ASSESSMENT REPORT

ICLON Research Programme - Teaching and Teacher Learning
Leiden University - Peer Review 2015 – 2020

December 2022

Assessment Report
ICLON Research Programme
Teaching and Teacher Learning
2015 - 2020
Leiden University

Table of contents

Preface

This report presents the findings and recommendations of a peer review of the ICLON Research Programme of Leiden University, carried out in the fall of 2022.

Our peer review committee was appointed by the Board of Leiden University. The review is based on a self-assessment report provided by ICLON, additional documentation, and meetings with the staff and PhD candidates of ICLON during a site-visit on November 17-18, 2022. This review report is both prospective and retrospective and contains several recommendations to ICLON.

As chair, I wish to thank my fellow evaluators for their expert and sincere contributions to the discussions and considerations of the findings. The work was not only intense, but also socially pleasant and academically rewarding.

We thank all members of ICLON, including staff and PhD candidates, for their open and constructive participation in the review process.

We hope this report marks the start of another period of highly successful research by ICLON.

February 2023

Prof. dr. Susan McKenney
Chair of the ICLON Peer Review Committee

1. Introduction

1.1 The evaluation

All publicly funded university research in the Netherlands is evaluated at regular intervals in compliance with the national Strategy Evaluation Protocol (SEP 2021-2027), as agreed by the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU, now UNL), the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) and the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW). The evaluation process, which is applied at the research unit or institute level, consists of a systematic external peer review conducted every six years.

The evaluation system aims to achieve three generic objectives:
- improvement in the quality of research through an assessment carried out according to international standards of quality and relevance;
- improvement in research management and leadership; and
- accountability to the higher management levels of the research organizations, to the funding agencies, government and society at large.

1.2 The assessment procedure

The evaluation procedures followed by the Review Committee were those set out in the NWO/UNL/KNAW "Strategy Evaluation Protocol (SEP 2021-2027) for public research organizations."

The review committee was requested to report its findings on the research institute in line with the three main criteria, which should always be reviewed in relation to the institute's mission, especially if this mission restricts the institute to operate only for/within a national scientific community.

The committee met online several times to discuss preliminary findings based on ICLON's self-evaluation report and to prepare for the site visit, which took place on November 17-18, 2022. On the first day of the site visit, the committee convened to finalize discussion points and coordinate the approach to meetings with ICLON staff. On the second day of the site visit, (see annex 2 for the full program and the names of participants), meetings were held with:
- ICLON's management team and board
- A selection of the scientific staff
- PhD candidates
- Ethics committee
- Societal stakeholders

The Peer Review Committee consisted of:
- Prof. dr. Susan McKenney, University of Twente (chair)
- Prof. dr. Bram De Wever, Ghent University
- Dr. Harmen Schaap, Radboud University Nijmegen
- Dr. Siebrich de Vries, University of Groningen
- Esther van Dijk, MSc, Utrecht University
- Dr. Frans van Steijn acted as independent secretary to the committee

1.3   Quality of the information

The information that was made available to the committee consisted of:
- Self-evaluation report 2015-2020 ICLON Research Program
- Terms of Reference
- Program Site-visit
- Strategy Evaluation Protocol 2021-2027

The committee deemed the information to be honest and adequate.

2 Structure, organization and mission of ICLON

2.1 Introduction

ICLON (Leiden University Graduate School of Teaching) is Leiden University's centre for teacher education and teacher professional development in secondary and higher education. ICLON is an interfaculty centre directed by a board consisting of the three deans of the Leiden faculties of Science, Humanities, and Social & Behavioural Sciences, respectively.

ICLON's research is organized in one research program aiming to improve the quality of teaching through scientific understanding of teaching and teacher learning. This objective is achieved by expanding educational theory and acquiring systematic knowledge of educational practice, both with a primary focus on teachers and teaching as the crucial factors for the quality of education.

2.2 Mission and strategy of ICLON research

ICLON's mission is to develop scientific models and theories about teaching and teacher learning and to improve teaching practice. This dual focus on theory and practice permeates the institute's research activities. The research is organized according to twelve fundamental teaching-learning principles and related practical tools to strengthen coherence and knowledge sharing across research and innovation projects. These principles are the fundamental building blocks with which multiple educational approaches can be realized. The dual focus and the teaching-learning principles characterize ICLON's research programme.

2.3 Management and organization

Principal   Leiden University
Unit   ICLON
Directors   Prof. dr.ir. Fred Janssen,
                                               scientific director
                                               Prof. dr. Roeland van der Rijst,
                                               research program director

Research input scientific staff 2020   8.64 fte (20 persons)
PhD candidates in 2020   37 (8 employed)
Research funding in 2020   K€955 / 8.07 fte

ICLON research is directed by a management team, consisting of the director, a director of the research program, and a director operational management and human resources. The management team is supervised by a board

consisting of the deans of three Leiden University faculties. For research, the program director is advised by a scientific committee consisting of all tenured academic staff members. Research proposals are evaluated and advised upon by the ICLON Research Ethics Committee with respect to ethical and methodological aspects.

At the closing of the evaluation period in 2020, the academic staff consisted of two full professors, one professor by special appointment, two associate professors, and four assistant professors. Research was furthermore conducted by five post-docs and 37 PhD students (of which, eight employed by ICLON and 29 with outside funding arrangements). Research is funded directly by Leiden University (73%), by (national) research grants (12%), and by contract research and other sources (15%).

The large number of PhD students with individual scholarships and personal grants, a common situation in educational sciences, is not reflected in these percentages for external funding. They nevertheless form a substantial component of ICLON's research efforts and achievements.

3   Assessment ICLON research program

3.1   Research Quality

The committee was asked to assess ICLON's research in the period 2015 – 2020; due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the planned assessment in 2021 was postponed until now, but that did not alter the regulatory assessment period. Based on ICLON's self-evaluation and the interviews during the site-visit, the committee perceived that the institute has achieved an extensive array of results from its scientific research. The presented list of publications 2015 – 2020 is impressive, covers a broad range, and includes many contributions in top tier journals. The academic impact is demonstrated not only in academic journals, but also in conferences and in national and international cooperation with researchers within both theoretical and practical domains of education. The research program 'Teaching and Teacher Learning' has guided this research for many years and may do so for many more. The committee recognizes and applauds ICLON's approach of maintaining a 'dual focus,' aiming its research towards both scientific and practical objectives. This mission is further elaborated by using twelve teaching-learning principles, or building blocks, such as 'formative', 'inclusive', or 'collaborative learning'[1].

---

[1] The full range of the 12 principles is: adaptive, collaborative learning, content and language integrated, formative, goal-system based, inclusive, inquiry-based, modular, multi-perspective-based, safe and participative, self-regulated, whole task-based.

In general, the committee found merit in ICLON's principles-based approach. However, the committee observed a large number of distinct principles, and craved a narrative or other clear structure to connect them. While all research done at ICLON appears to be connected to one or more principles, the committee found it difficult to understand this mission, in its present form, as a guiding basis to support research decisions. The committee therefore advises ICLON to clarify the twelve principles themselves, and especially the coherence and synergy between them. In so doing, the committee advises to create a distinct and clear vision (e.g. a single mission or three thematic areas), that tie the principles together and enhances the visibility and viability of the program. Ideally, such efforts would not only make the intersecting lines of research more transparent, but may also support ICLON's strategic decision making when it comes to initiatives for seeking funding and establishing sustainable collaboration with stakeholders in the (near) future.

A similar observation was made with regard to transparency of research work undertaken by ICLON. Internally, ICLON's mission and strategy seem to be shaped by the many effective and stimulating meetings for knowledge exchange, by ICLON's yearly research market, by the institute's scientific committee, and by research group meetings and presentations in small and large settings. There is little doubt that this is a robust and thriving group of scholars, and the committee highly appreciates that. But to better achieve the dual goals (in combination with obtaining research in different sectors, with 12 learning principles and different theoretical angles), more is needed. In particular, (inter)national colleagues as well as local practitioners must be able to see what ICLON has to offer. The committee strongly feels ICLON misses the visibility that the quality and impact of its results deserve. The committee appreciates for example the qualitative information given, but finds it unfortunate that the self-evaluation refrains from indicating the research quality by quantitative means. These might have been given as impact factors of publications, H-indexes of its researchers, or an aggregated inventory of leadership in relevant academic circles. The use of quantitative information is not a goal in itself, but additional figures (e.g. numbers/types of joint projects, number/types of PhD trajectories) may help achieve the objective of bolstering credibility and increasing the visibility of ICLON—as a collective group and of its individuals—to potential research partners in the field. Moreover, the committee urges ICLON to invest more effort in showing its strong characteristics to the outside world and its nearer environment in the faculties of Leiden University.

The committee was also impressed by the supportive and collaborative leadership style employed by ICLON's directors and research staff. The committee advises ICLON to work towards a shared and clear vision for

strategic guidance and monitoring of their research program. ICLON could benefit from creating such a coherent vision and related annual plans, in terms of decision-making about (seeking) future funding, establishing future partnerships in the field, and strengthening ICLON as a brand.

3.2   Relevance to society

In many ways, ICLON achieves societal impact. Many of its research projects are developed together with schools in secondary and higher education and are subsequently applied there. The committee was introduced to interesting examples involving Kennisnet (the national organization for education and ICT), innovative developments in the John Dewey School, Leiden's medical faculty, and others. In some cases, new knowledge and practices really are the result of co-creation by ICLON researchers and their partners in the field. The committee was indeed impressed by the way ICLON cooperates with a range of practitioners in higher and secondary education.

Applying the twelve teaching-learning principles is regularly visible in the projects that bring ICLON researchers actively in the schools. Also, these building blocks play an important role in the didactics of the teacher education program. The committee observed that ICLON is home to multiple researchers who could be characterized as 'boundary spanners' – helping to bridge the much-lamented theory-practice gap, for example by facilitating the translation of theoretical knowledge for implementation in practice, or by understanding and voicing practical concerns to make innovations more relevant and feasible. The committee was pleased to observe this, since ICLON requires such boundary spanners to realize its dual focus.

While all this is achieved in individual research projects, the committee notes opportunities for improvement related to ICLON's collective impact on society. First, it appeared as though current success relies almost solely on personal contacts for initiation and maintenance. To be clear, the committee recognizes and praises ICLON for rich personal contact with societal stakeholders; this is a strength. At the same time, the limited occurrence of other cooperative ties (such as institutional partnerships or school networks) renders this aspect somewhat fragile. The committee was unable to discern a well-defined ICLON-wide vision or impact strategy that researchers and stakeholders are able to relate to. For instance, different professional learning communities (PLCs) are installed within some schools. If ICLON deliberately chooses to systematically foster PLCs, then products, plans or policies to support this pathway should be more visible. While acknowledging the value of keeping things as light and simple as possible for efficiency, the committee advises ICLON to reflect on the clarity and resilience of their current organizational infrastructure for achieving societal impact, and to take steps

to reduce the hazards that come with the current approach. Such action could also contribute to the recommendation concerning visibility. In addition, a clear ICLON-wide vision on this matter could help enhance/consolidate societal impact, as a result of more strategic and robust selection of partners.

As noted with regard to research quality, ICLON's visibility, now with respect to practice, on campus, in the schools, in the region, in teacher education programs, appears to be less than optimal. While reading the documentation beforehand and visiting the organization's website, the committee struggled to glean a sense of ICLON's work and success with regard to societal impact, but the site-visit which included conversations with stakeholders painted a positive picture. The committee stresses the importance of communications and public relations tools for enhancing impact, and encourages ICLON to develop a more systematic strategy for research visibility as a whole. In line with the example above, the committee could easily envision improved clarity and access to information about the already mentioned PLC's, expertise networks, knowledge centres and educational partnerships.

3.3 Viability

When it comes to within-ICLON operations, the committee sees a stable unit. ICLON has proven itself to be effective in securing grants, cooperating with partners in the field, and maintaining (inter)national recognition despite the aforementioned concerns about visibility. In this sense, ICLON operations could be stronger but its internal viability is not a cause for concern.

However, when it comes to institutional viability, the committee raised concerns directly related to visibility. The committee also notes that nothing remains the same, and ICLON's environment continues to change in various ways. It is therefore not enough to have excellent research results that are valued highly in the academic and educational communities. The way the outside world sees ICLON relates strongly to its funding and governance position. More is needed here than employing a communication strategy. ICLON's funding position with only 12% research grants and 13% contract research needs strengthening. The institute's governance position equally demands that its reputation with the constituting faculties and university board is made as strong as possible.

ICLON therefore needs to emphasize its strong features more clearly. As mentioned in the previous two sections, these include: the versatility of its scientific and practical approach by using its broad teaching-learning principles; its partnerships with the faculties, schools and education networks; and its professional and supportive academic culture. Specifically, the committee advises ICLON to develop a proactive strategy to present itself

as a centre of expertise for higher and secondary education to its institutional environment. Elements of that strategy may be the innovation of ICLON's website presenting its research portfolio; installing more learning communities; and making a concerted effort to attract more external research funding. The committee sees strong synergies between this recommendation and those given previously, and encourages ICLON to take an holistic approach to making (the systematic and conceptual connections within) their work more accessible to others, specifically: fellow researchers, educational practitioners, and university colleagues.

3.4   PhD training and education program

At this moment, ICLON hosts a large number of about 37 PhD students, 8 of which are employed by the institute. The others have scholarships, outside funding, or work as teachers or teacher trainers. A substantial number of the PhDs has an international background.

Without exception, the committee perceived a warm and supportive environment in ICLON that provides PhDs sufficient support on their paths towards academic research training and careers. Their supervisors are valued for their active support and the way they help PhDs to develop their skills. Doctoral candidates also indicated that they are stimulated to visit international research groups and to cooperate with international scholars.

For the schooling aspects of the PhD trajectory, ICLON cooperates in ICO, the Interuniversity Centre for Educational Sciences. PhDs are involved in ICO as full-time or part-time members. The Leiden University graduate school also offers (obligatory) courses to PhD candidates. Some make use of additional training programs, such as those offered by DUDOC and the Regional Centre of Expertise Development of The Hague (CRK).

Supervision of PhDs is taken quite seriously, as evidenced by the fact that intervision meetings are organized for supervisors. Doctoral supervisors indicate that, despite the large number of PhDs, the workload is not experienced as (too) heavy. Rather, it is seen as stimulating for their own research.

Due to decreased Leiden University PhD scholarships, the international PhD students currently form the majority of the population at ICLON. Prompted by feedback in the past, the institute now pays greater attention to the social coherence of this diverse group, which is recognized by PhDs themselves. ICLON now has an onboarding program for foreign students and the entire group of PhD students regularly comes together for research related and/or social exchange. In addition, through research project meetings and a

monthly Happy Hour, PhDs in ICLON express that they really feel part of the academic community. The committee appreciates the way ICLON organizes the PhD program.

While no problematic areas were identified relating to PhD education and training, two possible areas for enrichment were mentioned by the PhDs themselves. One area was increased attention and support for international visits and experiences. To the extent that this is feasible within the constraints of scholarship funding, the committee endorsed this suggestion. The other area pertained to preparing subsequent career steps, inside or outside academia, after completion of the PhD program. The committee notes efforts in this area could improve both PhD experiences and ICLON visibility.

3.5   Academic Culture and Human Resources Policy

The committee's view on ICLON's academic culture was greatly enhanced by the open conversation it had with the ICLON Research Ethics Committee (IREC). The IREC contributes not only to a culture of research ethics in the institute, but also broadly advises the researchers on methodological issues. The positive view the committee acquired was clearly confirmed in the other interviews during the day. Keywords to describe ICLON's academic culture are: supportive, critical, professional, open and positive. IREC operates in this spirit. ICLON researchers take turns in this committee, which ensures that ethical conduct and methodological soundness are embedded in the research culture and broadly shared within this community.

ICLON takes care of its community members. Intervision and mutual support are regular elements of the institute's conduct. ICLON staff report that they experience this as nourishing and stabilizing.

During 2015-2020, ICLON was successful in attracting highly qualified researchers. The work/life balance appears to be sound, but given the different roles many staff members play, individual motivations and opportunities might be discussed more often in regular (group and individual) meetings. There is potential benefit to further developing ICLON's inclusivity and diversity policy. As mentioned previously, ICLON has taken steps to improve social cohesion, primarily among doctoral candidates. According to staff members, this should remain a topic of interest. Additionally, when asked about work pressure, staff indicated that they do have monthly meetings to discuss issues in general (e.g. different approaches to balancing multiple roles in academia) but that it could be beneficial to devote specific attention to monitoring work pressure and supporting colleagues in managing it. The committee agrees wholeheartedly with these observations, and

additionally identifies inclusivity and diversity within ICLON as topics for possible consideration.

3.6 Open Science

In line with its high societal relevance objective, ICLON naturally endorses an open science policy. All publications are at least accessible in the Leiden open repository. With respect to the re-use of research data, ICLON follows a careful policy, because privacy and consent are sensitive elements of doing research in schools and with students and teachers. IREC takes its responsibility for careful conduct in this respect, and realistically anticipates increasing debates (in the field and within the institution) related to guarding privacy while also contributing to open science. The committee recommends that ICLON considers evaluating its open science policy with the goal of identifying opportunities for increasing its ambitions (and possibly also bolstering its routines) in this area. In terms of more visibility and better communication with the field of education, being a forerunner in this respect will be an additional advantage.

3.7 Conclusions and Recommendations

The committee concludes that in the reviewed period, ICLON's research has achieved high quality scientific results in a supportive and collaborative environment. ICLON's approach to implement its results and acquired knowledge of teaching and teacher training in a variety of educational environments has proven successful. ICLON is a viable research institute with strong human and financial resources with the potential and perspective of strengthening these further. ICLON hosts an enthusiastic and successful group of intercultural PhDs that receive adequate and dedicated support from the institute's able staff.

In the assessment above, the committee included several recommendations to ICLON, both explicit and implicit. Listed below, the recommendations concern two general categories, which can be mutually reinforcing: A. Internal coherence: measures to increase the coherence within ICLON's research community; and B. Visibility: advice to increase ICLON's visibility.

A. Internal coherence

1. The committee advises ICLON to work towards further articulation of a shared and clear *vision* guiding their research program, allowing the institute to operate more as a coherent research group.

2. With respect to ICLON's societal relevance, the committee advises to develop a well-defined ICLON-wide *impact strategy* that researchers and stakeholders are able to relate to.

3. The committee advises ICLON to consider to improve the *structural cooperation* and knowledge exchange with their societal partners. An example could be employing professional learning communities (PLCs) both as means for enhancing sustainable collaboration with stakeholders and also as subject of research.

4. The committee considers it advisable to *help the PhDs prepare better for a career after their promotion*, inside or outside academia. Part of this could be to stimulate and support them in gaining international experiences.

5. The committee recommends to *discuss researchers' motivations and opportunities* more frequently in regular (group and individual) meetings.

6. The committee advises ICLON to *consider (developing) its inclusivity and diversity policy*.

B. Visibility

7. The committee recommends to develop a *concise and coherent presentation of the twelve teaching-learning principles*. This should lead to a vision plan with clear research lines. ICLON will benefit from such a coherent vision and a related strategic plan, in view of seeking future funding, establishing future partnerships, and strengthening ICLON as a brand.

8. The committee recommends ICLON to develop a pro-active strategy to *present itself as a research centre of expertise for higher and secondary education* both on-campus (e.g. through cooperation in the Leiden Teaching and Learning Centre) and off-campus (e.g. through cooperation with local schools, regional networks, and national bodies).

9. This strategy should *make ICLON's strong features visible*: the versatility of its scientific and practical approach by using its broad teaching-learning principles; its partnerships with the faculties, schools and education networks; and its professional and supportive academic culture.

10. ICLON is advised to *invest more effort in showing the quality and impact of its research* to the world outside the institute.

11. The committee recommends as practical elements of a visibility strategy to innovate *ICLON's website* presenting its research portfolio; to install more PLCs; and to make a concerted effort to attract more external research funding.

12. ICLON is advised to *evaluate its open science policy* aiming to push it more to the forefront of its ambitions.

Annex 1 Terms of Reference ICLON Assessment

Terms of reference

The board of Leiden University hereby issues the following Terms of Reference to the assessment committee of the Leiden University ICLON research programme Teacher and Teacher Learning.

1.   Introduction: Research assessments in the Netherlands

In the Netherlands, the boards of the universities, KNAW and NWO are responsible for the quality of the research at their institution. As part of their quality assurance cycle, all academic research in the Netherlands is evaluated every six years. The executive board of the relevant university, the board of NWO, or the board of KNAW commissions the research assessment and determines which research units are to be evaluated each year. For the coordination of the assessment, all research organizations associated with VSNU, KNAW, and NWO use the Strategy Evaluation Protocol. The main goal of a SEP evaluation is to evaluate a research unit in light of its own aims and strategy. In the self-evaluation, the unit reflects on its ambitions and strategy during the previous six years as well as for the future in a coherent, narrative argument, supported wherever possible with factual evidence. This fact means that there should be a direct relationship between the arguments with regard to the aims and strategy on the one hand and the type of robust data underpinning the self-evaluation on the other. The SEP assessments help to monitor and improve the quality of the research conducted by the research unit. Additionally, the assessments of the research quality and societal relevance of research contribute to fulfil the duty of accountability towards government and society. The boards of the institutes may use the outcomes of the research evaluations for quality assurance purposes and institutional strategy development.

The protocol itself is reviewed every six years in order to move along with important developments in research.

2.   Objectives of the research assessment of ICLON

The committee is requested to assess the quality of research conducted by ICLON as well as to offer recommendations in order to improve the quality of research and the strategy of ICLON. The committee is requested to carry out the assessment according to the guidelines specified in the Strategy Evaluation Protocol. The evaluation includes a backward-looking and a forward-looking component. Specifically, the committee is asked to judge the performance of ICLON on the main assessment criteria and offer its written conclusions as well as recommendations based on considerations and arguments. The main assessment criteria are:

i. research quality;
ii. societal relevance;
iii. viability of the unit.

During the evaluation of these criteria, the assessment committee is asked to incorporate four specific aspects. These aspects are included, as they are becoming increasingly important in the current scientific context and help to shape the past as well as future quality of ICLON. These aspects are as follows:

A. Open Science: availability of research output, re-use of data, involvement of societal stakeholders;

B. PhD Policy and Training: supervision and instruction of PhD candidates;

C. Academic Culture: openness, (social) safety and inclusivity; and research integrity;

D. Human Resources Policy: diversity and talent management.

The main assessment criteria and the four specific aspects are described in detail within the Strategy Evaluation Protocol.

In addition to these criteria specified in the Strategy Evaluation Protocol, the board requests the committee to pay attention to the following additional questions as well as to offer its assessment and recommendations:

In the upcoming years, we would like to strengthen even more the relevance of our research activities and research output for schools, teacher education, higher education institutes, and teachers' continuous professional development.

I. Does the accreditation committee recognize the current strength of the dual focus on theory development and innovation of educational practice of our research programme and what would, according to the committee, be best actions for the near future to strengthen the dual focus even more?

   a. in the domain of higher education, specifically related to teaching and learning at Leiden University;

   b. in the domain of secondary and primary education.

Currently, the research group has an international orientation in number of PhD students and guest researchers from abroad and staff collaborations with highly ranked international universities. However, more is needed to really develop a leading academic role internationally.

II. Does the committee recognize the current international orientation and what would, according to the committee, be next steps for us to take to expand the sphere of influence of our research internationally?

3. Committee requirements: statement of impartiality

The members of the committee are requested to sign a statement of impartiality before they conduct their assessment work. In this statement, the members declare that they have no direct relationship or connection with ICLON.

4. Schedule of the assessment and reporting

The self-evaluation and the site visit form the main sources of information for the committee, on which basis it draws up its report. The self-evaluation will be sent no less than four weeks prior to the site visit, together with the Strategy Evaluation Protocol and the programme for the site visit.

The site visit at ICLON will take place on November 18, 2022. The secretary of the research programme, Ben Smit will contact you about logistical matters and other relevant issues related to the research assessment approximately two months prior to the site visit.

The committee is requested to report its findings in an assessment report drawn up in accordance with the SEP guidelines and format. The committee is asked to send the draft report to ICLON no more than eight weeks after the site visit. ICLON will check the report for factual inaccuracies; if such inaccuracies are detected, the committee will ensure that they are corrected. The committee will then send the final version of the assessment report to the board. The board publishes the final version of the assessment report.

Annex 2 Program Site Visit ICLON

Thursday November 17, 2022, 16.00 – 18.00 hr
Location: Tulip Inn Leiden
Start-off meeting committee

Friday November 18, 2022;
Location Room A2.03 Willem van Einthoven Building, Leiden
Site-visit:

8.30	Welcome
9.00 – 10.00	Panel 1: ICLON Board and Management *Professor Paul Wouters (chair of the ICLON board & dean Social Sciences Faculty), Professor Fred Janssen (director of ICLON), Professor Roeland van der Rijst (director of research program), Marjan Voorkamp (director operational management & HR)*
10.15 – 11.15	Panel 2: Scientific Staff *Nadira Saab, Nivja de Jong, Dineke Tigelaar, Michiel Dam, Tessa Mearns, Albert Logtenberg, Arjen de Vetten*
10.30 – 12.30	Panel 3: PhD students *Max Kusters, Anneke Wurth, Marjon Baas, Stefan Pouwelse, Marie-Jetta den Otter, Linyuan Wang, Yuzhi Lai, Simone Rijksen*
13.30 – 14.30	Panel 4: Research Ethics Committee *Nivja de Jong (chair), Michiel Dam, Dineke Tigelaar, Errol Ertugruloglu, Ben Smit (Secretary)*
14.45 – 15.45	Panel 5: Stakeholders *Gert-Jan Kloos (VO: Curriculumvernieuwing bij Edith Stein College), Nadia Demaret (PO en VO; digitaliserig in onderwijs; Kennisnet), Nelleke Gruis (Faculteit der Geesteswetenschappen), Esther de Vrind (Lerarenopleidingen)*
16.00 – 17.30	Committee preparation and conclusions
17.30	Plenary feedback (all ICLON invited)

Annex 3 Research data

a. Personnel

	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Full professors	2	2	3	3	2	3
Associate Profs.	2	1	1	1	1	2
Assistant Profs.	4	5	6	6	5	4
Post-docs	7	7	8	10	7	5
PhDs employed	14	17	19	18	13	8
PhDs not employed	(13)	(18)	(23)	(24)	(29)	(29)
Total research staff employed	**29**	**32**	**37**	**38**	**28**	**24**

b. Funding (FTE / k€)

Funding (FTE):	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Direct funding	6.49	6.24	8.46	8.01	6.18	5.89
Research grants	0.27	5.31	4.12	2.40	0.80	0.99
Contract research	1.68	1.86	4.95	2.48	0.68	0.87
Other	4.65	4.60	3.48	4.00	1.08	0.31
Total funding	**13.09**	**18.01**	**21.00**	**16.88**	**8.74**	**8.07**
Expenditure (k€)						
Personnel costs	1,032	1,570	1,759	1,641	946	732
Material costs	208	220	331	239	319	223

Annex 4 Curricula vitae of the Committee members

Prof. dr. Susan McKenney (chair)

Susan McKenney is professor of Teacher Professionalization, School Development and Educational Technology at University of Twente. She is especially interested in exploring and supporting the interplay between curriculum development and teacher professional development. This includes the supportive role of technology in curriculum and teacher development, as well as particular attention for these issues in the fields of science education, citizenship development, and early childhood literacy. She is also committed to exploring how educational research can serve the development of scientific understanding while also developing solutions to real problems in educational practice. Since educational design research lends itself to these dual aims, she works on developing and explicating ways to conduct design research. Much of her work has been carried out in collaboration with organizations in developing countries, but she also enjoys research and consultancy in the Netherlands, the USA and Europe.

Prof. dr. Bram De Wever

Bram De Wever is currently associate professor at the Department of Educational Studies at Ghent University, Belgium and head of the research group TECOLAB at that department. He studied Educational Sciences at Ghent University and received his master degree in 2002. Bram finished his PhD on scripting collaboration in online discussion groups in 2006 and has been focusing on technology enhanced learning research ever since. From 2007 he was a post-doc research fellow at the Research Foundation Flanders (FWO) and in 2010 he got a tenure track position on Learning and Instruction at Ghent University; he got tenured in 2015. Bram is currently also associate Editor of Journal of the Learning Sciences and the supervisor of the Flemish Research team of PIAAC (Programme for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies; OECD). His research is focusing on technology enhanced learning and instruction, peer assessment and feedback, inquiry learning and collaborative learning and writing activities. More recently, he is also involved in projects focusing on professional development and lifelong learning. Most of his research is situated in higher, adult and secondary education.

Dr. Harmen Schaap

Harmen Schaap is Assistant Professor at the Radboud Teachers Academy. This function includes a role as teacher educator, coordinator of the two-year teacher education program and educational scientist. His current research focuses on teacher agency, professional identity tensions and burn-out of both early-career- and experienced teachers. He aims to increase insights into complex interactions. His research shows that different personal (for

example self-efficacy and motivation) and contextual factors (for example learning culture, subject teams and leadership in schools) interact with each other, which impact teacher agency and their professional identity tensions. Results of his studies are used by schools and educational partnerships in developing their teacher induction programs, aiming to guide teachers during the first year in the teaching profession in order to prevent them from drop-out. Also, the results are used to develop specific professionalization activities for teachers in schools (for example professional learning communities). Harmen Schaap received different grants, for example a grant for policy research towards teacher agency in the context of different professionalization initiatives and a grant for fundamental scientific research towards well-being and burn-out of early-career teachers and experienced teachers in primary, secondary and vocational education (both funded by the Nederlands Regieorgaan Onderwijsonderzoek).

Dr. Siebrich de Vries
Siebrich de Vries works as an assistant professor at the University of Groningen and as a professor of Didactics at NHL Stenden University of Applied Sciences in Leeuwarden. She studied French Literature and Linguistics and Applied Linguistics at the University of Groningen and proceeded to work as a French teacher at various schools for secondary and higher education in the northern region of the Netherlands. In 1991 she joined the University of Groningen, first as a subject pedagogy teacher educator for French, and later as a project manager in the field of teacher professional development in secondary and higher education. In 2014 she got her PhD on the relationship between teachers' educational beliefs and their participation in professionalization activities. Her current research and other professional activities in teacher education and in schools focus on the connection between theory and practice, in particular the implementation of Lesson Study in the Dutch educational context.

Esther van Dijk, MSc
Esther van Dijk started working in education in 2017 as project leader quality assurance in secondary education at CVO Groep Zuidoost-Utrecht. In 2018, she continued her work in education as a PhD candidate studying teacher expertise development of academics. Her PhD project was a collaboration between the Education Center at University Medical Center Utrecht as well as the Centre for Academic Teaching and Learning and the Department of Education at Utrecht University. Since September 2022, Esther supports academics in the development of their teaching as educational consultant and advisor at Educational Consultancy and Training at Utrecht University. Since then, she also continues her research into academics' teacher expertise development as postdoctoral research at the Education Center at University Medical Center Utrecht.

Dr. Frans van Steijn

Frans van Steijn (secretary) studied physics (BSc) at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and philosophy (MA) at the University of Amsterdam. He received a PhD at the UvA on a thesis "The Universities in Society; a Study of part-time professors in the Netherlands"(1990). Since 1996 Frans was senior advisor at Vereniging van Universiteiten VSNU (now Universiteiten van Nederland UNL), the Association of Universities in the Netherlands. He was Secretary to the Board and Secretary to the Rector's Conference. His expert fields are quality assurance, research policy and research integrity.

In September 2014 Frans retired from VSNU and established an independent office for consultancy and project management, specialized in quality assurance in universities and research organizations. In that new capacity Frans van Steijn assisted several research review committees and an institutional audit as secretary.