

How to Pitch for Headcount and Retain Legal Talent

Compliance and Ethics

Law Department Management



Cheat Sheet:

- **Build the business case.** Secure additional legal headcount by linking workload to measurable business value, risk mitigation, employee well-being, and cultural alignment.
- S**tart with the business need and support it with data and storytelling.** Strengthen your pitch for an FTE by linking measurable business impact to real-world examples that make regulatory and operational risks tangible to executive management.
- **Hire for resilience and cultural fit.** In a volatile biotech environment, prioritize adaptability, integrity, communication skills, and curiosity alongside technical legal expertise.
- **Retain through presence and purpose.** Prevent burnout and turnover by fostering leadership availability, autonomy, growth opportunities, and a shared commitment to integrity as the foundation of long-term performance.

In November 2025, I was invited to contribute to a webinar on “How to Attract and Retain Legal Talent” organized by the Association of Corporate Counsel Europe (ACC Europe) and the legal recruitment and talent advisory firm YouConnect. The session brought together legal and compliance professionals from across industries to discuss one of the most persistent challenges facing in-house legal leaders: how to secure the right resources and keep teams motivated in an increasingly competitive and complex market.

The questions proposed for discussion were deceptively simple: *How do you build a convincing business case for an additional full-time equivalent (FTE)? What persuades executive management to invest in legal headcount? How do you attract and retain strong legal talent once approval to hire an additional FTE is obtained?* These questions lie at the intersection of leadership, communication, and organizational psychology, and they go to the heart of how legal functions add value in today's business environment.

I welcomed the opportunity to contribute, not only because of the practical relevance of these topics but also because they touch directly on the reality of my own work as a legal leader in the biotech industry. Over the years, I have served legal functions in companies of varying size and maturity, from early-stage ventures building their first governance framework to late-stage scale-ups navigating global partnerships and regulatory submissions. Across this spectrum, one theme has remained constant: the strength of the legal function is a decisive factor in a company's ability to grow responsibly.

While the questions of "how to pitch," "how to hire," and "how to retain" can be answered with frameworks and best practices, their real significance lies deeper. They require legal leaders to think about credibility, culture, and resilience. Numbers and charts may justify an extra FTE, but what truly secures approval to hire such FTE is the trust built over time and the clarity with which legal leadership articulates its role in the success of the business. Likewise, attracting and retaining talent depends less on job descriptions or salary benchmarks and more on the integrity and consistency that leaders model every day.

This article builds on the reflections that I shared during the ACC Europe webinar and expands them through the lens of my experience. The biotech industry, perhaps more than many other industries, operates in an environment where volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity — commonly abbreviated as VUCA — are part of daily reality. These pressures shape not only business strategies but also the expectations and needs of the legal function.

In the sections that follow, I share a series of personal observations on how to navigate these dynamics. I start by describing the unique environment of biotech companies and the leadership challenges that come with it. I then outline my approach to building the business case for additional headcount, discuss how to attract legal professionals who fit both the technical and cultural needs of the organization, and conclude with reflections on how to retain talent in a sustainable, people-centered way.

Although these insights originate in biotech, I believe they are relevant to any organization facing growth, change, and constraint at the same time. The article does not aim to offer universal rules but to share subjective, experience-based reflections, practical lessons learned from navigating legal leadership in a VUCA world.

> Volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity are not abstract concepts in this sector. They are the everyday reality that shapes how decisions are made, how teams are built, and how leadership must operate.

The biotech challenge: Operating in a VUCA world

Over the years, I have often described the world of biotechnology as a textbook example of a VUCA environment. Volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity are not abstract concepts in this sector. They are the everyday reality that shapes how decisions are made, how teams are built, and how leadership must operate.

Volatility in biotech stems from its dependence on scientific discovery, market confidence, and regulatory approval. A single clinical result or investor announcement can redefine a company's outlook overnight. Uncertainty follows from the long timelines and unpredictable outcomes inherent to research and development. It typically takes more than ten years, and hundreds of millions of euros, to bring a single product to market. Even then, success is not guaranteed. Many companies operate for years without profit, relying on investor confidence and successive funding rounds to sustain their pipeline.

Complexity arises from the intersection of science, law, finance, and ethics. Each decision, whether contractual, regulatory, or strategic, has implications that extend far beyond the laboratory or the legal department. Ambiguity is perhaps the most pervasive feature of all. Information is often incomplete, risks are layered, and decisions must be made before all variables are known. The result is a constant need to interpret, prioritize, and act within uncertainty.

At the same time, the regulatory landscape continues to expand. New laws, codes of conduct, and compliance obligations appear across jurisdictions, often with overlapping or even conflicting requirements. Shareholders, regulators, and the public now expect transparency and ethical behavior from life-science companies at levels unimaginable two decades ago. The combination of rapid innovation, high risk, and heightened scrutiny creates a unique pressure cooker.

In this environment, the temptation and the opportunity to cut corners are ever-present. Under pressure to "make the numbers," executives and teams may be drawn toward expedient but risky decisions. This rarely stems from ill intent but from urgency and resource scarcity. The industry has witnessed companies that failed not because their science was weak but because they underestimated the importance of compliance, governance, or culture. The cost of neglecting these foundations is tangible: staff turnover, investigations, lawsuits, regulatory warnings, and erosion of trust with investors and partners.

I have seen how these pressures can undermine even the most promising ventures. When compliance, culture, or governance are treated as secondary to scientific achievement, the consequences eventually catch up. Some companies have faced regulatory sanctions or internal crises that drained both resources and morale. Others have seen their reputations deteriorate, limiting access to capital or partnerships. In most cases, the warning signs were visible well before the breakdown occurred, yet they were overlooked in favor of short-term gains.

These patterns are not unique to biotech, but the stakes and timelines of this sector make them especially acute. The VUCA context magnifies every decision and tests the resilience of every system. It demands leaders who can operate with both conviction and composure, even when the path ahead is not clear.

The role of legal in a VUCA environment

In such a volatile environment, the legal function cannot be confined to drafting contracts or ensuring regulatory compliance. Its purpose is broader and more strategic. Legal must act as a trusted advisor that brings clarity when others see confusion, calm when others feel urgency, and integrity when short-term temptation looms.

Legal leaders in biotech navigate a dual mission: to protect the company and to enable its growth. Protection means ensuring that the company operates within the law, manages its risks, and respects its ethical obligations. Enablement means helping the organization take informed risks, build partnerships, and deliver on its purpose without losing sight of its values. Balancing these two dimensions requires judgment, courage, and a deep understanding of the business.

> Building a legal team that can bring calm and clarity in the midst of volatility is not a luxury. It is a necessity for long-term survival.

In my experience, integrity, composure, and courage are not optional traits for in-house counsel. They are the foundation of the profession. A strong legal team provides what I call resilience capital, a safeguard that allows the business to operate confidently in uncertain conditions. When I build or expand a legal team, this is the lens I use. I do not simply look for additional hands to handle workload. I look for people who can think clearly, communicate credibly, and stand firm when things become difficult.

The concept of resilience capital captures the essence of what the legal function contributes to a VUCA business. Biotech companies depend on financial capital to fund research and on human capital to execute it. But they also rely on the collective ability of their people, and especially their leaders, to navigate uncertainty without compromising ethics or clarity. A mature and well-supported legal function strengthens that ability across the organization. It enables the company to take calculated risks, not reckless ones, and to remain true to its mission even under pressure.

When resources are limited, leadership must decide where to invest attention and people. I have learned that investing in integrity and competence is never wasted. It pays dividends in the form of trust, both internally among colleagues and externally with investors, regulators, and partners. Building a legal team that can bring calm and clarity in the midst of volatility is not a luxury. It is a necessity for long-term survival.

This context explains why I approach every discussion about legal headcount and talent strategy from a broader perspective. The question is not simply how many people are needed to handle workload, but what capabilities are required to ensure that the company can grow responsibly in a volatile and uncertain world. The next chapter describes how I translate this understanding into a business-driven, data-informed, and narrative approach when pitching for an additional full-time equivalent in the legal function.



Pitching for headcount: Building the business case

When I am asked how I build a business case for additional headcount, I usually start by saying that the methodology matters as much as the message. A convincing pitch combines business need, data, story, and scenario planning. These four elements form the foundation of every argument I make when I ask for reinforcement.

The business need

The first step is always to start from the business need, not from the legal workload. Executives will rarely be persuaded by an argument that begins with “We are overloaded.” They listen when you translate that workload into business impact: delays in contract execution, exposure to regulatory risk, or missed opportunities for growth. The question I try to answer is not, “What do we need in legal?” but “What problem will this solve for the company?” or “What value will this create?”

> Legal must act as a trusted advisor that brings clarity when others see confusion, calm when others feel urgency, and integrity when short-term temptation looms.

Data

The second component is data. Quantitative evidence adds credibility and helps to frame the discussion in objective terms. That data can take many forms: the number of contracts per year, the ratio of internal versus external legal costs, the growth of compliance requirements, or the response

time to business-critical questions. I often benchmark these figures against comparable companies or regulatory expectations. Data does not replace judgment, but it anchors the conversation in facts.

Storytelling

The third element is storytelling. Numbers can demonstrate pressure, but stories create understanding. A real example from within the organization can make abstract risk tangible. I find that sharing a concise, well-chosen story often makes the strongest impact.

Storytelling in a business context must also be persuasive. The most effective stories link facts to purpose and show what is at stake for the company. When I prepare a business case, I structure my narrative around four recurring themes: business enablement, risk quantification, employee wellbeing, and cultural alignment.

- Business enablement shows how reinforcement will help the organization move faster and smarter. Additional capacity allows the company to close transactions more efficiently, manage projects proactively, and reduce dependence on external counsel. Executives respond when they see that legal is a driver of execution, not a brake on progress.

- Risk quantification translates legal exposure into measurable business terms. Instead of abstract compliance concerns, I describe what a delay or breach could mean for revenue, funding, or reputation. A well-told story about a near miss or industry example helps turn risk into something concrete and credible.

- Employee well-being and retention are equally persuasive. Chronic overload erodes accuracy, morale, and engagement, not only within the legal team but across the organization, as pressure, delays, and risk exposure ripple through business units and decision-making processes. Reinforcing the team is therefore not a concession but an investment in sustainability. A balanced and supported legal function performs better over time, reduces the risk of errors and attrition, and preserves institutional knowledge that is critical in highly regulated environments.

- Finally, cultural alignment connects the argument to values. Strengthening legal is not just about efficiency; it signals that the company takes integrity and responsibility seriously. It reinforces the message that long-term success depends on how we achieve results, not only on the results themselves.

Good storytelling combines these dimensions into a coherent message that appeals to both reason and conviction. Facts inform; stories persuade.

Scenario planning

The final element is scenario planning. This means presenting options: what happens if we do nothing, what happens if we partially reinforce, and what happens if we fully invest. Scenario thinking shows executives that you are pragmatic, that you understand trade-offs, and that your proposal is not a demand but a plan. It invites discussion and collaboration rather than resistance.

Quantitative evidence adds credibility and helps to frame the discussion in objective terms.

A case study: GDPR compliance in a biotech company

An example from my earlier experience, when I served as Senior Director Legal and Data Protection Officer and was a member of the Senior Management Team of a biotech company, illustrates how these four components come together. When the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) was adopted in 2016 and became enforceable in 2018, it created a new compliance reality for companies handling sensitive data. For biotechs running clinical trials, it introduced an entirely new layer of risk. Clinical data are at the heart of what we do. Any breach of patient confidentiality can compromise not only compliance but also trial integrity and trust with investigators and hospitals.

We had seen the GDPR coming and had started preparations, but as implementation drew closer, it became clear that our existing structure could not absorb the additional workload. The regulation affected almost every part of the business: contracts with investigators and vendors, informed consent forms, data storage and transfer, and internal access controls. For a listed company in the life-sciences sector, non-compliance could lead to substantial fines and, in a worst-case scenario, even to a clinical hold if data-handling deficiencies were deemed to affect patient safety or trial validity. The reputational impact with investors could also be significant.

Then an incident occurred that brought the issue to life. One of our technical staff members, who was responsible for logistics in the delivery of investigational products, visited a hospital and made contact with a patient participating in a trial. He was not a physician, and his involvement breached both hospital and sponsor protocols. The incident caused understandable concern among the principal investigator and his staff. What might have remained a theoretical compliance risk suddenly became a real crisis. It revealed how gaps in training and oversight could undermine not only regulatory compliance but also professional relationships with clinical sites.

That crisis became a catalyst for change. It helped me explain to the leadership team that GDPR compliance was not an optional exercise in bureaucracy but a matter of operational credibility. I presented the situation using the same four components of my methodology. The business need was clear: we required a robust data-protection framework to preserve the integrity of our trials. The data showed the scope of the exposure: the number of trial sites, the flow of personal data, and the cross-border complexity of our studies. The story (the hospital incident) made the risk tangible. Finally, the scenario planning illustrated what would happen if we failed to act: potential regulatory action, reputational damage, and delay of our clinical programs.

Quoting Jean Monnet, one of the architects of European integration, I reminded colleagues that “People only accept change when they are faced with necessity, and only recognize necessity when a crisis is upon them.” That insight proved true. The incident created the sense of necessity required

for the organization to evolve. Management approved the recruitment of a data-protection specialist, and we implemented a comprehensive compliance program. What had started as a painful episode became an enabler for maturity and prevention.

Lessons learned

Earlier in my career, I learned that while crises are never desirable, they often expose structural weaknesses and create the urgency needed for meaningful and lasting change.

This experience taught me that making a business case is not only about logic and evidence, but equally about timing and tone. Executives must see the risk before they feel its consequences. The role of the legal leader is to translate that risk into something relatable and urgent, without resorting to fear. When you frame your request as an investment in resilience rather than an admission of weakness, it resonates differently.

When communicating these arguments, I have found that clarity and proportionality are crucial. Executives need to understand risk in business language. I translate legal exposure into potential operational or financial consequences: delays, cost increases, loss of investor confidence, or reputational harm. This approach moves the conversation away from abstract compliance fears toward practical management decisions.

I have also learned to anticipate objections. Leadership may question whether tasks can be outsourced, delayed, or absorbed internally. My response is to acknowledge those possibilities and show their limits. Outsourcing can help temporarily, but it does not build internal ownership or culture. Delays might reduce short-term spending, but they often increase long-term costs through inefficiencies or errors. Absorbing more work internally without reinforcement risks burnout and turnover, which are far more costly to repair.

> The VUCA context magnifies every decision and tests the resilience of every system. It demands leaders who can operate with both conviction and composure, even when the path ahead is not clear.

For legal leaders making their first business case, my advice is simple: combine conviction with calm. Speak the language of the business, use data without hiding behind it, and remain composed even if the answer is not immediate. Building trust is often a gradual process. Persistence, transparency, and integrity make the difference. Every conversation about resources is also a conversation about leadership credibility.

Every subsequent pitch I have made for headcount has followed the same principles. I combine quantitative data with a narrative that connects to our business reality, and I show what the future looks like with and without action. The power of the argument lies not in the complexity of the analysis but in the clarity of its message. A good business case for an additional FTE should read as a proposal for value creation, not as a complaint about workload. It should show how the added capacity will protect the company, empower the business, and reinforce the culture of integrity that allows a biotech company to thrive in a VUCA world.

From a leadership perspective, however, securing approval to hire an additional resource is only the beginning. Once the resources are granted, the focus must shift from justification to execution. The next challenge is to attract the right people: professionals whose skills, mindset, and values align with the organization's mission and the realities of operating in a demanding, innovation-driven environment.

Attracting the right people



Once a new position is approved, the focus shifts from justification to execution. Finding the right person is not a matter of filling a vacancy. It is about shaping the culture and the future of the team. Every hiring decision in a legal department is strategic. It determines how the team will think, communicate, and respond under pressure. In a volatile business, the quality of people defines the resilience of the function.

Defining what "right" means

In biotech, "right" does not only mean technically competent. The right profile combines legal expertise with adaptability, clarity of thought, and courage. Biotech companies operate at the intersection of science, regulation, and finance. The legal and compliance function must constantly translate complex, evolving realities into sound, actionable advice.

I have always looked for people who are not afraid of ambiguity, who can stay calm in demanding situations, and who are willing to speak up even when their message is inconvenient. The most valuable lawyers are those who combine composure with integrity, professionals who can say "no" respectfully when necessary, and who bring forward solutions instead of only identifying risks.

A good in-house lawyer in biotech needs three qualities that are not always taught in law school: resilience, curiosity, and communication. Resilience allows them to keep perspective when projects shift, timelines collapse, or scientific results disappoint. Curiosity drives them to understand the science and business, not just the law. Communication, the ability to convey complex issues simply and credibly, determines whether their advice is heard and acted upon.

> Building a convincing case for additional headcount requires a combination of business need, data, storytelling, and scenario planning.

Culture as an attractor

Compensation is important, but it is rarely decisive for high-performing professionals who seek meaning in their work. In my experience, talented lawyers are drawn to environments where they can contribute visibly and grow personally.

Recent surveys confirm this. According to the 2024 Wolters Kluwer Future Ready Lawyer Report, 81 percent of legal professionals say an acceptable work-life balance is a critical factor, 79 percent expect competitive compensation, and 79 percent want professional development and training. Younger professionals in particular expect purposeful leadership and flexibility in how they perform their role. ACC's 2025 Law Department Compensation Survey similarly found that in-house legal professionals ranked work-life balance alongside compensation as the most important attribute of their job.

For a biotech company, that means cultivating a culture of respect, learning, and presence. Respect for expertise across disciplines, learning through exposure to science, business, and regulation, and presence, meaning leaders who are accessible, who listen, and who provide context rather than instructions.

When I interview candidates, I often tell them that they must be comfortable with uncertainty and yet be decisive in their advice. That mix of humility and confidence is what sustains good judgment under pressure. The best hires are those who find motivation not only in outcomes but in the process, who want to contribute to building something meaningful over time.

The leadership role in attraction

Attracting strong legal talent is not primarily a recruitment exercise. It is a leadership responsibility. The image of the legal function in the organization determines whether good candidates see it as a place where they can thrive.

That perception starts internally. If management sees legal as a blocker, that impression will spread. If, on the contrary, legal is seen as a constructive partner, that reputation will attract similar profiles. High-caliber professionals want to work where legal is trusted and valued.

I have learned that being visible and communicative about what your team does, and why it matters, is essential. Share successes. Explain the rationale behind difficult calls. Recognize the effort of your

people in public. These small acts build credibility and make your department a magnet for talent.

Legal recruitment professionals often confirm that candidates choose environments where they perceive clarity of purpose and leadership they can learn from. Leadership visibility and authenticity are among the most powerful attractors of all.

Beyond the CV

Attracting the right people also means seeing beyond experience titles and sector boxes. The biotech industry is full of professionals who started in other fields such as technology, manufacturing, or healthcare. The essential question is not whether they have done this exact job before, but whether they can learn fast, think independently, and communicate effectively.

When evaluating candidates, I pay close attention to how they explain complex matters to non-lawyers. A person who can explain clearly will likely also manage complexity effectively. I also listen to how they describe challenges in past roles, whether they show accountability, reflection, and a sense of proportion.

Recruiting for potential rather than perfection creates diversity of thought and resilience in the team. In a sector where no one has all the answers, diverse minds working with shared values are a company's best defense against volatility.

> Retention is not about keeping people from leaving; it is about creating a place where they want to stay because they feel valued and trusted.

Retaining talent: Availability, trust, and growth

Attracting the right people is only half of the equation. Retaining them is what ultimately defines the strength of a legal function. In the fast-moving and high-pressure world of biotech, retention is not achieved through compensation or titles alone. It depends on leadership presence, balanced workloads, psychological safety, and a shared sense of purpose.

The cost of overstretch

In small or scaling organizations, the risk of overstretch is constant. Legal departments are often expected to do more with less, to manage expanding compliance expectations, and to deliver faster each year. For a time, committed professionals can sustain this pace. But when intensity becomes the norm, performance eventually declines, morale erodes, and attrition follows.

Overstretch is not only a human issue; it is a strategic risk. As ACC's 2025 The State of Stress Among In-house Legal Professionals report found, high stress levels amplify the risk of attrition by a factor of 3 to 5 compared to moderately or mildly stressed staff. When key people leave, projects slow down, continuity is lost, and knowledge gaps appear. Replacing experienced in-house counsel is costly and time-consuming, especially in specialized sectors such as life sciences. Prevention is far

more efficient than replacement.

For me, recognizing the early signs of overstretch is a management responsibility. It requires paying attention not only to deliverables but also to the tone of team interactions, the energy level in meetings, and the willingness of people to contribute ideas beyond their immediate tasks. Silence, hesitation, or constant urgency are signals that something needs to be rebalanced.

Availability and leadership presence

One of the most effective ways to retain talent is to be available. In a demanding environment, people need to feel that their manager is present, accessible, and genuinely interested in how they are doing.

Availability does not mean constant oversight. It means being visible when it matters, offering guidance when needed, and creating moments of calm in the middle of complexity. I have always made it a priority to check in regularly with my team members. These conversations are not about control but about connection. They provide a safe space for people to raise concerns, ask for help, or simply reflect on priorities.

In my view, presence is a form of leadership accountability. As head of the function, I am ultimately responsible for the well-being and performance of the team. I see it as my duty to ensure that workloads are sustainable and that no one feels isolated in the pressure. This approach helps prevent burnout, but it also builds trust. When people know they can speak openly without fear of being judged, they are more likely to stay, grow, and contribute with confidence.

Freedom and accountability

Retention is closely linked to how much freedom professionals experience in their work. Lawyers value autonomy; they want to be trusted to make sound decisions and to see the impact of their contributions.

I have found that giving people space to lead their own files, to interact directly with business stakeholders, and to shape their advice, strengthens both engagement and accountability. The key is balance: enough independence to empower, enough guidance to support. Regular feedback, shared learning moments, and open discussions about expectations make this balance sustainable.

When a team member feels ownership of their role and knows that their leader will stand by them when challenges arise, their commitment deepens. Retention is not about keeping people from leaving; it is about creating a place where they want to stay because they feel valued and trusted.

Growth and recognition

Long-term retention depends on growth. Even in lean organizations, there are many ways to provide development opportunities: cross-functional projects, exposure to board discussions where possible, mentoring of junior colleagues, or participation in due diligence and licensing negotiations. Growth is not always vertical; it can be experiential.

I believe in recognizing progress as much as achievement. Acknowledging effort, curiosity, and learning keeps people motivated and loyal. Recognition does not need to be formal. Often, a simple

expression of appreciation in front of peers or senior management carries great weight.

Encouraging development also strengthens the organization as a whole. A team that keeps learning can adapt to new challenges without requiring constant external reinforcement. It creates internal continuity and resilience. These are the very qualities that allow a biotech company to navigate volatility.

Integrity and shared purpose

Ultimately, retention in biotech legal teams depends on integrity and shared purpose. People stay where they feel that their work has meaning, that their leaders act with consistency, and that values are not compromised for convenience.

Integrity cannot be delegated or simulated. It must be demonstrated daily in decisions, communication, and treatment of others. When the team sees that principles are upheld even under pressure, it builds a form of loyalty that no financial incentive can match.

I often tell my team that we are in the same boat, facing the same storms, and that my role as leader is to steer with them, not above them. That sense of shared journey creates cohesion. It reminds everyone, including myself, that the legal function is not an island but an essential part of the company's capacity to act responsibly and with courage.

> The strength of a legal department lies not in how much it controls but in how well it enables.

Conclusion: Integrity as resilience capital

This article has explored how legal leaders can strengthen their teams in volatile and demanding environments, such as the biotech industry. Biotech operates in a world defined by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity. The legal function must not only manage that complexity but bring clarity and composure to it. Integrity, courage, and communication are central to that mission.

Building a convincing case for additional headcount requires a combination of business need, data, storytelling, and scenario planning. The most persuasive arguments focus on business enablement, risk quantification, employee wellbeing, and cultural alignment. A strong business case shows how legal resources contribute to resilience and value creation rather than simply addressing workload.

Experience also teaches that crises can become catalysts for change when handled constructively. The GDPR example illustrated how operational challenges can drive maturity and improvement when they are framed as opportunities for better systems, clearer processes, and stronger compliance culture.

Attracting the right people is a leadership act. Beyond technical expertise, what matters most are adaptability, curiosity, and the ability to communicate clearly and credibly. Culture, visibility, and purpose remain the strongest attractors. High-performing professionals are drawn to

environments where they can learn, contribute, and work with leaders who are accessible and authentic.

Retention, in turn, depends on balance and presence. Avoiding overstretch, maintaining regular check-ins, encouraging autonomy, and recognizing growth all help create a culture of trust and belonging. When integrity and shared purpose are visible in daily decisions, they transform a team into a community that supports both performance and wellbeing.

Across all these dimensions, one message stands out clearly: legal excellence is inseparable from human leadership. The law provides structure, but people give it meaning. The strength of a legal department lies not in how much it controls but in how well it enables — by enabling business, enabling integrity, and enabling the individuals who serve both.

Join ACC for more compliance insights!

Disclaimer: The information in any resource in this website should not be construed as legal advice or as a legal opinion on specific facts, and should not be considered representing the views of its authors, its authors' employers, its sponsors, and/or ACC. These resources are not intended as a definitive statement on the subject addressed. Rather, they are intended to serve as a tool providing practical guidance and references for the busy in-house practitioner and other readers.

Bart Goddyn



Chief Legal Officer | Board Member | Life Sciences

Bart Goddyn is a Chief Legal Officer and board member advising life sciences companies across all stages of growth. Trained in law (JD, LL.M) and business (MBA), he brings a multidisciplinary perspective to legal strategy, governance, compliance, and complex transactions in highly regulated, innovation-driven sectors. His work focuses on building legal functions as drivers of resilience and responsible growth in volatile and uncertain conditions.