

## **REPORT FROM THE EXTERNAL ADVISORY BOARD of CEDIS**

RAPPORTEUR: Nuno Garoupa

Institution: George Mason University

City: Arlington, VA

Country: USA

Email: ngaroup@gmu.edu

Date: 2/2/2024

Having analysed CEDIS activities in the period between January 1, 2018 and December 31, 2023, and on the basis of the criteria of evaluation established in Annex 1 of the “Rules of Procedure for the External Advisory Board”, these are my findings and recommendations in relation to:

### Criteria A

1) clear statement on the advancement of knowledge and respective impact with a reference to publications or any other relevant research and innovation indicators:

*Concerning research, positive and growing but still modest publications at international level and by a limited number of researchers → impose more ambitious goals and incentives, mainly nonmonetary (teaching relief, early sabbatical). Individual quantitative productivity is not the only criteria, but should be acknowledged and discussed. Provide information about h-index and other.*

2) degree of internationalisation and collaborative research of CEDIS outputs:

*See above*

3) advanced training of researchers including Master’s and PhD students or postdocs:

*Given the Portuguese context, seems adequate. It should be considered placement and career strategies to avoid institutional inbreeding.*

4) the development and consolidation of careers at different levels, including the integration of researchers into permanent positions, and the impact of FCT scientific employment instruments on the activities of CEDIS

*Internationalization means high turnover of junior and senior members. There should be a stable plan of researchers’ renovation/hiring.*

5) the quality of hosting conditions of researchers, such as, mentoring plans, gender and equality and inclusiveness actions and fair and transparent evaluation mechanisms, among others:

*Seems adequate in the Portuguese context.*

6) promotion and dissemination of scientific and technological research, dissemination of results and actions to promote scientific culture, including, the organization of conferences, colloquia, and seminars:

*CEDIS should be part of a comprehensive institutional strategy for achieving recognition at European level (a top 10 European law school); make Nova a powerhouse of law and society in Europe; host conferences, workshops, events in law and society.*

7) knowledge and technology transfer, such as the creation of spin-offs or industry partnerships:

*I have never been a fan of these goals and concerns; in law, the most important insight is to distinguish between research and legal consultancy/practice. CEDIS seems very clear about this.*

8) effort to secure funding from diverse sources, national and international (e.g. ERC, EU funding, regional and/or other from funding agencies):

*Seems growing and reasonable.*

9) preservation, curation and dissemination of CEDIS results and data, respecting the principles and practices of Open Science; promotion of scientific and technological culture (outreach); actions of scientific, technological, cultural, artistic, social or economic relevance to society; existence of Data Policies:

*Seems reasonable; no comments.*

#### Criteria B

10) evidence of international and national recognition of the research team:

*See point 1 above.*

11) evidence of interaction and benefits for society:

*Clinics should be understood as outreach and not teaching; their benefits to society should be specified and embraced.*

12) skills and composition of the research team to adequately execute the proposed programme:

*No comments, seems perfectly in good hands; but see point 1 above.*

13) ability to successfully compete for national and international research grants and contracts:

*This ability is a function of recognition, see point 6 above.*

#### Criteria C

14) quality, merit, relevance, impact, originality/differentiation, and ambition of the objectives and the overall proposed strategic programme for the next five years, including ethical concerns, whenever applicable, Open Science, gender and data policies, budget, and programmatic:

*No substantive comments.*

15) appropriate CEDIS management and organizational structure, including science communication and outreach activities, citizen science, technology transfer and IP protection policies:

*No substantive comments.*

16) Plans for advanced training, particularly the scientific conditions to support PhD programmes, evidencing the benefit to the PhD programme from the proximity of research activity of CEDIS:

*See point 3 above.*

17) Adequate HR management, including developing the condition to attract and retain qualified human resources, such as plans for hiring new researchers:

*Subject to the difficult situation of higher education in Portugal, seems adequate.*

18) Career development strategy for researchers at all stages of their careers, regardless of their contractual situation, including for researchers on fixed-term contracts. Please refer to the R&D Unit strategy for countering precarity and integrating researchers into permanent career positions. Whenever applicable, please refer to applications within the FCT-Tenure programme, namely CEDIS Chairs, in coherence with the dimension of CEDIS, its current Human Resources profile, and its trajectory:

*CEDIS should have an international strategy largely independent of Portuguese higher education policy. Publicly available resources should be construed as leverage, and not an end in terms of research and outreach agenda. Precarity and providing tenure for all and independent of merit cannot be confused.*

19) any other criteria:

*Teaching – “to challenge the prevailing dogmatic approach that characterized legal (...) education in Portugal”; “redefine the practice of legal education” ...unclear in terms of redesigning content/substance and method – make a 5-year plan for slow but systematic recommendations on changes in curriculum of courses as function of ongoing priorities and technology.*



---

[SIGNATURE]