been adopted as an element of the minimum that has to be achieved (see part II).

Concerning the second, qualitative level of the model, it is necessary to mention in the CV whether the research output is national or international/foreign and in that perspective whether it is an A-, B- or C-achievement.

For publications, projects and lectures, the following definitions apply:

- An international/foreign journal is a journal with an editorial staff that consists for more than 50% of people not having Belgian nationality. The editorial staff are those people meeting periodically and composing the journal in an active manner (to be distinguished from advisory boards or scientific committees).
- The book commission, the formation of which is anticipated, will pronounce on the international/foreign dimension of books, as well as on their ABC-ranking.
- An international/foreign project is a project written out by the EU or an international/foreign organization and granted after European c.q. international competition.
- An international/foreign lecture is organized abroad or is organized in Belgium, but in the latter case the lecture is not in Dutch and the lecture is attended by a predominantly international public.

9. Uniform CV-model

The universities already have their own separate CV-systems at their disposal. An important part of the data needed for the 'Model for the integral quality assessment of research in law' can already be retrieved from the databases present at the universities.

In order for the CV to meet the two levels of the 'Model for the integral quality assessment of research in law studies' (the minimal level at which everybody has to meet the requirements and the second level at which only a quality assessment according to ABC-criteria is taken into account), the categories below have to be adopted in the CV. Certain activities of the researcher, in this model not considered to be research, and therefore not adopted in the first part of the note, are placed under the categories of scientific support or miscellanea.

9.1. Research

9.1.1. Publications

For publications, the following data have to be adopted:

- articles in journals: author(s) + title + journal + year
- notes: author(s) + title + journal + year
- books: author(s) + title + amount of pages + publishing house + year
- contributions in books: author(s) + title + publishing house + year
- editor of a book: editor(s) + language + publishing house + year
- PhD: institution at which obtained + subject

If any publications result from the PhD, these have to be adopted in the CV as such (e.g. book or article in journal).

- Scientific awards for publications: title award, date, place of award

If the same article is published more than once in different books and/or journals, this has to be indicated in the CV.

9.1.2. Projects

The following data concerning projects have to be reported:

- title/theme of the project;
- provider of subsidies/financer/client (with indication of national/international/foreign);
- duration/period;
- project sum/ budget (expressed in FTE);
- number of persons employed (counting in months of work);
- role of the researcher in the project;
- individual or joint project (amount of participants) and amount of applicants.

9.1.3. Congresses and lectures

In the CV, a distinction is made between an active lecture (speaker) and a less active participation as chair or panel member. Only giving a lecture as a speaker is taken into account for the first level (minima). The rest is of importance at the second level and shows from the CV.

In the CV, it is indicated first what the role of the researcher was at the congress: expert or speaker / organizer / panel member / chair.

For every lecture, the following is indicated:

- the title/theme of the lecture;
- the organizer of the congress (with the indication of international/foreign or national);
- the date/period and place of the congress;
- the scientific output: proceedings, report book, ...;
- whether it is an individual or a co-presentation (amount of participants).

9.1.4. Consultancy

The following data are necessary for the identification of advices:

- project- or contract number (of the university);
- reference for the report (author(s), amount of pages, title);
- subject of consultancy;
- client (with indication of international/national);
- period;

Does it concern an assignment in the name of and for the account of the university / for an academic credit?
Has the advice led to a report or document (minutes, parliamentary preparation, ...)?

9.1.5. PhD-tutorship and involvement

For PhD-tutorship and -involvement, the following data have to be indicated:

- role of the researcher: promoter/co-promoter/active supervisor/jury member with a description of what the PhD-tutorship or -involvement consists of;
- name PhD-student;
- title PhD;
- year of the defence of the PhD;
- university at which the PhD was acquired;
- starting date of the PhD if it has not yet been acquired.

9.1.6. Membership of editorial boards

For the membership of editorial boards, the following data have to be indicated:

- editorial board of A-journal: name journal, period
- editorial board of B-journal: name journal, period

9.2. Scientific support

The following activities are considered as scientific support and have to be adopted under that category in the CV:

- lectures at client seminars and certain professional seminars;
- organization of congresses;
- publications supporting research like codices (also annotated) and volumes of jurisprudence
- book reviews;
- contributions and articles in non-scientific journals, magazines and newspapers.

The following data need to be registered in the CV:

- lectures at client seminars and certain professional seminars:
 - the title/theme of the lecture;
 - the organizer of the client seminar/professional seminar;
 - the date/period and place of the client seminar/professional seminar;
 - whether it concerns an individual or a co-presentation (amount of participants);
 - the language of communication of the client seminar/professional seminar.
- organization of congresses
 - the title/theme of the congress;
 - the date, period and location of the congress;
 - the scientific output of the congress: proceedings, report book, ...;
 - does it concern an individual or a co-presentation.
- publications supporting research
 - the nature of the publication (codex, volume of jurisprudence);
 - the title of the publication;
 - the publishing house of the publication;
 - the year of publishing;
 - the amount of pages;
 - is it an individual or a co-publication.

- book reviews:
 - the title of the reviewed work;
 - the journal in which the review was published;
 - the year of publication.
- contributions and articles in non-scientific journals, magazines and newspapers
 - the title of the contribution;
 - the name of the journal/magazine/newspaper.
 - amount of pages;
 - date of appearance.

9.3. Miscellanea

9.3.1. *Scientific awards*

Only awards granted for the whole oeuvre are considered as scientific prizes. Prizes for publications are categorized in the CV under 'publications'.

The following data have to be registered on the CV:

- the title of the award;
- the date on which the prize was achieved;
- the place of award;

9.3.2. *Scholarships etc.*

In this category, research scholarships and research stays have to be categorized.

Research scholarships are defined as scholarships granted by an external body enabling the researcher to conduct research more or less exclusively.

Research stays are stays at the invitation (and the expense) of an institution different from the one the researcher is working at.

The following data have to be registered on the CV:

- research scholarships:
 - date of the obtaining of the scholarship;
 - place where the scholarship was awarded;
 - title of the scholarship.
- research stays:
 - date/period of stay;
 - place of stay;
 - title.

PART II: MINIMUM SYSTEM FOR THE FIRST LEVEL

The model for integral quality assessment aims to evaluate the quality of research in law on the basis of three parameters for a reference period of 5 years (3 years for the post-doctoral level), and proposes for a couple of research parameters or a combination of research parameters a **minimum**, which every researcher at least has to satisfy. A minimum is proposed for (1) publications, (2) projects and PhD-tutorship and -involvement (together) and (3) lectures.

1. *Publications*

For the stipulation of the minimal requirements (the 'minima'), only A- and B-publications are taken into account.

For the minima, articles, notes, chapters in books and books are taken into consideration.

- Maximum half of the required minimum is allowed to consist of notes. From the degree of professor onwards, notes are no longer taken into account for the minimal requirements.
- An international component is added to the minimal requirements. In a testing phase it will be investigated how international journals can be fitted in the ABC-scheme, this in order to check the quality of foreign journals (see also p. 10 and further).

In order to guarantee the simplicity of the model, it is proposed to express the publications in B-articles:

- 1A-article = 2B-articles
- 1B-book=5B-articles
- 1A-book=5A-articles=10B-articles
- 1 chapter in an A-book = 1A-article=2B-articles
- 1 chapter in a B-book = 1B-article

Remark: conversion or transfer from 2B-articles to 1A-article can only be applied at the first level for the determination of the minimal requirements. At the second level, the quality assessment needs to be applied in a complete form, in order for a B-article to remain a B-article and not be able to climb to the A-level by quantitative equation. At the first level of the minima an important quantitative component prevails, whereas at the second level no quantitative processing is done and the quality is provided with more insight by means of the ABC-criteria.

Co-publications count for a fraction of the amount of people involved: $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{3}$, etc.

The minimal requirements are differentiated per category:

- Post-doctoral: 6B (for a reference period of 3 years, contrary to 5 years for tenured academic staff (ZAP); maximum half of which are allowed to be notes)
- Lecturer: 6B, of which at least 1 international (max. half of which notes)
- Senior lecturer: 9B, of which at least 2 international (max. half of which notes)
- Professor/full professor: 12B of which at least 3 international (no notes)

Examples:

- Minimum 6 B = 1 B book + 1 B article or 2 A articles + 2 B articles
- Minimum 12 B = 2 books + 1 A article or 1 A book + 1 A article or 1 A book and 2 B articles

2. Projects and PhD-tutorship and involvement

The minimal requirements for projects and PhD-tutorship and involvement are only applied starting from the degree of senior lecturer. They do not apply for lecturers and postdoctorals.

If several applicants are involved in a project (coordinator, promoter, expert), the budget of the project (expressed in FTE) will be divided according to the formula $FTE/(x-1)$, x being the amount of applicants:

2 participants and $\frac{1}{2}$ FTE = $\frac{1}{2}$ FTE / 2-1 => project counts for $\frac{1}{2}$ FTE per applicant (C-project if no international/foreign dimension, otherwise B-project)

2 participants and 1 FTE = 1 FTE / 2-1 => project counts for 1 FTE per applicant (B-project if no international/foreign dimension, otherwise A-project)

3 participants and 1 FTE = 1 FTE / 3-1 => project counts for $\frac{1}{2}$ FTE per applicant (C-project if no international/foreign dimension, otherwise B-project)

3 participants and 2 FTE = 2 FTE / 3-1 => project counts for 1 FTE per applicant (B-project if no international/foreign dimension, otherwise A-project)

...

The following minimal requirements are suggested:

- Senior lecturer: 1 C-project granted or 1 A-supervision or 2 B-supervisions
- Professor and full professor: 1 C-project granted or 1 A-supervision or 4 B-supervisions

3. Lectures

A-, B- and C-lectures are taken into account for the minimal requirements.

The minima are expressed in B-lectures:

1 A-lecture = 3 B-lectures = 6 C-lectures

Starting from the ZAP-level of lecturer, the international component is implemented.

Co-lectures are considered for a fraction of the amount of people involved, $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{3}$, etc.

The following minimal requirements are proposed:

- Postdoctoral: 3 B
- Lecturer: 6 B (of which at least 1 B international)
- Senior lecturer: 9 B (of which at least 2 B international)
- Professor and full professor: 12 B (of which at least 3 B international)

Examples:

- Minimum 6 B = 2 A-lectures
- Minimum 12B = 4A or 2A + 6B-lectures
- Minimum 9B = 1A + 3B + 6C-lectures

4. Overview of the model for the integral quality assessment of research in law

	publications			projects and PhD-tutorship/-involvement	lectures	
	Amount of articles	of which max. amount of notes	of which min. amount international /foreign	Amount	Amount	of which min. amount international/foreign
Post-doctoral	6B or equivalent	half (3B) or equivalent	--	--	3B or equivalent	--
Lecturer	6B or equivalent	half (3B) or equivalent	1B	--	6B or equivalent	1B
Senior lecturer	9B or equivalent	half (5B) or equivalent	2B or equivalent	1C project granted or 1A PhD-tutorship/-involvement or 2 B PhD-tutorship/-involvement	9B or equivalent	2B or equivalent
(Full) Professor	12B or equivalent	0	3B or equivalent	1C project granted or 1 A PhD-tutorship/-involvement or 4B PhD-tutorship/-involvement	12B or equivalent	3B or equivalent

1 A article = 2 B articles
 1 B book = 5 B articles
 1 A book = 5 A articles
 1A book = 5 A articles
 = 10 B articles
 1chapter in A-book = 1 A article
 = 2 B articles
 1chapter in B-book = 1 B article

1 A lecture = 3 B lectures
 =6 C lectures

Remarks:

- Researchers on a postdoctoral level are stimulated at the level of publications: they are expected to satisfy the same minimal requirements as the lecturers, but for a shorter reference period (3 years instead of 5).
- If a researcher has not yet been at his current level for five years (postdoctoral, lecturer, senior lecturer, (full) professor), his former degree determines the minimal requirements.