

# Index

---

- Abejón Peña, T 318  
Abramo, G 260  
academic and professional involvement  
    comparison 6  
    Austria 117–18, 121  
    EU 400  
    Finland 218–19  
    France 277  
    Germany 93–4  
    Italy 248  
    Netherlands 62–3, 68  
    Slovenia 357  
    Spain 305, 311, 315  
    Sweden 189–90  
    Switzerland 153  
    UK 36, 38, 49  
affiliation bias 3  
    Austria 119, 134  
Aguado i Cudolà, V 298, 313  
Alberti Rovira, E 298  
Alcain, M 299, 304, 319  
Alcáin Partearroyo, M 305, 320  
Alegre Ávila, J 312, 314  
Aliaga, F 321, 322  
Alonso-Gamboa, J 320  
Álvarez, M 298  
Álvaro-Guizar, G 318  
Ammannati, L 260  
Amschwand, F 145, 153  
Amttenbrink, F 80, 82  
Andrés Aucejo, E 302, 316, 317, 318,  
    320, 321  
ANECA (National Agency of Evaluation  
    of Quality and Accreditation),  
    Spain 298, 300, 313, 316, 319  
anonymity issues  
    Austria 119, 134  
    Finland 229  
    Netherlands 66, 67  
    Spain 308  
    Sweden 190, 191, 194  
    Switzerland 154, 164  
Anta Carreros, C 299, 319  
ANVUR (National Agency for the  
    Evaluation of the University and  
    Research Systems), Italy 239–40,  
    241, 242, 249–51, 257, 262, 430,  
    436, 439  
Aparicio Acosta, F 297  
assessment practices *see under* individual  
    countries  
associate professorship  
    Austria 130  
    France 278–9, 281, 284–6, 287–8,  
    289–90  
    Italy 240, 252, 257, 258, 259  
    Slovenia 371, 372  
    Spain 312, 315  
    Sweden 205, 207–9  
    *see also* professorship appointment  
Atienza, M 299  
Auer, M 89  
Austria 104–41, 426, 428, 433, 435, 439,  
    442–3, 445–6, 448  
    anonymity issues 119, 134

- Austrian Agency for Research Integrity (OeAWI) 111
- conflicts of interest 113, 118, 134
- expert panels 113, 127, 129
- good scientific practice guidelines 110–11
- private law schools 104
- public universities and law faculties 104
- student numbers 105
- university autonomy 106, 107, 112, 428
- Austria, funding agencies 132–7, 448
  - assessment methods 133–4
  - criticisms 135–7
  - ex post* evaluations 134
  - organizations 132–3
  - peer review 133–4, 135–6
  - private funding issues 133, 136–7
  - target and performance agreement 105–6, 108, 112, 115, 128–9, 132, 426, 433
  - third-party funding 106, 136–7
  - Wissenschaftsfonds* (FWF) agency 133–4, 135–6
- Austria, journals and books 116–22
  - academic and professional research, lack of distinction between 117–18, 121
  - affiliation bias 119, 134
  - assessment methods 119–20
  - case notes 118, 121
  - citation counts 120
  - citations and abbreviations guidelines 120
  - co-authorships 109
  - contribution types to journals 118
  - criticisms 121–2
  - journal numbers 117
  - open access discussions 122, 134, 138–9
  - peer review 119, 121, 122, 125, 439
  - ranking, lack of 108
  - rejection of submissions 119, 121, 133, 134, 137
  - submissions guidelines 120–21
- Austria, journals and books, publication evaluation 111–15, 435
  - assessment methods 112–14, 119–20, 128–9
  - bibliometric and citation analysis 113–14, 128–9
  - criticisms 115
  - external evaluation of university 112
  - internal evaluation of research and teaching staff 112
  - organization and regulations 111–12
  - quality management systems 111–12, 138–9
- Austria, journals and books, quality indicators and lack of journal rankings 108–10, 435
- plagiarism 109, 110–11, 443
- quantitative approach concerns 108–9
- salami slicing 108
- Austria, PhD dissertation committees 123–6, 442, 443
  - assessment methods 123–4, 126
  - criticisms 126
  - dissertation organization 123
  - doctoral programmes 125–6
  - interdisciplinary theses 123–4
  - PhD by publication 124–5
  - prize awards 130, 134
  - thesis publication 125
- Austria, tenure and promotion decisions 126–32, 445–6
  - associate professorships 130
  - criticism 131–2
  - habilitation procedure 126, 127, 129–30, 131
  - influence on university policies 130–31

- methodological quality and new scientific insights 130  
 performance agreement 128, 130, 132  
*Praxisprofessuren* (practical professorship) 127–8, 446  
 professorship appointment procedures 107, 114, 127–8, 129, 130, 131, 446  
 qualification agreement 126–7, 129  
 self-evaluation 113, 120, 128, 129  
 authors' experience and reputation  
   EU, book publishers 408–9  
   intellectual capacity, EU, Frontier Research programme 390–91  
   knowledge and ability requirements, PhD dissertations, Sweden 197  
   legal research experience assessment (*sexenio*), Spain 325–7, 331, 332  
   professional experience rating, Spain 314–15  
   scientific maturity of candidate, Italy 258  
 autonomous institutions  
   Austria 106, 107, 112, 428  
   France 266  
   Spain 296  
   Switzerland 144–5, 147–8  
   UK 22–3, 42  
  
 Baccini, A 259  
 Bach-Hönig, B 397, 398  
 Bakardjieva Engelbrekt, A 16, 170–217  
 Balkin, J 402  
 Balme, P 266  
 Banfi, A 260  
 Barbat, C 260  
 Barral Viñals, I 332  
 Barrett, L and P 42–3  
 Beaud, O 286  
  
 Bengtsson, B 188  
 bibliometric indicators (quantitative evaluation) 2–5, 6–7  
   Austria 108–9, 113–14, 128–9  
   EU 413  
   Finland 227–8, 236  
   France 267–8, 270–71, 272  
   Italy 244  
   Netherlands 81–2  
   Slovenia 344–6, 350–51, 353–4, 355, 360–61, 370–71, 372, 375, 432, 441  
   Spain 302, 428  
   Sweden 173–4, 177–9, 180–81, 182–3, 186–9  
   Switzerland 147, 149–52  
   UK 28–9, 31, 35  
   *see also* citation counts; classification levels; impact assessment  
 Binswanger, M 3  
 Bologna Process 298–9, 368–9  
 Bonaccorsi Tindaro Cicero, A 259  
 book publications 440–41  
   Austria *see* Austria, journals and books  
   editorial review *see* editorial review  
   EU *see* EU, book publishers  
   Finland 221–2  
   France 272–3, 274–6  
   Germany 92, 94  
   Italy *see* Italy, journals and books  
   Netherlands *see* Netherlands, journals and books  
   peer review *see* peer review, journals and books  
   quality assessment *see* quality assessment, journals and books  
   Slovenia *see* Slovenia, journals and books  
   Spain *see* Spain, journals and books

- Sweden *see* Sweden, journals and books
- Switzerland *see* Switzerland, journals and books
- UK *see* UK, journals and books  
*see also* journals; PhD dissertations; ranking of publications
- Borrego, Á 317, 318, 320, 322
- Bosch Capdevila, E 331, 332
- Braben, D 396
- Bradney, T 51
- Brennan, J 28–9
- Bricall, J 297
- Brown, R 21, 29
- Bruce, T 23
- Buchmann, C 111
- Buela, G 297
- Buratti, L 281
- Byland, K 17, 142–69
- Calvo, B 296, 297, 303, 310, 311
- Camas Jimena, M 298
- Campbell, K 31–2, 38
- Campins Eritja, M 301, 302, 332
- Carasso, H 21, 29
- Casadesús Fa, M 313
- case notes 423–4
- Austria 118, 121
  - Italy 249
  - Netherlands 79, 80, 85
  - Spain 304–5
  - Sweden 175, 189, 190
- Cassese, S 251, 260
- Castermans, A 80, 82, 385
- Castilla Barea, M 297, 332
- Cetto, A 320
- charitable bodies, UK, funding 30, 43–4
- Chaves García, J 301, 304, 318, 330
- Chilton, A 13
- Chubin, D 396
- citation counts 1–2, 3, 5, 6, 7
- Austria 120
  - EU 395, 398, 413
  - Germany 93
  - Slovenia 350–51, 353, 358–9, 360, 361–2, 377
  - Spain 316–17, 321, 328
  - Sweden 173–4, 176, 185, 186
  - see also* bibliometric indicators (quantitative evaluation)
- classification levels
- Finland 220–25, 228
  - Italy 249–51
  - Netherlands 63–4, 81
  - Slovenia 357
  - Sweden 182, 187
  - see also* bibliometric indicators (quantitative evaluation)
- CNEAI (National Research Activity Assessment Commission), Spain 300, 316, 326, 330–31, 332
- co-authorships
- Austria 109
  - Slovenia 351, 357–8, 363
  - Switzerland 149
  - see also* journals
- COBISS online database, Slovenia 346–7, 354–5, 357, 371, 437–8
- Collini, S 2, 22, 24, 25, 29, 41, 42, 44, 48, 49
- competition issues
- competitive funding focus, Netherlands 73, 78–9
  - funding issues, Finland 232
  - prior evaluation in form of competition for PhD thesis publication, France 275
  - professorship access, competitive examination, France 286–7
  - tenure and promotion procedures, Spain 312
  - tenure and promotion procedures, Sweden 205, 208, 212

- complaint procedure, EU, Frontier Research programme 394
- conflicts of interest  
Austria 113, 118, 134  
France 250, 267, 278, 282, 284  
Slovenia 367  
Sweden 202, 204, 206
- Conte, G 238
- Conti, S 248
- contract research  
EU 410–12  
Netherlands 56–7, 73, 76, 77–8  
Switzerland 143
- Coomans, F 13
- Costa, D 17, 265–93
- Cownie, F 33, 36, 41
- Crewe, I 24
- CSIC (Superior Council of Scientific Research), Spain 295, 307, 436
- Cueto Pérez, M 295, 296, 297, 310, 330, 331
- Dahler-Larsen, P 80
- Danell, R 391
- D'Angelo, C 260
- databases  
centralized national database, need for, Sweden 174–6  
citation database consideration, Italy 262  
COBISS online database, Slovenia 346–7, 354–5, 357, 371, 437–8  
DICE database, Spain 320, 321  
ISOC database, Spain 319  
Latindex database, Spain 319–20  
RESH database, Spain 320, 321  
Scopus 113, 221, 250–51, 261–2, 343, 347, 350–51, 353, 363–4, 428, 432–3, 445  
Swedish Research Council (VR) 174–5, 176, 177–8, 181, 183  
Web of Science (WoS) 113, 174, 181–3, 250, 261–2, 318, 344, 346, 347, 350–51, 353, 363–4, 428, 432–3, 445
- Dávid, A 398
- De Bock, R 64
- De la Orden, A 300
- De las Heras, G 313, 314, 332
- De Rijcke, S 4, 80, 417
- De Witte, B 8, 398
- De-Miguel, M 309, 310
- Del Pozo Álvarez, J 318
- Delgado López-Cózar, E 326
- Deroussin, D 277
- Di Cristina, F 260
- Dibadj, R 384
- DICE database, Spain, tenure and promotion procedures 320, 321
- digital journals 189, 274, 306  
*see also* journals
- Doak, J 41
- Doctor Europaeus certification, Italy 253–4, 260–61, 430–31
- doctorates *see* PhD dissertations
- double-blind peer review *see* peer review, double-blind
- Douzinas, C 25
- Du Perron Committee 61–2, 64, 69–70
- Duncan, N 10–11, 389
- editorial review  
Finland 229  
France 273, 274–6  
Netherlands 64–5, 66  
Slovenia 357, 365–6, 439  
Spain 307  
Sweden 190–91, 193, 439  
*see also* books; journals; peer review
- electronic journals 189, 274, 306  
*see also* journals
- Embid Irujo, A 294
- Engel, C 398

- Engelmark, S 179
- Eseverri, E 328, 330, 331, 333
- EU 384–421, 457, 458
  - citation counts 395, 398, 413
  - Doctor Europaeus certification 253–4, 260–61, 430–31
  - ERC Work Programme *see* EU
    - funding of research, Frontier Research programme
  - expert panels 391–3, 394, 395, 406–7
  - Horizon 2020 programme 385, 392, 457
  - multidisciplinary approach 387–8
  - originality requirement 388, 390
  - quota system for study places 105
  - see also* individual countries
- EU, book publishers 407–10
  - author's credentials, consideration of 408–9
  - completed manuscript assessment, lack of 409
  - market perspective and profits 410
  - peer review 409
  - proposal assessment 409
  - quality assessment 408, 416–17
- EU, contract research 410–12
  - evaluation criteria 411
  - expected output from applications 411
  - implementation of EU programme or policies 410
  - tenderer's credentials and track record 411–12
- EU, funding of research, Frontier Research programme 384–98, 458
  - complaint procedure 394
  - evaluation criteria 387–91
  - evaluation of evaluation procedure 394–5
  - evaluation outcome 393–4
  - evaluation process 391–8
    - evaluation process, criticism of 396–8
    - evaluation process, two-step 393
    - external reviewers' role 394, 395
    - grants 386–7
    - identification of frontier research concerns 396–7
    - inconsistencies 389
    - intellectual capacity, creativity and commitment of researcher 390–91
    - monitoring for transparency and impartiality 394–5
    - neutrality issues 397–8
    - peer review panels 391–4, 395, 396–8, 404, 417
    - proposal allocation to panels and individual panel members 392–3
    - proposal grading 394
    - proposal structure 387
    - scientific excellence and criteria involved 387–9
    - self- or pre-selection mechanism for applications 391
    - track record assessment 390–91, 395
- EU, journals 398–407
  - academic and practitioner involvement 400
  - doctrinal works 400–403
  - evaluation procedure 404–7
  - evaluation procedure, two-step 406–7
  - journals on EU law and journals promoting European debate on transnational issues 399–400, 402–3
  - peer review 404–7
  - quality standards 403–4, 416–17
- EU, journals, rankings 412–15
  - European ranking 412–13

- inclusion in international rankings
  - 413
  - quantitative indicators 413
  - university rankings and U-Multirank project 413–15
- European Higher Education Area and Bologna Process 298–9, 368–9
- evaluation practices *see under* individual countries
- ex post* evaluation
  - Austria 134
  - Netherlands 77–8
  - Sweden 203
  - Switzerland 164, 166
  - UK 28–9
- experience of authors *see* authors' experience and reputation
- expert panels
  - Austria 113, 127, 129
  - EU 391–3, 394, 395, 406–7
  - Finland 221, 229, 233, 235
  - France 271, 272, 282, 283–4, 290
  - Italy 242–3, 248, 249, 253, 254–5, 256
  - Netherlands 67, 76, 80
  - Spain 307, 309, 313–15, 323
  - Sweden 176, 182, 196, 202, 204, 205–6
  - Switzerland 149, 154, 157–8, 160, 164–5
- see also* peer review
- Fabre-Magnan, M 286
- Feldman, D 33
- Fernández, P 322
- Fernández Vallina, F 311
- Fernando Pablo, M 297
- Finland 218–37, 428, 431, 436–7, 439, 442–4, 446, 448–9
  - academic education versus professional training 218–19
  - bibliometric indicators 227–8, 236
  - evaluation responsibility 220
  - language issues 222, 223, 225, 226–7, 228, 233
  - monitoring issues 226
  - numerus clausus* system 218
  - 'output guiding' systems 220, 428, 431–2
  - University of Helsinki as research university 219
- Finland, doctoral (LLD) dissertations 230–31, 428, 442, 443
  - academic quality and prestige 230–31
  - article dissertations 230
  - quality assessment 231
  - scholarly criteria 230–31
- Finland, funding agencies 219, 232–4, 448
  - Academy of Finland criteria 232–4
  - competitiveness 232
  - expert panels 221, 229, 233, 235
  - private funding 219, 232
  - Publication Forum, research funding and university recruitment involvement 225
  - quality assessment 233
- Finland, promotion and tenure decisions 234–6, 446
  - and external research funding 234
  - internal evaluation systems for individual researchers 235–6
  - international cooperation assessment 234, 236–7
  - professors and assistant professors 234–5
  - salary system 235–6
  - track system 234, 235, 444
- Finland, publication evaluation 228–30, 436–7
  - academic and peer-reviewed articles 229–30
  - anonymity problems 229

- editorial review 229
- Finland, Publication Forum, ranking of
  - legal publications 220–26, 360, 361, 436–7
- academic publication channels 221–3, 225–6
- classification levels 220–25, 228
- criticism 225–6
- data collection procedure 224
- expert panels 221
- Finnish society and culture focus 222–3
- international publications 222, 225
- journal articles instead of
  - monographs, increase in 226
- journals, conferences and book publishers 221–2
- peer review system 225–6, 439
- quality assessment 225, 431–2
- quota system 223–4, 225–6
- research funding and university
  - recruitment involvement 225
- university assessments and
  - publication evaluation 226–8
- Fischer, C 136
- Fister, I 358
- Flink, T 384
- Flodström, A 177
- Flowerdew, J 8
- Flückiger, A 238, 384
- France 265–93, 427–8, 431, 436, 438–9, 443–5, 450
  - academic and professional
    - involvement comparison 277
  - autonomous institutions 266
  - bibliometric indicators (quantitative evaluation) 267–8, 270–71, 272
  - conflicts of interest 250, 267, 278, 282, 284
  - evaluating authority 267–8
  - expert panels 271, 272, 282, 283–4, 290
  - High Council for Evaluation of Research and Higher Education (HCERES) 267–8, 269–70, 271–2, 277, 427, 431
  - law schools 265–6
  - transparency issues 276
- France, funding agencies 266–7, 282–4
  - generic calls for projects procedure 283–4
  - National Research Agency (ANR)
    - missions and operating principles 282
  - National Research Agency (ANR)
    - research project selection procedures 283–4
- France, journals and books 272–6, 436
  - books 272–3, 274–6
  - digital journals 274
  - editorial policy 273, 274–6
  - originality requirement 272, 274, 276, 280
  - peer review 273–4, 438–9
  - prior evaluation in form of
    - competition for PhD thesis publication 275
  - ranking of law journals, absence of 268
  - selection criteria 274
- France, PhD theses evaluation 277–81, 290, 443
  - academic career evaluation 278–80
  - doctoral supervision and research
    - bonus (PEDR) 290
  - during doctoral studies 277–8
  - monitoring issues 269, 277–8, 290–91
  - quality appraisal 277–8, 280
  - statistical data on employment status 280–81



- France, research institution assessment  
 265–6, 268, 269–72, 277, 428  
 peer review 270–71, 291–2  
 peer review criteria 271–2, 427, 431  
 quality indicators 272
- France, tenure and promotion decisions  
 284–91, 444, 445  
 associate professorships 278–9, 281,  
 284–6, 287–8, 289–90  
 doctoral supervision and research  
 bonus (PEDR) 290  
 independence guarantee 292  
 internal promotions 288–9  
 peer review of scholarly publications  
 286, 287–8  
 professorship access 286–8  
 professorship access, competitive  
 examination: *agrégation du  
 supérieur* 286–7  
 publications evaluation 290–91  
 salary levels 289–90  
 selection committee 285–6
- Franceschini, F 259
- Frontier Research programme, EU *see*  
 EU, funding of research, Frontier  
 Research programme
- full professorship *see* professorship  
 appointment
- funding 446–9  
 Austria *see* Austria, funding  
 agencies  
 EU *see* EU, funding of research,  
 Frontier Research programme  
 Finland 219, 225, 232–4, 448  
 France 266–7, 282–4  
 future research 457–9  
 Germany *see* Germany, funding and  
 grants  
 Italy *see* Italy, funding agencies  
 Netherlands *see* Netherlands,  
 funding agencies  
 peer review *see* peer review, funding  
 private *see* private funding  
 quality assessment *see* quality  
 assessment, funding  
 Slovenia *see* Slovenia, funding  
 Spain *see* Spain, funding agencies  
 Sweden *see* Sweden, funding;  
 Sweden, funding agencies  
 Switzerland *see* Switzerland,  
 funding agencies  
 target agreements *see* target  
 agreements, funding  
 third-party *see* third-party funding  
 UK *see* UK, funding
- future research 452–9  
 funding 457–9  
 journals and book publishers  
 evaluation 453–4  
 law schools and legal research  
 centres assessment 452–3  
 PhD dissertations 454–6  
 tenure and promotion 456–7
- Galetta, D 260
- Galindo Caldés, R 313, 314
- Gamper, A 109, 110
- García de Enterría, E 299
- Garfield, E 355
- Gasparini Casari, V 260
- gender equality, Sweden 196, 202, 446
- Germany 88–103, 426, 428, 433, 436,  
 439, 442–3, 445–6, 448–50  
 book publications 92, 94  
 Guttenberg affair 110–11, 443  
 institutional framework of  
 universities and law faculties  
 89, 90–91
- Lower Saxony independent Science  
 Commission 90
- magazines and informal rankings of  
 law schools 90–91
- Max Planck Society 89
- monograph series 92, 93

- non-university research institutions 89
- performance and quality evaluation of law faculties 90–91
- private law schools 89
- professorships, doctorate candidates for 94–5, 442, 443
- tenure and promotion decisions 94–5, 96–7, 442, 443, 445–6
- Wissenschaftsrat* group 88, 90
- Germany, funding and grants 98–101, 448
  - Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (DFG) review process 98–9
  - funding agencies 98, 446
  - quality assessment 99, 100–101
- Germany, journals 91–4, 436
  - academic and practitioner journals, distinction between 93–4
  - acceptance criteria 91–2
  - and international standards 91, 95, 96, 426
  - citation analysis and impact assessment pilot 93
  - peer review 91, 93, 101–2, 439
  - quality assessment 92–4
- Geuna, A 29, 33, 49
- Gill, R 42
- Giménez-Toledo, E 321, 333
- Glass, R 358
- Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF), UK 49
- Gómez, M 324
- González, J 333
- Google Scholar 321–2
- Gotthardt, M 90
- Grant, B 37
- Grimaldi, M 286
- Gröls, M and T 92
- Grove, J 24
- Grundmann, S 88
- Gschwend, L 151
- Gurrea Casamayor, F 295
- Gutmann, T 88
- Guttenberg affair, Germany 110–11, 443
- habilitation *see* tenure and promotion procedures
- Hackett, E 396
- Hagall, A 4
- Hahn, J 111
- Haldane principle, UK 44
- Hamann, H 91, 93
- Hamann, J 31
- Hammarfelt, B 175, 180, 181, 187
- Hanau, P 90
- Hare, P 24, 33, 41
- HCERES (High Council for Evaluation of Research and Higher Education), France 267–8, 269–70, 271–2, 277, 427, 431
- Henkel, M 21, 48
- Henriques, L 397
- Herrera García, M 298
- Hesselink, M 399
- Hicks, D 28, 33, 49
- Hillgruber, C 88
- hiring *see* tenure and promotion decisions
- Hofer, M 128
- Hojnik, J 16–17, 341–83
- Hooimeijer, P 74
- Horizon 2020 programme, EU 385, 392, 457
- Hornbostel, S 391
- Huberman, A 409
- Hug, S 417
- Hussain, S 36
- Hutchinson, T 10–11, 389
- impact assessment 3, 5
  - Germany 93
  - Italy 244–5, 249, 261, 430–31

- Slovenia 344–6, 350–51, 353–4, 355, 360–61, 375, 432, 441
- Spain 316–17, 320, 328
- UK 25–6, 28, 30–31, 35, 38, 41
- see also* bibliometric indicators (quantitative evaluation)
- ISOC database, Spain, tenure and promotion procedures 319
- Italy 238–64, 430–31, 436, 439, 444, 447, 450
- ANVUR (National Agency for the Evaluation of the University and Research Systems) 239–40, 241, 242, 249–51, 257, 262, 430, 436, 439
- language issues 251, 253, 260–61
- National Scientific Qualification (ASN) and access to faculty positions 240, 257
- university system 238
- VQR publication evaluation system 240, 241, 243–6, 249–51, 262, 430–31
- Italy, funding agencies 254–6, 261, 447
- PRIN project assessment procedure 254–6
- private funding 238
- project impact 256, 261
- quality of project and research team 255–6
- selection criteria for reviewers 256
- Italy, journals and books 246–52, 430–31, 436
- books 251
- case notes 249
- court appeals 251
- evaluation methods 248–9
- internationalization 250–51, 260–61
- journal classification 249–51
- legal citation database consideration 262
- monograph proposals 243, 251
- peer review 248–9, 250–51, 439
- professional periodicals 248
- quality and impact assessment 249, 261, 430–31
- ranking of publishers and editorial series 252, 436
- Italy, PhD dissertation evaluation 252–4
- examination committee appointment 253
- internationalization and Doctor Europaeus certification 253–4, 260–61, 430–31
- peer review 253
- quality responsibility 252–3
- Italy, research institution assessment 238–9, 241–6
- assessment criteria and indicators 244–6
- bibliometric indicators, opposition to 244
- expert panels 242–3, 248, 249, 253, 254–5, 256
- internationalization indicator 245–6
- originality requirement 242, 244–5, 249, 255, 258
- peer review 242–3, 244
- procedure and methods 242–3
- quality profiles 246, 247
- research outputs under evaluation 243–6
- Italy, tenure and promotion decisions 257–9, 444
- associate professorships 240, 252, 257, 258, 259
- committee members 257–8
- National Scientific Qualification (ASN) and access to faculty positions 240, 257
- OECD countries 257
- professorship appointment 240, 241, 252, 253, 257, 258, 259
- qualifications assessment 258–9

- scientific maturity of candidate 258
- Jacobsson, C 176
- Jeffrey, B 139
- John, B 139
- Jonkers, K 175
- journals
- assessments *see under* individual countries
  - editorial review *see* editorial review
  - electronic journals 189, 274, 306
  - future research 453–4
  - monograph proposals *see* monograph proposals
  - open access publication *see* open access publication
  - originality requirement *see* originality requirement
  - peer review *see* peer review, journals and books
  - quality assessment *see* quality assessment, journals and books
  - ranking *see* ranking of publications
  - salami-slicing prevention *see* salami-slicing prevention
  - see also* book publications; PhD dissertations; ranking of publications
- Juliá Igual, J 315, 331
- Källström, S 198
- Kaltenbrunner, W 80
- Karlsson, S 176
- Kestemont, L 417
- Klanjšek Gunde, M 378
- Kluwer, W 67, 69
- Köbben, A 78
- Koers Committee report, Netherlands 59–60, 61, 62
- Kogan, M 21, 48
- König, T 384
- Köp, B 114–15
- Kostorz, P 93, 101
- Koubi, G 268
- Krašovec, U 355
- Kučić, L 351
- Kucsko-Stadlmayer, G 132
- Kugelberg, C 195
- Kyvik, S 396
- Langfeldt, L 396
- language issues 2, 8, 10, 11, 12–13
- Finland 222, 223, 225, 226–7, 228, 233
  - Italy 251, 253, 260–61
  - Slovenia 358, 361
  - Sweden 174–5, 182, 189, 192, 200, 203–4, 208
  - Switzerland 152–3
- Latindex database, Spain 319–20
- law school assessment *see* research institution assessment
- Leggeri, C 248
- Legrand, A 286
- Lepori, B 397
- Letto-Vanamo, P 16, 218–37
- Levinson, S 402
- Li, Y 8
- Lienhard, A 1–19, 142–69, 422–59
- Lindholm, J 185, 186
- Lladó Martínez, A 296
- López, J 298
- López Martos, M 295
- Lorenz, S 88
- Lovitts, B 9
- Lozano Leyva, M 311
- Lundgren, A 212
- Luukkonen, T 387, 388, 389, 394, 396
- Mac Síthigh, D 16, 1111
- McNay, I 33
- magazines and informal rankings of law schools, Germany 90–91

- Maier, E 16, 104–41  
 Maier, K 114–15  
 Maisano, D 259  
 Malmberg, A 183  
 Mangas Martín, A 327, 331, 332, 333  
 Marcello, D 260  
 Marginson, S 414  
 market perspective and profits, EU, book publishers 410  
 Martin, B 21, 32, 36  
 Max Planck Society, Germany 89  
 Mayer, H 124  
 Meijers fellowship (Leiden law school), Netherlands 79–80  
 Melin, G 391  
 Melleray, F 285  
 Mercer, J 40  
 Michavila, F 296, 297, 303, 310, 311  
 Micklitz, H-W 389, 391, 398, 399, 402, 403, 404, 412, 417  
 Militello, V 260  
 Miras Portugal, M 297, 311  
 mobility of researchers 13, 315, 333  
 Modrego, A 301  
 Moilanen, A 227  
 monitoring issues  
   EU 394–5  
   Finland 226  
   France 269, 277–8, 290–91  
   Netherlands 59, 66, 67  
   Slovenia 379, 425  
   Switzerland 167–8  
   *see also* peer review  
 monograph proposals  
   Germany 92, 93  
   Italy 243, 251  
   Slovenia 344, 348, 351, 356, 357, 358, 370–71  
   Sweden 174, 182–3, 188–9  
   UK 38–9, 40  
   *see also* journals  
 Moron-Puech, B 286  
 Mortelmans, K 397  
 Müller, T 132  
 multidisciplinary approach 13  
   Austria 123–4  
   EU 387–8  
   Netherlands 62, 76  
   Sweden 199  
   UK, funding 46–7  
 Neergaard, U 399  
 Netherlands 56–87, 427–30, 435–6, 438–40, 442–7, 449–50, 453  
   anonymity issues 66, 67  
   *Ars Aequi* journal 65–6  
   Du Perron Committee and  
     Legal Science Repository  
     suggestion 61–2  
   evaluation responsibilities 57  
   expert panels 67, 76, 80  
   Higher Education and Scientific  
     Research Act 57, 427  
   *Intellectuele Eigendom en  
     Reclamerecht* journal 68–9  
   midterm reviews 57  
   mission statements and research  
     objectives 60  
   monitoring issues 59, 66, 67  
   multidisciplinary approach 62, 76  
   *Nederlands Juristenblad* journal  
     68, 69  
   *Nederlandse Organisatie voor  
     Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek*  
     (NWO) role 5, 56, 73–8, 446  
   *Netherlands Journal of Legal  
     Philosophy* 65  
   *Rechtsgeleerd Magazijn Themis*  
   *Tijdschrift voor Bouwrecht* journal  
     69  
   *Weekblad voor fiscaal recht* journal  
     66  
   *WPNR* journal 66, 68

- Netherlands, funding agencies 73–8, 446, 447
  - and contract research 56–7, 73, 76, 77–8
  - assessment procedure and research proposals 75
  - competitive funding focus 73, 78–9
  - European research foundations 76
  - ex ante* assessment procedures 76–7
  - ex post* evaluation of research projects 77–8
  - identity of best projects 74
  - past performance role 74–5
  - peer reviews 75, 76
  - research funding budget of law schools 56–7
- Netherlands, journals and books 57–71, 428, 429–30, 435–6
  - academic versus professional publications, lack of distinction between 62–3, 68
  - and decision to publish 63–71
  - case notes 79, 80, 85
  - classification levels 63–4, 81
  - Du Perron Committee advice 64, 69–70
  - editorial review as standard 64–5, 66
  - English language journals 64
  - open access publication 61–2
  - originality requirement 70
  - peer review 59–60, 65–6, 67, 72, 438–9
  - peer review culture for book publishers, lack of 66–7, 440
  - quality indicators 67–9
  - quality indicators, from implicit to explicit 69–71
  - ranking, lack of 61, 63–4
  - scientific thoroughness and profundity factors 70
  - self-evaluation 58, 59, 79
  - Smits Committee advice 64
  - Stolker Committee
    - recommendations 63
    - submission guidelines 64–5
    - word limits 70
- Netherlands, PhD dissertations 71–3, 442, 443
  - evaluation criteria 71–2
  - growing importance 71
  - quality, lack of knowledge of average 72–3
  - supervision and instruction 59
- Netherlands, research institution
  - assessment 57, 58–63
  - decentralization considerations 60, 62–3
  - Koers Committee report 59–60, 61, 62
  - metrics versus peer review 61–2
  - national research assessment and Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) 57–9, 428, 429–30
  - peer review 59–62
  - research quality, relevance and viability criteria 58–9, 62
- Netherlands, tenure and promotions
  - decisions 78–82, 444–5
  - competitive research financing (COF) system (Tilburg law school) 78–9
  - internal evaluation systems for individual researchers 78–80
  - Meijers fellowship (Leiden law school) 79–80
  - professorship appointment 79
  - quantitative evaluation issues 81–2
  - Sanders qualification system (Rotterdam law school) 79
  - teaching obligations, effect of 81
  - uniformity, lack of 78, 81
  - valorization issues 81
- Neufeld, J 391

- neutrality issues, EU, Frontier Research programme 397–8
- Nieto, A 313
- Nokkala, T 397
- Nombela Cano, C 296
- Nordell, P 190, 191, 192, 194
- Norrie, A 25
- Norway, ranking of journals 175, 176, 181, 182–3, 187, 437
- Novak, M 106, 124, 129
- Ochsner, M 417
- Oliveira, L 299
- Olmos Migueláñez, S 298
- open access publication 12–13
  - Austria 122, 134, 138–9
  - Netherlands 61–2
  - Switzerland 165, 166
  - UK 33–4, 37
  - see also* journals
- originality requirement
  - EU 388, 390
  - France 272, 274, 276, 280
  - Italy 242, 244–5, 249, 255, 258
  - Netherlands 70
  - Spain 328
  - UK 28, 39
  - see also* journals; quality assessment
- Ortega Martínez, E 309
- Ortiz de Urbina Gimeno, Í 299
- ‘output guiding’ systems, Finland 220, 428, 431–2
- Parejo Alfonso, L 296
- Paricio Royo, J 333–4
- Park, R 402
- Parker, J 41
- Pauliat, H 288
- peer review 2, 5, 423–4
  - see also* editorial review; expert panels; monitoring issues; quality assessment
- peer review, double-blind 6, 8–9, 439–40
  - Austria 133–4
  - Finland 222, 229–30
  - France 274
  - Germany 91, 92
  - Italy 248
  - Netherlands 65, 66–7
  - Slovenia 348, 357, 361, 365, 366
  - Spain 306, 307
  - Sweden 190, 191
  - Switzerland 154, 155, 156, 164, 165, 167
- peer review, funding
  - Austria 133–4, 135–6
  - EU, Frontier Research programme 391–4, 395, 396–8, 404, 417
  - Netherlands 75, 76
  - Spain 330
  - Sweden 177–8, 186–7, 201–3, 432
  - UK 45, 46
- peer review, journals and books
  - Austria 119, 121, 122, 125, 438–41
  - EU 404–7
  - Finland 225–6, 439
  - France 273–4, 438–9
  - Germany 91, 93, 101–2, 439
  - Italy 248–9, 250–51, 439
  - Netherlands 59–60, 61–2, 65–6, 66–7, 67, 72, 438–9, 440
  - Slovenia 365–6, 377, 439
  - Spain 305–6, 308, 439
  - Sweden 190, 191–2, 193, 194–5, 439
  - Switzerland 155–6, 439
  - UK 28–9, 32–3, 36, 37, 38–9, 428, 439
- peer review, PhD dissertation 442–3
  - Italy 253
  - Switzerland 158
- peer review, research institution assessment

- France 270–71, 271–2, 291–2, 427, 431  
 Italy 242–3, 244  
 Sweden 183–4  
 Switzerland 152
- peer review, tenure and promotion decisions  
 France 286, 287–8  
 Sweden 205
- Pen, M 83
- Pérez Yuste, R 294
- Peruginelli, G 16, 238–64
- Petersen, N 17, 88–103
- PhD dissertations 441–4  
 Austria *see* Austria, PhD dissertation committees  
 doctoral (LLD) dissertations, Finland *see* Finland, doctoral (LLD) dissertations  
 France *see* France, PhD theses evaluation  
 future research 454–6  
 Italy *see* Italy, PhD dissertation evaluation  
 multi- and interdisciplinary research 443–4  
 Netherlands *see* Netherlands, doctorate dissertations  
 peer review *see* peer review, PhD dissertation  
 quality assessment *see* quality assessment, PhD dissertations  
 Slovenia *see* Slovenia, PhD dissertations criteria  
 Spain 308–10  
 Sweden *see* Sweden, PhD dissertations  
 Switzerland 146, 157–8, 168, 442  
 UK 39–40, 47, 442  
*see also* book publications; journals
- Pichonnaz, P 142, 151
- Pigeyre, F 286
- Piolatto, M 29
- plagiarism, Austria 109, 110–11, 443
- Polo, G 313, 314, 332
- Pöschl, M 108, 109, 110
- Posner, E 13
- Posner, R 414
- PRIN project assessment procedure, Italy 254–6
- private funding  
 Austria 133, 136–7  
 Finland 219, 232  
 Italy 238  
 Sweden 172, 201, 211  
 Switzerland 143–4, 162  
*see also* funding
- private law schools  
 Austria 104  
 Germany 89  
 Slovenia 341  
 Spain 294
- prize awards  
 Austria 130, 134  
 Switzerland 157, 158, 162
- professional and academic involvement  
 comparison *see* academic and professional involvement comparison
- professorship appointment  
 Austria 107, 114, 127–8, 129, 130, 131, 446  
 Finland 234–5  
 France 286–8  
 Germany 94–5, 442, 443  
 Italy 240, 241, 252, 253, 257, 258, 259  
 Netherlands 79  
 Slovenia 370–71  
 Spain 314–16, 325–6  
 Sweden 204–5, 209–10, 212  
 Switzerland 160



- see also* associate professorship;  
tenure and promotion  
decisions
- promotion *see* tenure and promotion  
decisions
- publication evaluation *see* book  
publishing; journals
- Purnhagen, K 17, 88–103
- quality assessment 3, 6, 9–12, 423–5  
*see also* originality requirement;  
peer review
- quality assessment, funding  
Finland 233  
Germany 99, 100–101  
Italy 255–6  
Spain 323–4, 327–8, 332–3  
Sweden 173–4, 177–8, 186–7,  
202–3, 204, 432  
Switzerland 164–5
- quality assessment, journals and books  
Austria *see* Austria, journals and  
books  
EU 403–4, 408, 416–17  
Finland 225, 431–2  
Germany 92–4  
Italy 249, 261, 430–31  
Netherlands 67–9, 69–71  
Slovenia 365–6, 375, 432–3  
Spain 312, 314–15, 316–22, 327–8  
Sweden 192–3  
Switzerland 154–5, 440  
UK 36–7, 38
- quality assessment, PhD dissertations  
Finland 231  
France 277–8, 280  
Italy 252–3  
Netherlands 72–3  
Spain 309–10  
Sweden 196–8
- quality assessment, research institutes  
France 272
- Germany 90–91  
Italy 246, 247  
Netherlands 58–9, 62  
Spain 299–300, 303–4, 333–4  
Sweden 180, 181–6  
Switzerland 145, 147–8, 150, 151,  
152, 433–4  
UK 39–40, 442
- quality assessment, tenure and promotion  
decisions  
Spain 312, 314–15  
Sweden 206, 210–11, 213  
Switzerland 161
- quantitative evaluation *see* bibliometric  
indicators (quantitative  
evaluation)
- quota system  
Finland, Publication Forum, ranking  
of publications 223–4, 225–6  
Slovenia, Publication Forum,  
ranking of publications 361  
study places, European Commission  
105
- ranking of publications 3, 6, 435–8  
Austria 108  
Finland *see* Finland, Publication  
Forum, ranking of legal  
publications  
France 268  
Germany 90–91  
Italy 252, 436  
Netherlands 61, 63–4  
Slovenia 347–9, 350–51, 361, 437–8  
Spain 307, 317, 320, 321–2  
Sweden 174–6, 190–91, 206, 437  
Switzerland 154, 156  
UK 35–6  
*see also* book publications; journals
- Reckling, F 136  
Reedijk, J 355  
Reichmann, G 110

- rejection of submissions
  - Austria 119, 121, 133, 134, 137
  - Sweden 191, 192–3
- Renaudie, M 265
- reputation of authors *see* authors'
  - experience and reputation
- Research Excellence Framework (REF),
  - UK *see* UK, Research Excellence Framework (REF)
- research institution assessment
  - Austria 107, 110, 134, 428
  - Finland 226–8
  - France *see* France, research institution assessment
  - Germany 89, 90–91
  - Italy *see* Italy, research institution assessment
  - Netherlands *see* Netherlands, research institution assessment
- peer review *see* peer review,
  - research institution assessment
- quality assessment *see* quality
  - assessment, research institutes
- Slovenia 341–3, 362–4, 428
- Spain 294–6, 297–8, 301–2
- Sweden *see* Sweden, research institutes assessment
- Switzerland *see* Switzerland,
  - research institution assessment
- UK *see* UK, Research Excellence Framework (REF)
- RESH database, Spain, tenure and
  - promotion procedures 320, 321
- Rieble, V 109
- Rixen, S 88
- Roca i Trias, E 329, 331
- Rodríguez Conde, M 298
- Romi, R 285
- Roux, T 9, 10
- Rubin, E 389
- Ruda, A 17, 294–340
- Rueda Beltrán, M 318
- Rüegg, W 398
- Ruiz-Corbella, M 330
- Rumney, P 41
- Saarela, M 226
- Saari, S 227
- Saks, M 402
- salami-slicing prevention
  - Austria 108
  - Slovenia 357–8
  - Spain 330
  - see also* journals
- salary levels
  - Finland 235–6
  - France 289–90
  - Spain 330–31
  - Sweden 210–11
  - see also* tenure and promotion decisions
- Saldaña, J 409
- Salvador Coderch, P 308
- San Francisco Declaration on Research
  - Assessment 3
- San Millán, M 299
- Sánchez González, M 299, 332
- Sanders qualification system (Rotterdam
  - law school), Netherlands 79
- Sandgren, C 170, 187, 188, 190, 194,
  - 196, 199–200, 204, 211–12, 213
- Sandström, E and U 176
- Sanmartín, O 325
- Sanz-Menéndez, L 301
- Sastre Ariza, S 299
- Sayer, D 21, 28–9
- Schatz, D 5
- Schindler-Daniels, A 385
- Schmied, M 17, 142–69
- Schön, W 398

- Schulze-Fielitz, H 89, 93, 95
- Scopus database 113, 221, 250–51, 261–2, 343, 347, 350–51, 353, 363–4, 428, 432–3, 445
- self-evaluation
- Austria, tenure and promotion 113, 120, 128, 129
  - EU, funding of research, Frontier Research programme 391
  - Netherlands, publications 58, 59, 79
  - Slovenia, research institution
    - assessment 343
  - Sweden, research institution
    - assessments 179, 182, 185
  - Switzerland, research institution
    - assessments 148–9, 151
- Siems, M 22, 33, 70
- Siversten, G 176
- Slovenia 341–83, 425, 428, 432–3, 437–9, 441–2, 445, 447, 449
- COBISS online database 346–7, 354–5, 357, 371, 437–8
  - conflicts of interest 367
  - language issues 358, 361
  - law schools and legal research
    - institutes 341–2, 428
  - national research projects 342–3
  - objectivity 344, 346, 352
  - private law schools 341
  - research institution assessment
    - 341–3, 362–4, 428
  - Slovenian Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (SQAA) 343, 355, 362–3, 370, 445
  - Slovenian Research Agency
    - 342–54*passim*, 356, 358, 360, 362, 365, 366, 367, 371, 447
  - Slovenian Research Information System (SICRIS) 343, 346, 348, 349, 354–5, 356, 362, 363, 365, 371, 376, 377, 432, 437–8
  - Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) law list 360, 361
  - transparency issues 344, 366
  - WoS and Scopus databases 343, 347, 350–51, 353, 363–4, 428, 432–3, 445
- Slovenia, funding 343, 351–2, 353, 354, 447
- bibliometric system, failure and lack of adaptation to 360
  - co-funding of research monographs 356
  - funding scores 351–2
  - provided by Ministry of Science 363–4
  - public funding of law schools 341
  - Slovenian Research Agency 374, 375–6
- Slovenia, journals and books 344–64, 364–7, 437–8
- academic and professional works, distinction between 357
  - bibliography management 346–9, 428
  - bibliometrics and impact factor
    - 344–6, 350–51, 353–4, 355, 360–61, 375, 432, 441
  - books 366–7
  - citation counts 350–51, 353, 358–9, 360, 361–2, 377
  - classification levels 357
  - co-authorships 351, 357–8, 363
  - conceptual inadequacy of system 354–6
  - editorial review to peer review move 365–6, 439
  - fake journals 359

- funding scores 351–2
  - higher-impact publications, focus on 353–4
  - institutional research evaluation 362–4
  - international journals 361–2
  - internationalization of Slovenian law journals 364–5
  - journals outside usual ambit 358
  - monograph proposals 344, 348, 351, 356, 357, 358, 370–71
  - papers in foreign law journals 353
  - quality indicators 365–6
  - quantitative scoring of research quality 349–52, 428
  - quota system 361
  - ranking 347–9, 350–51, 361, 437–8
  - salami-slicing in books 357–8
  - Slovenian law journals and yearbooks, scoring issues 360
  - specialized information centres by field (OSIC) 347
- Slovenia, PhD dissertations 342, 367–9, 442
  - and Bologna Declaration 368–9
  - original findings by PhD candidates 369
- Slovenia, Slovenian Research Agency,
  - evaluation of research proposals and prior publications 374–9
  - funding only for young researchers 376
  - funding of research programmes 374, 375–6
  - group selection 374–5
  - monitoring and supervision 379, 425
  - peer review 377
  - proposal criteria 375
  - quality assessment 375, 432–3
  - referential publications 377
  - relevance of work for research field or profession 375
  - research projects 376–9
  - two-stage procedure with privileged applicants 378–9
- Slovenia, tenure and promotion decisions 342, 353, 354, 370–73, 445
  - academic appointment procedures 372–3
  - associate and assistant professorships 371, 372
  - full professorships 370–71
  - full-time researchers not involved in university teaching 371
  - quantitative conditions 370–71, 372
- Smits Committee advice, Netherlands 64
- Snel, M 16, 56–87, 384–421
- Söderbergh Widding, A 179
- Sousa, S 28–9
- Spain 294–340, 428, 436, 439, 444–5, 448, 450
  - academic and professional involvement comparison 305, 311, 315
  - academic staff evaluation 300
  - ANECA (National Agency of Evaluation of Quality and Accreditation) 298, 300, 313, 316, 319
  - anonymity issues 308
  - bibliometric indicators 302, 428
  - CNEAI (National Research Activity Assessment Commission) 300, 316, 326, 330–31, 332
  - CSIC (Superior Council of Scientific Research) 295, 307, 436
  - European Higher Education Area and Bologna Process 298–9
  - law faculties, research groups and programmes 303–4
  - PhD dissertation committees 308–10
  - PhD dissertation committees, quality assessment 309–10

- private law schools 294
- qualitative methods 299–300, 303–4, 333–4
- research groups, lack of 299
- research institution assessment 294–6, 297–8, 301–2
- research projects 296–7
- Research State Agency (AEI) 300–301
- research subject evaluation 300–301
- transparency 304, 308, 310, 332–3
- university autonomy 296
- Spain, funding agencies 322–31, 448
  - Challenges Programme 323, 324–5
  - Excellence Programme 322–4
  - legal research experience assessment (*sexenio*) 325–7, 331, 332
  - originality, rigour, methodology and impact assessment 328
  - peer review 330
  - preferred contributions 328–9
  - publications deemed irrelevant 329–30
  - quality, relevance and feasibility assessment 323–4, 327–8, 332–3
  - salami-slicing prevention 330
  - salary levels 330–31
- Spain, journals and books 300, 302, 304–8, 436
  - books 307–8, 327
  - books, editorial review 307
  - case notes 304–5
  - citation counts 316–17, 321, 328
  - electronic journals 306
  - funding agencies, publications deemed irrelevant 329–30
  - journal types 304–5
  - peer review 305–6, 308, 439
  - quality assessment for promotion 316–22, 327–8
  - ranking of publications 307, 317, 320, 321–2
  - Spanish Journals on Social Sciences and Humanities (RESH) system 305
  - submission guidelines 306
- Spain, tenure and promotion decisions 310–22, 444, 445
  - academic ‘schools’ weight concerns 312–13
  - associate professorships 312, 315
  - DICE database 320, 321
  - evaluation 310–17
  - expert evaluation commissions 307, 309, 313–15, 323
  - full professorship 314–16, 325–6
  - funding agencies and salary levels 330–31
  - Google Scholar use 321–2
  - ISOC database 319
  - journals and books, quality assessment for promotion 316–22, 327–8
  - Latindex database 319–20
  - professional experience rating 314–15
  - public competition assessment 312
  - publication quality assessment 312, 314–15, 316–22
  - research merits assessment 315–17
  - RESH database 320, 321
  - selection procedures 310–11
  - SPI information system 321
- specialized information centres by field (OSIC), Slovenia 347
- Spitzer, R 13
- Steininger, A 89
- Stephan, P 28
- Stern Review, UK, Research Excellence Framework (REF) 34–5, 42
- Stolker, C 6, 25, 37, 38, 47, 67, 69, 71, 385, 398, 405, 409, 413

- Stolleis, M 88–9
- Sweden 170–217, 427–8, 432–4, 437, 439–40, 442–3, 446–7, 450, 457
- anonymity issues 190, 191, 194
  - conflicts of interest 202, 204, 206
  - higher educational system (HIE) 171–2
  - language issues 174–5, 182, 189, 192, 200, 203–4, 208
  - Norwegian model comparison 175, 176, 181, 182–3, 187, 437
  - research quality focus 170–71
  - Swedish Research Council (VR)
    - database and Thomson Reuters information system 174–5, 176, 177–8, 181, 183
- Sweden, funding 172, 173–9, 200–204, 427, 447
- biased distribution of funding claims 177
  - bibliometric model, criticism of current 177–9
  - centralized national database, need for 174–6
  - criticism of procedures 203–4
  - evaluation indicators 177
  - ex post* evaluation 203
  - interaction parameter 178–9, 188
  - Knowledge in Cooperation* bill 178–9
  - main agencies 200–201
  - partial redistribution based on research quality 173, 174–6
  - peer review 201–3
  - private funding 172, 201, 211
  - quality assessment 202–3, 204
  - quality-based allocation of resources and peer review suggestion 177–8, 186–7, 432
  - quantitative methods for quality evaluation 173–4
  - research quality focus 179
  - selection procedure 201–2
- Sweden, journals and books 189–95, 437, 440
- academic cooperation between Nordic countries 190–91
  - academic and professional legal journals, lack of distinction between 189–90
  - case notes 175, 189, 190
  - citation counts 173–4, 176, 185, 186
  - classification levels 182, 187
  - editorial review to peer review shift 190–91, 193, 439
  - journal review procedure 192
  - legal journals 189–90
  - legal publishers 193
  - legal publishers, criticism of existing evaluation 193–4
  - legal publishers, peer review tradition, lack of 193, 194–5
  - monograph proposals 174, 182–3, 188–9
  - peer review, optional 191–2
  - quality criteria, lack of clear 192–3
  - ranking of journals 174–6, 190–91, 206, 407
  - rejection of submissions 191, 192–3
- Sweden, PhD dissertations 195–200, 442, 443
- expert panels 176, 182, 196, 202, 204, 205–6
  - knowledge and ability requirements 197
  - legal scholarship role 198–200, 204
  - multi- and cross-disciplinary approaches 199
  - objectivity and integrity of jury selection procedure 196
  - procedures 195–6
  - publication acceptance changes 198
  - quality requirements 196–8

- science theory and research methods requirements 197–8
- Sweden, research institution assessment 180–89
  - benchmarking exercise 185–6
  - bibliometric methods 180–81, 182–3, 186–9
  - capacity for recruitment and generating external funding 185
  - comprehensive quality evaluation exercises, growing trend 181–6
  - comprehensive quality evaluation exercises, growing trend, Stockholm University 183–5
  - comprehensive quality evaluation exercises, growing trend, Umeå University 185–6
  - comprehensive quality evaluation exercises, growing trend, Uppsala University 181–3
  - distribution of resources at local university level, evaluation diversity 180–81
  - leading research environments identification 183–4
  - legal scholarship effects on professional community 188
  - national standard evaluation system for measuring quality, lack of 180
  - peer review 183–4
  - scholarly production 184–5
  - self-evaluation 179, 182, 185
- Sweden, tenure and promotion decisions 204–12, 446, 457
  - quality assessment 206, 210–11, 213
  - academic advancement stages 205
  - appointment and promotion
    - to docent (non-salaried associate professor) 205, 207–9
  - appointment and promotion
    - to docent (non-salaried associate professor), Örebro University 208–9
  - appointment and promotion
    - to docent (non-salaried associate professor), Uppsala University 208
  - assessment procedure 205–6, 212
  - competition issues 205, 208, 212
  - criticisms 211–12
  - expert panels 205–6, 212
  - gender equality 202, 446
  - irregularities 212
  - peer review 205
  - professorship appointment 204–5, 209–10, 212
  - publication evaluation for
    - appointment as senior lecturer 206–7
  - salary negotiations 210–11
  - tenure-track lecturer 205
  - transparency and accountability issues 211, 212
- Switzerland 142–69, 427, 436, 439–40, 442, 447, 449–50
  - academic and professional involvement comparison 153
  - anonymity issues 154, 164
  - autonomous institutions 144–5, 147–8
  - bibliometric procedures and indicators 147, 149–52
  - ex post* evaluation 164, 166450
  - expert panels 149, 154, 157–8, 160, 164–5

- Federal Act on Funding and Coordination of the Swiss Higher Education Sector (HEdA) 142, 147, 427
- in-depth evaluations at law faculties 147
- legal research and legal practice, links between 143
- monitoring issues 167–8
- national provisions 144–6
- quality assurance 145
- transparency issues 145, 156, 161, 163, 165
- Switzerland, funding 143–4, 162–6, 447
  - contract research 143
  - evaluation criteria 164–5
  - evaluation methods 164, 167–8
  - open access publication requirement 165, 166
  - private funding 143–4, 162
  - quality assessment 164–5
  - research modification possibilities 166
  - scientific research and innovation promotion 162
  - Swiss Academy of Humanities and Social Sciences (SAHS) 162
  - Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF) 144, 162–6
  - third-party funding 144, 145–6, 160–61
- Switzerland, journals and books 152–6, 436
  - assessment methods and quality criteria of journals 154–5
  - assessment methods and quality criteria of legal book publishers 155, 440
  - journal editorial teams 153
  - journals and research and practice interdependence issues 153–4
  - language segmentation 152–3
  - peer review issues 155–6, 439
  - ranking of publications, lack of 154, 156
  - Switzerland, PhD dissertations 146, 157–8, 168, 442
    - assessment framework 157–8, 168
    - peer review 158
    - prize awards 157, 158, 162
    - procedures and criteria 157–8
  - Switzerland, research institution
    - assessment 143, 147–52
    - criticism 151–2
    - framework 147–9
    - peer review concerns 152
    - publications' role and bibliometric methods 149–51
    - quality assurance and accreditation 147–8, 150, 151, 152, 433–4
    - reporting duty 148–9
    - self-assessment 148–9, 151
  - Switzerland, tenure and promotion decisions 146, 159–61
    - appointment procedures 160
    - assessment framework 159–60
    - current evaluation practices 161
    - professor promotions 160
    - quality criteria 161
    - researcher assessment practices 160–61
    - researcher categories 159–60
    - university accreditation guidelines 159
- Tamanaha, B 424
- Tanquerel, T 238, 384
- target agreements, funding
  - Austria 105–6, 108, 112, 115, 128–9, 132, 426, 433
  - UK 42, 43
  - see also* funding
- Tauran, T 288
- tenure and promotion decisions 444–6



- Austria *see* Austria, tenure and promotion decisions
- Finland 234–6, 446
- France *see* France, tenure and promotion decisions
- future research 456–7
- Germany 94–5, 96–7, 442, 443, 445–6
- Italy *see* Italy, tenure and promotion decisions
- Netherlands *see* Netherlands, tenure and promotions decisions
- peer review *see* peer review, tenure and promotion decisions
- quality assessment *see* quality assessment, tenure and promotion decisions
- Slovenia *see* Slovenia, tenure and promotion decisions
- Spain *see* Spain, tenure and promotion decisions
- Sweden *see* Sweden, tenure and promotion decisions
- Switzerland *see* Switzerland, tenure and promotion decisions
- UK *see* UK, tenure and promotion decisions
- see also* professorship appointment; salary levels
- tenure-track lecturer, Sweden 205
- third-party funding
- Austria 106, 136–7
  - Switzerland 144, 145–6, 160–61
- see also* funding
- third-party ‘league tables’, UK, Research Excellence Framework (REF) 27–8
- Thomas, P 38
- Thomson Reuters, Web of Science (WoS) database 113, 174, 181–3, 250, 261–2, 318, 344, 346, 347, 350–51, 353, 363–4, 428, 432–3, 445
- Thornton, M 21, 22, 23, 33, 36, 41, 49
- Thym, D 89
- Tijssen, H 389
- Timmermans, M 71
- Torres-Salinas, D 302
- track record assessment, EU, Frontier Research programme 390–91, 395
- track system, Finland, promotion and tenure decisions 234, 235, 444
- transnational mobility of researchers 13, 315, 333
- transparency issues
- EU, Frontier Research programme 394–5
  - France 276
  - Slovenia 344, 366
  - Spain 304, 308, 310, 332–3
  - Sweden 173, 176, 211, 212
  - Switzerland 145, 156, 161, 163, 165
- Tromp, H 78
- Truchet, D 290
- Tushnet, M 402
- U-Multirank project, EU 413–15
- UK 20–55, 426, 428–9, 437, 439, 442, 444, 446–8, 450, 452–3, 457
- autonomy of law schools 22–3, 42
- case studies 25
- Clark v University of Lincolnshire and Humberside* 24
- doctoral research and quality assurance policy 39–40, 442
- government department(s) responsibilities and evaluation and policy relationship 24, 25, 29–31

- Higher Education and Research Act  
23, 44
- judicial review and accountability  
24
- Queen Mary University of London v HEFCE* 44
- R v HEFCE ex parte Institute of Dental Surgery* 24
- Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) 21, 24, 36
- research centres 23
- UK, funding 23, 42, 43–50, 446–7, 448  
and impact on law schools 48–9  
charitable bodies 30, 43–4  
declining funding success rates,  
criticism of 49–50  
demand management systems 44–5  
doctrinal legal research 47  
Global Challenges Research Fund (GCRF) 49  
grant holder reports and peer review  
46
- Haldane principle 44  
multidisciplinary approach 46–7  
peer reviews 45, 46  
project funding, move towards  
49–50  
proposal reviews 44–6  
research councils 43, 45
- Research Excellence Framework (REF), public money allocation, ‘dual support system’ and quality related (QR) funding 29–30, 35  
single discipline research by lone scholars 48  
success rate of applications 47–8  
target setting 42, 43
- UK, journals and books 35–9, 437  
Academic Journal Guide and journal ranking 35–6, 437  
and institutional reputation 38
- ‘generalist’ and ‘specialist’ publications, differences between 36, 38, 49  
monograph proposals 38–9, 40  
open access journals 33–4, 37  
originality requirement 28, 39  
peer reviews 36, 37, 38–9, 428, 439  
quality and relevance thresholds 36–7, 38  
ranking of publications 35–6
- Research Excellence Framework (REF), publications evaluation 31–3  
significant scholarly material focus 36  
US journals, appeal of 37–8
- UK, promotions and appointments 40–43, 442, 444  
contract differences 42–3  
‘mock’ assessments using REF criteria 42
- UK, Research Excellence Framework (REF) 21–35, 426, 429, 437, 439, 444, 452–3, 457  
and unit of assessment (UoA) 21–3, 25, 26  
as evaluation of research and publications 25–6, 41  
bibliometrics use 28–9, 31, 35  
criticism and reform 33–5  
ex post peer review 28–9  
fields of interest development 38  
grading descriptors 28  
impact quality assessment 25–6, 28, 30–31, 35, 38, 41  
legal basis 23–4  
numerical ‘profile’ of aspects of submission 27  
output selection effects 26–7, 33, 34–5, 38  
peer review panels and sub-panel membership 32–3

- public money allocation , ‘dual support system’ and quality related (QR) funding 29–30, 35
- publications evaluation 31–3
- research council applications 26
- research environment component 26
- significance and financial consequences 26–31
- Stern Review 34–5, 42
- third-party ‘league tables’ 27–8
- university and law school assessment *see* research institution assessment
- Urdin, C 319
- US
  - journal rankings 1–2, 36
  - journals, appeal of 37–8, 361
  - tenure review 29, 107
- Van Boom, W 14, 70, 74, 82, 84
- Van der Burg, W 74
- Van der Meulen, B 74
- Van Dijck, G 413
- Van Genugten, W 58, 63, 64, 66
- Van Gestel, R 1–19, 28, 56–87, 389, 391, 398, 399, 402, 403, 404, 405, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 422–59
- Van Leeuwen, T 7
- Van Ommeren, F 65
- Van Vught, F 414, 415
- Vasishth, S 394, 397
- Velázquez de Medrano Ureta, C 298
- Vesperini, G 260
- Vidal García, J 303
- Von Bogdandy, A 398
- VQR publication evaluation system, Italy 240, 241, 243–6, 249–51, 262, 430–31
- Vranken, J 69, 405
- Wahlgren, P 199
- Web of Science (WoS) database 113, 174, 181–3, 250, 261–2, 318, 344, 346, 347, 350–51, 353, 363–4, 428, 432–3, 445
- Weiler, J 1–2, 355, 413
- Westerman, P 58
- Whitley, R 21, 32, 36
- Wimmer, N 132
- Wise, E 178
- Wissenschaftsfonds* (FWF) agency, Austria 133–4, 135–6
- Wissenschaftsrat* group, Germany 88, 90
- word limits, Netherlands, journals and books 70
- Yoon, A 3
- Zacharewicz, T 175
- Zeiler, C 114
- Ziegele, F 414, 415
- Zupanc, J 378
- Zuppiroli, L 142

