

**Evaluation Report**  
**Faculty of Law, Economics and Business Administration**  
**University of Joensuu**

Review Panel

**Emeritus Professor Aulis Aarnio (Chair)**

University of Helsinki

[aulis.aarnio@kolumbus.fi](mailto:aulis.aarnio@kolumbus.fi)

**Professor Peter Naudé**

Manchester Business School, United Kingdom

[peter.naude@mbs.ac.uk](mailto:peter.naude@mbs.ac.uk)

**Professor Torben M. Andersen**

Aarhus University, Denmark

[tandersen@econ.au.dk](mailto:tandersen@econ.au.dk)

## **Opening Statement**

The Panel undertaking this review is extremely appreciative of the help and useful guidance given by all members of staff at the University with whom it came into contact. The staff and students that we met were at all times most friendly and unreservedly helpful. It is in this spirit that this document is written: we hope that our observations have been accurate, and that the recommendations that we make are seen as input into decisions concerning future development, in the sense that this document should be seen as the starting point of what lies ahead, rather than being the end point of a backwards-looking exercise.

## **Evaluation Report of the Department of Economics and Business Administration**

### **General comments**

The information made available to the Panel spanned the period 2000 – 2006. As of 2006, the Department of Economics and Business Administration consisted of 19 research and/or teaching faculty: 5 professors, 4 post-graduate students (who also act as research personnel) and 10 teaching staff (lecturers, full-time teachers, assistants or senior assistants).

### **1 Research Infrastructure**

One of the first observations of the group concerns the extent to which there are institutional structures that make it more difficult to undertake research. Doing research in the social sciences is not a solitary undertaking – any glance at the well respected journals in the areas shows the extent to which research is an activity undertaken by groups of individuals working together collaboratively. Not only is the Division fairly small, but it is made up of people in five different divisions that do not share a common

research theme (these being Marketing, Economics, Management and Leadership, Law and Economics, and Accounting).

It is the Panel's view that this structure, with an average group size of less than five staff members (i.e.  $19/4 = 4.75$ ) acts as an impediment to undertaking good quality research in two ways: by meaning that there is not a 'critical mass' of people with overlapping research interests, but also because the demands on people's time for teaching reduces even further their time for research (it was mentioned that, on average, staff would have some 15% of their time available for research – this is very low in comparison to other research-oriented universities).

Another infrastructural weakness is the financial insecurity of PhD students. There was a strong feeling from this cohort that the lack of longer term contacts was to their detriment. An allied issue was that while they felt that facilities were relatively pretty good, the travel policy could be improved – in particular, it was striking that there is no policy pushing young people abroad to create their network, to search for inspiration from other scholars. The question was raised as to whether this should be part of a researcher's training programme.

The Panel was not aware that physical or library facilities acted in any material way to inhibit research (other than in the sense that academics always want more library resources put at their disposal). What did seem to be more of a restriction was the relatively low access to external funding: this peaked in 2003 (€215.000) and was significantly lower in 2006 (€155.000). In addition, funding from the Academy of Finland fell from €116.000 to €66.000 over the same period. This, we believe, needs to be addressed in order to make more funds available in spend on research-driven activities.

## **2 Quality of Research and Areas of Research Excellence**

The Panel noted that there are some areas in which the staff are very active. For example, research into tourism/entrepreneurship is at a nationally acclaimed level,

although it probably suffers from the fact that while it is an issue that is important to the local area, it is not prominent in the international journals. Cross cultural studies, quality management, and applied econometrics are all producing high quality output. Joensuu has achieved a unique positioning in the area of Law and Economics that certainly gives it national prominence. However, the Panel was of the opinion that the research focus was thinly spread over a very wide range of different areas, as reflected in the personal interests of those involved. It was noted that there certainly was good evidence of publishing in international journals, but that these tended to be in 'decent' if not the higher level journals. It was felt that, in comparison to Norwegian institutes of a similar size, Joensuu is doing as well as other institutions. (A copy of the journal rankings used by the Association of Business Schools in the UK was made available for future reference).

### **3 Research Strategy**

The Panel felt that the Department could develop a more focused research strategy. At present it seems to be driven by the particular research interests of certain individuals, a natural consequence of the small size of the different research groups. In addition, it also seems to be demand-led in the sense that the research interests of a small number of Doctoral students can alter the centre of gravity of the research focus rather easily. This was felt to be of potential danger, and there should be a determined effort made to identify particular research these which are then used to attract research student to Joensuu, rather than altering research themes to suit research applicants. There should be a senior researcher in the field to lead in carefully selected research areas.

The Panel was not convinced of the fit between the various research themes in the Department and the stated four areas of expertise of the University. We would suggest that the senior management of the Department consider very carefully how research could be nurtured in areas such as forestry studies, optics, and information technology – these are within the stated aims of the University, and are all concerned with the

diffusion of technology in high-technology markets – certainly an area of interest in international journals focused on business to business marketing.

The Panel was of the opinion that research in the Department seemed to be fragmented in an academic sense of covering many areas, but also fragmented geographically as well. It is not clear that the formation of UEF will readily reduce that problem, and the co-ordination of research across the three sites at Joensuu, Savonlinna and Kuopio will need active intervention from the senior management in order to produce the hoped-for synergies.

#### **4 International Activities**

It was felt that the level of international activities was driven by individual inclination rather than by a defined strategy. There is no doubting the fact that many of the members of staff are well connected internationally, and that this derives benefit for the University of Joensuu. However, it should be noted that on this metric, the University is interested in three particular criteria: obtaining international research funding, international collaboration that produces joint publications, and international researcher mobility. It was felt that there was considerable room for more such activities. For example, while some of the senior researchers well connected internationally, and do have an international profile, concerted efforts should be made to move to further actual collaboration with such international partners.

The running of international conferences, such as that being done for the tourism industry next year, was noted as an excellent way of raising the profile of the University of Joensuu.

#### **5 National Cooperation**

It was noted that there had been some difficulties in dealings with the Lappeenranta University that grants the degrees in the major of business administration. However, it was also felt that the move in 2010 to the combined University of Eastern Finland would result in a more equal balance of power, and that such difficulties as existed in the past would be ameliorated.

## **6 Strengths and Weaknesses**

### Strengths

- There is clear evidence of individual excellence: there is some good research, which has been published internationally. The Panel noted too that this was even more so after the evaluation period, with more international publications appearing after the 2006 cut-off period.
- It was felt that the level of commitment to the new University of Eastern Finland was laudable, with the academics in the Department embracing this new vision in an extremely positive manner. However, we would offer also a note of caution: just how an enlarged Department, now effectively spread over three different campuses, would need to be managed, has perhaps not yet been clearly enough thought through. Strong leadership will be needed to ensure that the new era brings the synergistic rewards that are possible.

### Weakness

- The Panel felt that the largest weakness facing the Department was related to its size: that there is fragmentation both geographically and in terms of research focus (individuals and topics)
- It was also felt that this fragmentation had resulted in the lack of a clearly identified research strategy, and that this needs to be developed – and implemented - over the next few years
- As noted above, there is a need to attempt to rectify the financial insecurity of PhD students

## 7 Recommendations

As an overall position statement, the Panel notes that the department is comparable to similar smaller units in other Nordic countries in terms of size as well as quantitative and qualitative dimensions of research. They also share the common problem of finding a balance between serving regional interests while at the same time attempting to ensure that the quality of research is up to the best international standards. One danger is that the regional needs for teaching are mapped into attempts to have a broad based research agenda. There is no conflict between having a broad teaching portfolio and a narrow, specialized research agenda. Qualified researchers should be able to have a broader teaching than research portfolio. In particular for smaller units within Economics and Business Administration, critical mass in research is an important issue, and therefore specialization in a few core research areas is needed in order for the research quality to be up to international standards. The ability of these five different units to offer qualified supervision of doctoral students is closely linked to the research quality; that is, the units should direct their research agenda and research training at areas within which they can develop a comparative advantage. Both research and researcher training would benefit from this.

With this as a background perspective, the Panel would wish to make the following recommendations:

- 1) That there should be more focus on research. The Department, we believe, needs to develop a coherent, focused, research strategy that tries to compensate for the low numbers involved in research. We recognise the inherent contradiction here: while teaching from this small group needs to be general in the sense that it covers all the basics, we believe that research needs to be more focused. Particular themes need to be identified, and research students attracted to work in those areas (with the obvious caveat that those wishing to work in other areas be rejected). It is only in this way that a comparative advantage in research can be forged.

- 2) To improve the environment of younger researchers. This is an allied point, it being noted that training of new researchers is a specialist training, and therefore it must necessarily take place in an environment with a strong research orientation and with an adequate supply of qualified supervision. One cannot expect PhD candidates to meet international standards both in their thesis work and subsequent work unless the education takes place in a research environment with an international orientation and standards. Moreover, critical mass is needed both to ensure a sufficient supply of courses – depth and broadness – and interaction between students and faculty. This reinforces this need for a focused research strategy.
- 3) More international research collaboration is required. While attendance at international conferences is laudable, it is not necessarily an end in itself – research staff would be well advised to use this as a platform to launch collaborative research projects with international colleagues.
- 4) It was felt that the Department's website could be made more up to date and more accessible (an example was the difficulty in finding the working paper series in economics).
- 5) It was noted that Junior researchers do currently tend to have the opportunity to expand their network with other young researchers within Finland. The Panel argues that researcher training will benefit from more research focus and a stronger international profile. An important element of PhD training is to become actively acquainted with other scientific environments and to establish networks with other young researchers with similar interests. In particular for student from smaller units it is important to encourage such interactions by e.g. making a stay abroad at a recognized international research institution part of the PhD programme. It is therefore important that such stays abroad are not only encouraged but also supported by helping students to establish contact, acquire funding etc. The question was therefore raised as to whether they should be encouraged (or even required?) to go abroad for a period of time, in order to spend some time studying at other institutions.

## Grading

CRITERION	GRADE (1-7) <sup>a</sup>
1. Research infrastructure	3,5
2a. Standard of research at national level	4,5
2b. Standard of research at international level	3
3. Research strategy	2
4. International activities	3
5a. National co-operation	4
5b. International co-operation	3
GENERAL ESTIMATION	3

<sup>a</sup> 7 = excellent, 6 = very good, 5 = good, 4 = average, 3 = somewhat below average, 2 = fair, 1 = poor

## **Evaluation Report of the Department of Law**

### **General Comments**

The Panel has been able to make use of the evaluation report made by Professors Kaarlo Tuori and Pekka Vihervuori, dated 2.9.2002. This report was utilized because Professor Tapio Määttä specifically referred to it in his introduction to the Department of Law. He pointed out that the Department of Law has strived to follow the recommendations made in the report during the evaluation period 2002–2006 and beyond until 2008. The evaluation report made in 2002 was therefore regarded as part of the background material of the evaluation. The panel secretary, Dr. Leila Suvantola orally translated the key points of the evaluation to the non-Finnish speaking members of the panel while Professor Aarnio was able to fully utilize the report.

The material provided in advance to the Panel mainly covered the evaluation period 2002–2006. However, the introduction to the Department of Law made by Professor Määttä and the written material supporting it as well as the oral presentations made by the representatives of the department allowed the Panel to follow the development until 2008 and even to foresee certain targets until 2015. The assessment of the proposed new chairs in the Department covers the period until 2010.

The strategy of the University of Joensuu until 2015 and the related action plan during the performance agreement period 2007–2009 were available to the Panel in detail only in Finnish. The report of the main focus of the strategy was, however, available in advance in English. The Panel noted with satisfaction that the material available and the Panel interviews provided a very informative basis for the evaluation. The accurateness, speed and expertise of the secretary of the Panel Dr. Leila Suvantola also contributed to clarification of details.

According to the material provided to the Panel the Department of Law consists of 9 professors, 3 lecturers and 5 senior assistants, in total 17 teaching staff members. The Department can grant degrees of Master, Licentiate and Doctor of Administrative Sciences. In 2008 there were in total 66 Master degrees (44% of the total number of degrees in the Faculty), two Licentiate degrees as well as two Doctors Degrees. The aim of the Department is to stabilize the number of graduating Masters to 80 and the number of Doctors to eight per year. The critical mass for Doctors degrees would therefore be about 10% of the intake of students.

## **1 Research Infrastructure**

The Panel has considered the following issues in the evaluation as instructed: funding, facilities, personnel and working time allocation.

The Department of Law has been able to acquire considerable resources in the internal allocation of funds within the University which indicates the trust of the central administration of the University in the ability of the Department to achieve the set targets. The most important measure is, however, external funding – in particular that based on scientific evaluation – provided by e.g. the Academy of Finland. The funding based on scientific evaluation indicates how seriously the scientific achievements of the Department should and can be taken. The Department of Law has succeeded well in the acquisition of external funding – to a surprising extent.

The share of external funding has been both in 2005 and 2006 the highest in the country. During the former it was 34% and the latter 38%. These figures can be regarded high even on Nordic scale. Nationally they were almost twice as high as in e.g. the Faculty of Law at the University of Turku. The Faculty of Law at the University of Lapland acquired less than a third of the external funding acquired by Department of Law at the University of Joensuu. The figures become even more significant when it is taken into consideration that the Universities in Turku and Rovaniemi (Lapland) have full size faculties and thus bigger resources to acquire external funding.

Again, the comparison is even more radically favourable to the Department of Law when it is compared to the Department of Economics and Business Administration within the University of Joensuu.

The introduction, publications and interviews of key representatives of the Department provided an impression of a very capable and motivated staff which has confidence in the future. This was beautifully brought forward in the interviews of the post-graduate students. They had been attracted to the Department by the quality of teachers and their positive attitude to PhD-studies and their efforts in supervision of post-graduate research. The attractiveness is also visible in the abilities of the PhD students to travel to international conferences, seminars and workshops as well as in the possibility to visit high standard institutes abroad for longer periods of time. In this respect the Department of Law at the University of Joensuu is incontestably among the national leaders in particular in environmental law, EU law, comparative law and related legal theory.

All in all, the research infrastructure in the Department of Law at the University of Joensuu is of high national and good international standard. It also has a clear promise of success considering the international future of research.

## **2 Quality of Research and Areas of Research Excellence**

The above mentioned amount of external funding and its high proportion compared to the similar funding of other universities strongly indicate the research strengths of the Department of Law. This expertise will be strengthened in the future as the Law and Economics represented by Professor Kalle Määttä will be included in the Department. The following assessment of research quality assumes that Law and Economics will form a part of the Department of Law.

The undeniable leader of expertise in the Department of Law is environmental law represented by Professor Tapio Määttä. It is multidisciplinary connected not only to the University of Joensuu but also to other research in the field in Finland. The projects of Professor Määttä also have a clear international scope which is indicated by successful EU cooperation. The research area of environmental law is original both by aims and methods. The orientation of Professor Määttä to the basic questions of law and methodology give his projects long lasting significance. The ability to combine substance expertise with theoretical abilities places Professor Määttä undeniably to the national top group. He is a humble, hard working and skilful scientist who is well liked as a teacher – all in all a specimen of the classical academic tradition of whose work the entire University of Joensuu can be proud of.

A second, also internationally appreciated researcher is Professor Jaakko Husa who has shifted focus to the general questions of law and to comparative law. Professor Husa has won his spurs earlier in constitutional law and this has had to give way to international challenges. The international breakthrough of Professor Husa is still in the waiting but the signs are there that he will secure his position at least in the vicinity of European top group of researchers. In comparative law, however, he has progressed with big steps, if not unexpectedly long leaps. The most important publications of Professor Husa have been published in leading international journals and are actively cited by other researchers in the field. In this respect Professor Husa is the only international level comparative law researcher in Finland.

The third field to be mentioned is research to the Russian law led by Professor Soile Nystén-Haarala. This research programme in its own restricted, yet important field is a merit not only to the Department of Law, but also to the University as a whole. The programme has gained national recognition and funding to the University. The programme combines business law and in particular modern contract law. In itself this is important, yet combining different topics under an umbrella led by one person may pose a problem, even a threat. The material delivered to the Panel does not provide evidence of the Russian law project or business law to have any significant connection to the

above described theoretical strengths of the Department of Law. In this respect the projects of Professor Nystén-Haarala are burdened by threat of remaining unconnected to the other legal research and teaching in the Department of Law. It has to be noted, that within this field of law no significant basic research has been made in Joensuu. This may relate to the focus during start-up phase, but it has to be taken seriously in order to avoid overly pragmatic projects and disregard of the general theories and principles. Mere vicinity of the Russian border is not sufficient for extensive legal research in the long run.

Professor Kalle Määttä will provide a significant contribution to the research and teaching in the Department of Law. Professor Määttä has created an international network in his field of research and is both nationally and internationally productive. It remains to be seen how his expertise and networks can in the best possible way be combined to the other legal expertise of the Department of Law. The premises are good as Professor Määttä has extensive expertise also in the general questions of law. One possibly interesting option could be the joint interest of Professors Kalle Määttä and Jaakko Husa in comparative legal research in the wide meaning of the concept. The Panel will make a further comment on this issue in the recommendations.

EU law will be one of the key fields of the Department of Law in the future. Hereby we mean specifically internal market law which has been represented only by Professor Juha Raitio who, however, has left to the University of Helsinki. Professor Raitio created the foundations of teaching internal market law and the related questions at the University of Joensuu. This should be continued as in Finland there is – due to historical reasons – too much, even if high international standard, EU law research concentrating on constitutional issues. EU is mainly an internal market community and such it will remain. This should be kept in mind when the professorship of EU law will be filled and its field of teaching is settled.

The Department of Law also covers criminal and procedure law and some fields of administrative law which the Panel for languages restrictions was unable to assess in

more detail. Due to the national nature of legal research it can be regarded justifiable that the University of Joensuu has followed the recommendations of the assessment report in 2002 by Professors Tuori and Vihervuori to extend teaching to criminal and procedure law and it has succeeded well in this.

The number and quality of publications the Department of Law at the University of Joensuu is very competitive compared to other Finnish law research units. The Panel made a rough evaluation of the number of publications of the Department and other Finnish law faculties and departments. The comparison covers only year 2006 but the result appears fairly similar to 2005 which figures were also available. The Department of Law at the University of Joensuu had in total 95 publications in 2006 – i.e. about 10 publications per professor. This figure covers all publications. This figure in the Faculty of Law at the University of Helsinki was about 4.5, in the University of Turku 3.4 and in the University of Lapland 3.8 per professor.

Similar situation occurred in the relative shares of articles published in international publications or series. There were 1.3 international publications per professor in the University of Joensuu, in the University of Helsinki about the same, in the University of Turku 0.8 and in the University of Lapland 0.4. The last mentioned can be regarded alarmingly low and it is only one third of the results in the University of Joensuu. To the benefit of the University of Joensuu a significant number of these were published in high reputation publications, and all of the comparative law articles were published in the top international publications.

To conclude the Panel notes that the facts presented to it indicate the breath and level of research in the Department to be both nationally and internationally of good quality. There is, however, no reason for too much complacency. There is a long way to go to the international top. This requires bigger endeavour from a small unit than on average. It cannot be achieved without strong PhD education and motivation of the researchers to participate in true international cooperation networks, first and foremost in international cooperation projects. Travelling to international conferences is the first

step, as opening the door. True participation in internationally rewarding projects will measure the international significance both of the Department of Law at the University of Joensuu as well as that of the Finnish legal science. The Panel regards the Department of Law to be proceeding on a right path in this respect.

One can, however, ask whether internationalization is the right yard stick for a discipline regarded highly national. The Panel sees strong reasons for internationalisation. Societal relationships are becoming more legalised at an increasing pace. This concerns both the law of the nation states as well as international integration such as EU. Globalisation is a matter of its own. Law thus is becoming more international. This in turn increases e.g. the significance of comparative law research. We cannot become international unless we have knowledge of other legal cultures. The Department of Law at the University of Joensuu has either deliberately or by chance managed to focus on the main artery of international development.

### **3 Research Strategy**

On the basis of the above the Panel has come to the conclusion that the one of the strengths or even the strongest aspect of the Department of Law at the University of Joensuu is its conscious strategy development. This features the period of 2002–2006 but it can be indentified also in the target setting until year 2015. In this respect the Department of Law stands out from Economics and Business Administration. In fact the two related disciplines could learn from the Department of Law.

The strategic planning is branded with both national and international ambition. The target setting for certain periods of time is so ambitious that an outsider observer may suspect its reality. On a closer examination the Department of Law has itself proved ability and willingness to realise the set targets. This becomes evident when the evaluation recommendations of 2002 are compared to today's reality. The set targets have been achieved. The Panel therefore has no reason to doubt the realism of the current target setting. Indeed, the recession that has hit the economy has to be taken

into account. Yet, it may not mean giving up the set targets. However, these targets have to be updated in 2009 to meet the expectations of the day.

#### **4 International Activities**

The Panel has already examined above the figures indicating the international activity of the Department. It can, if repeated here, be regarded as good. The Panel points out again the activity of Professors Tapio Määttä, Jaakko Husa and Kalle Määttä in their respective fields of law. It is not an issue of individual international connections of researchers, but also – even if in part – institutionalized relationships.

Professor Tapio Määttä has managed to get close to institutional networks but also Professor Kalle Määttä has his networks, even though they cover a narrower field of expertise than environmental law. The multidisciplinary connections to international networks created by Professor Tapio Määttä – in particular to the EU – are significant to the evaluation.

The Department is on a good route, however not yet an international player in the real meaning of the word. It is a longer journey to Europe from Joensuu than from Europe to Joensuu. This symbolic difference of distance can only be closed with quality of research.

The distance to the top is shorter due to the fact that researchers of the Department are already being used as experts in international evaluation and expert tasks in Europe. This concerns Professors Tapio Määttä, Kalle Määttä and Jaakko Husa, partly also Professor Soili Nystén-Haarala. This can justifiably be regarded as an important measure of international recognition. The Department of Law is on a good route branded with promise of success. The position of the Department compared to other Law units is strong on the basis of the presented evidence.

## **5 National Cooperation**

National cooperation is at its best in the work done by environmental law at the University of Joensuu. It is connected both multidisciplinary within the University as well as nationally to an extent. There is strong national networking also in Law and Economics and it is the strong feature in the Russian law project and the related business law project.

The criminal and procedure law carries out the traditional national cooperation with different units within the country. No specific breakthrough has been made in this field in Joensuu. With lack of basic information of the national legal science as a whole the Panel has not been able to make an evaluation of the breath, intensity and usefulness of this cooperation. It was left the University of Joensuu to decide whether a national evaluation would be useful at some stage.

## **6 Summary and Recommendations**

The overall impression of the Panel was positive both on the level of strategic planning of the Department of Law as well as on the motivation of the researchers in the Department to develop it according to these targets. The Panel paid also attention to the fact that the targets of the Department were consistent with the general – even though very abstract and openly formulated – strategy of the University.

The general grade according to the criteria set by the University instructions was 5. This grade with a + mark would have been a signal on the direction to which the Panel regards preferable to develop the Department of Law. The Panel considered it best to leave such signals to the central administration of the University of Joensuu and the Department to make.

The Panel had, however, also doubts. The most important of them was the open university. The Panel understands the significance stressed by the Department to have

skilled and motivated students. In the long run this approach is, however, not sustainable. Teaching-based universities have all over the world sunk to average class. High standard teaching is always preceded by high standard research. This applies also in Joensuu – now and in the future.

Every additional teaching hour is missing from research of a high class researcher even if the maximum interrelationship of teaching and research were taken into account. A top individual can combine teaching and research even if the activity is teaching based. Yet this may not apply to institutions. If the University of Joensuu seriously intends to meet the set targets of internationalisation and expertise as presented to the Panel, research must be explicitly put first. Despite all the efforts made the Department of Law is a small unit and its resources for research are limited.

This means that the capacity of the best teachers should not be exploited in the open university teaching in excess of Master education. If the open university is regarded as important to the University of Joensuu as it appears, the teaching resources have to be ensured with other than the most talented and innovative staff. The open university should be addressed with its own resources and in this the decent institution with its expertise should not be forgotten.

In their assessment report in 2002 Professors Tuori and Vihervuori proposed that the department of Law were strengthened with expertise in criminal and procedure law and civil law. This has been done in criminal and procedure law. The situation in civil law is more complicated. According to the information received by the Panel civil law concentrates heavily on business law. The advantage of this is that teaching and research can be integrated with the needs of business life. The danger, however, of the current model is that the theoretical civil law remains absent. The Panel recommends that the Department should seriously consider – at least in case that another civil law professorship were established in the Department – that it should cover general civil law excluding of course e.g. family law. This choice would provide a closer connection to the existing strengths in theoretical field as well as natural connections to comparative law.

It can be thought to create connections to environmental law as general civil law can and should be directed towards property law. Thus civil law could provide a link between substantive civil law and theoretical legal research that would be significant both for research and teaching. It would also give the Department of Law a national profile.

The planned professorship of legislative studies is understandable due to the recent focus of e.g. Law and Economics. The need of the said chair is emphasised by the development in other national law research units. Yet, doubts remain concerning such a definition of the chair. Teaching and research should not be restricted to development of legislation. It would be just as important to follow changes in the administrative practices as perhaps in the court practices nationally and abroad and citizen activities. Thus a professorship in legal policy could be a more natural opening and consistent with the profile of the Department than by definition the narrower chair of legislative studies.

In addition, the new European trend in legisprudence unavoidably indicates that the theory of regulation is far too multifaceted to form a chair which would meet the needs of the Department of Law at the University of Joensuu. A chair in legal policy would, in turn, form a link between theory based teaching and empirical teaching and research. It would have connections to legal theory, comparative law and substantive criminology. Thus it also would strategically strengthen both theoretical and empirical expertise within the Department but would also show national leadership. It would strengthen the profile of the Department in relation to other legal research units in the country. The Department could truly form a centre of excellence in issues which are not researched or taught elsewhere. This could also have an impact on the attractiveness of the University and the Department of Law in the future.

The Panel proposes that the longer term strategy of the University of Joensuu and the Department of Law would include a centre of excellence in comparative law. This recommendation is based on the international status achieved by Professor Jaakko Husa and to the fact that a comparative law institute is lacking in Finland. The

significance of comparative law is increasing everywhere due to both internationalization and different types of integration. Centre of excellence would have a significant positive impact on the profile of the University of Joensuu both nationally and internationally – in particular as it could easily be combined with legal theory and the Law and Economics expertise of Professor Kalle Määttä.

The Panel expresses its opinion that the strategy should seek alternatives which would strengthen the current originality of the Department and its knowledge base. This would contribute to achievement of the general targets set by the University of Joensuu. The recommendations above are made in the purpose of serving this strategic thinking.

### Grading

CRITERION	GRADE (1-7) <sup>a</sup>
1. Research infrastructure	5
2a. Standard of research at national level	6
2b. Standard of research at international level	5
3. Research strategy	5,5
4. International activities	5
5a. National co-operation	6
5b. International co-operation	5
<b>GENERAL ESTIMATION</b>	<b>5</b>

<sup>a</sup> 7 = excellent, 6 = very good, 5 = good, 4 = average, 3 = somewhat below average, 2 = fair, 1 = poor

## **Signatures**

In Joensuu 17<sup>th</sup> December 2008

Emeritus Professor Aulis Aarnio (Chair)

Professor Peter Naudé

Torben M. Andersen