

ONDERZOEKERIJ

A photograph of a woman with long hair, wearing glasses and a dark top, looking down at a book she is holding. She is standing in a library aisle, with bookshelves filled with books visible in the background.

**Report on the research review of
Pedagogical Sciences and
Educational Sciences**

2012 – 2017

Report on the research review of Pedagogical Sciences and Educational Sciences 2012 – 2017

Maastricht University
University of Amsterdam
Leiden University
University of Groningen
Utrecht University, Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences
Utrecht University, Faculty of Science
Open University of the Netherlands
Interuniversity Center for Educational Sciences (ICO)

ONDERZOEKERIJ

De Onderzoekerij
Vondellaan 58
2332 AH Leiden

Phone: +31 6 24812176
Email: info@onderzoekerij.nl
Internet: www.onderzoekerij.nl

Contents

Preface	7
1. The review committee and the review procedures	8
1.1 Introduction and scope of the review	8
1.2 Composition of the review committee	8
1.3 Independence and confidentiality	9
1.4 Procedures followed by the review committee	9
1.5 Application of the SEP scores	9
2. Dutch Educational Sciences and Pedagogical Sciences	10
2.1 Strengths	10
2.2 Areas of concern for the future	11
2.3 Guidance for future evaluations	12
Assessment of the institutes	13
3. School of Health Professions Education, Maastricht University	14
3.1 Introduction, strategy and targets	14
3.2 Research quality	14
3.3 Relevance to society	15
3.4 Viability	15
3.5 PhD training	15
3.6 Research integrity policy	15
3.7 Diversity	16
3.8 Overview of the quantitative assessment of the Institute	16
4. Research Institute of Child Development and Education, University of Amsterdam	17
4.1 Introduction, strategy and targets	17
4.2 Research quality	17
4.3 Relevance to society	18
4.4 Viability	18
4.5 PhD training	18
4.6 Research integrity policy	19
4.7 Diversity	19
4.8 Overview of the quantitative assessment of the Institute	20
5. Institute of Education and Child Studies, Leiden University	21
5.1 Introduction, strategy and targets	21
5.2 Research quality	21
5.3 Relevance to society	22
5.4 Viability	22
5.5 PhD training	23
5.6 Research integrity policy	23
5.7 Diversity	23
5.8 Overview of the quantitative assessment of the Institute	23

6. Nieuwenhuis Institute for Educational Research, University of Groningen	24
6.1 Introduction, strategy and targets	24
6.2 Research quality	24
6.3 Relevance to society	25
6.4 Viability	25
6.5 PhD training	26
6.6 Research integrity policy	26
6.7 Diversity	26
6.8 Overview of the quantitative assessment of the Institute	26
7. Department of Education & Pedagogy, Utrecht University	27
7.1 Introduction, strategy and targets	27
7.2 Research quality	27
7.3 Relevance to society	28
7.4 Viability	28
7.5 PhD training	28
7.6 Research integrity policy	29
7.7 Diversity	29
7.8 Overview of the quantitative assessment of the Institute	29
8. Freudenthal Institute, Utrecht University	30
8.1 Introduction, strategy and targets	30
8.2 Research quality	30
8.3 Relevance to society	31
8.4 Viability	31
8.5 PhD training	32
8.6 Research integrity policy	32
8.7 Diversity	32
8.8 Overview of the quantitative assessment of the Institute	32
9. Welten Institute, Open University of the Netherlands	33
9.1 Introduction, strategy and targets	33
9.2 Research quality	33
9.3 Relevance to society	34
9.4 Viability	34
9.5 PhD training	35
9.6 Research integrity policy	35
9.7 Diversity	36
9.8 Overview of the quantitative assessment of the Institute	36
10. National Research School: Interuniversity Centre for Educational Sciences (ICO)	37
10.1 Introduction	37
10.2 Quality	37
10.3 Relevance to society	38
10.4 Viability	38

Appendix 1: SEP scores	40
Appendix 2: Programme of the site visit	41
Appendix 3A: Quantitative data – School of Health Professions Education, Maastricht University	45
Appendix 3B: Quantitative data – Research Institute of Child Development and Education, University of Amsterdam	47
Appendix 3C: Quantitative data – Institute of Education and Child Studies, Leiden University	49
Appendix 3D: Quantitative data – Nieuwenhuis Institute for Educational Research, University of Groningen	51
Appendix 3E: Quantitative data – Department of Education & Pedagogy, Utrecht University	53
Appendix 3F: Quantitative data – Freudenthal Institute, Utrecht University	55
Appendix 3G: Quantitative data – Welten Institute, Open University of the Netherlands	57

Preface

The University of Amsterdam, the University of Groningen, Leiden University, Maastricht University, the Open University of the Netherlands, and Utrecht University as well as the National Research School: Interuniversity Centre for Educational Sciences (ICO) agreed to be assessed concerning their research in pedagogical sciences and educational sciences. This report presents the results of this assessment.

The report follows the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) 2015 – 2021, published under the authority of the Association of Universities in the Netherlands (VSNU), the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO), and the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW). The review committee was composed of scholars from various countries and with different academic backgrounds. The work of the committee was supported by De Onderzoekerij.

As chairman of the committee I like to thank the management, staff and PhD students of the institutes for their presentations and the open and honest discussions. Furthermore, I like to thank the members of the committee for their hard but always trustful work. Finally, I like to thank Esther Poort and Meg van Bogaert. Esther Poort coordinated the review; Meg van Bogaert collected the preliminary assessments, served as the secretary of the committee during the site visit in Utrecht, and prepared the report. She did truly great work.

Detlev Leutner
Chair of the Committee



1. The review committee and the review procedures

1.1 Introduction and scope of the review

In accordance with the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP) 2015–2021 (Appendix 1) the research in Educational Sciences and Pedagogical Sciences covering the period of 2012–2017, is being reviewed by an external peer review committee. This research review is part of the six-year cycle of evaluation of research in all Dutch universities. Of the fourteen Dutch Universities seven conduct research in Pedagogical Sciences and thirteen in Educational Sciences. Although not all universities decided to participate in this national review, the review committee was given a broad overview of the research in Pedagogical Sciences and Educational Sciences in the Netherlands. The following research institutes participated:

- Research Institute of Child Development & Education, University of Amsterdam;
- Nieuwenhuis Institute for Educational Research, University of Groningen;
- Institute of Education and Child Studies, Leiden University;
- Department of Education & Pedagogy Utrecht University, Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences;
- Freudenthal Institute, Utrecht University, Faculty of Sciences;
- Welten Institute, Open University of the Netherlands;
- School of Health Professions Education, Maastricht University.

In addition, the National Research School: Interuniversity Centre for Educational Sciences (ICO) is being reviewed.

In accordance with the SEP the review committee's tasks were to assess the quality of the research conducted by the institutes and their relevance to society as well as their strategic targets and the extent to which they are equipped to achieve them. In addition, the review committee provides qualitative feedback on the PhD programmes, research integrity and diversity aspects of the institutes. The review committee was furthermore invited to write a review on the performance of Dutch Pedagogical Sciences and Educational Sciences from an international perspective and considering international trends. This review is provided in Chapter 2 of this report.

The panel received detailed information consisting of the self-evaluation reports of the institutes under review, including all the information required by SEP (including appendices), key publications for each research institute and general information on Pedagogical Sciences and Educational Sciences in the Netherlands.

1.2 Composition of the review committee

The review committee for the research review in Educational Sciences and Pedagogical Sciences was composed of the following members:

- Professor Detlev Leutner (chair), professor for Instructional Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences, University of Duisenburg-Essen, Germany;
- Professor Ian Grosvenor, professor of Urban Educational History and Head of Education and Social Justice at the University of Birmingham, United Kingdom;
- Professor Hans Gruber, professor in Educational Science at the University of Regensburg, Germany;
- Professor Sanna Järvelä, professor in Learning Sciences and Educational Technology, University of Oulu, Finland;
- Professor Elizabeth Meins, professor in Developmental Psychology, University of York, UK;
- Professor Catherine Snow, professor of Education, Harvard Graduate School of Education, U.S.A;
- Professor Lieven Verschaffel, professor in Educational Psychology at the KU Leuven, Belgium;
- Professor Karine Verschueren, professor and head of the research unit School Psychology and Development in Context at KU Leuven, Belgium.

The committee was supported by dr. Meg van Bogaert who acted as secretary and dr. Esther Poort who coordinated the research review.

1.3 Independence and confidentiality

All members of the review committee signed a statement of independence to safeguard that the committee members could judge without bias, personal preference or personal interest, and that the judgement is made without undue influence from any of the institutes or stakeholders. With his institute being part of ICO, professor Verschaffel did not take part in the review of the national research school. He refrained from comments in the preparation and final report and was not present during the interviews with stakeholders. Any other existing professional relationships between committee members and institutes under review were reported and discussed at the initial meeting. The review committee concluded that there was no risk of bias or undue influence.

1.4 Procedures followed by the review committee

The review committee was invited by the six participating universities to assess the participating institutes and the national research school during a site visit at a central location in the Netherlands (Utrecht). Prior to the site visit, all committee members were requested to read the self-evaluation reports of all seven research institutes as well as that of ICO. Each committee member was furthermore requested to independently formulate a preliminary assessment concerning two research institutes under review, based on the written information that was provided. This way all research institutes were reviewed in-depth by a first and a second reviewer. Nevertheless, all committee members are jointly responsible for the review, scoring and report of all the institutes and ICO.

This report is based on the documentation provided by the research institutes, but it also includes the information gathered during the interviews with management, staff and PhD students of the institutes. The site visit took place from 13 to 17 January 2019 in Utrecht; the programme of the site visit is provided in Appendix 2. Preceding the interviews, the review committee was briefed by the secretary about research reviews according to SEP and was provided with information regarding specifics on Dutch research (e.g., funding, organisation and the position of PhD candidates). In this meeting the review committee also discussed its preliminary findings, decided upon a number of comments and questions, and agreed upon procedural matters and aspects of the review.

After the interviews the review committee discussed its findings, comments and preliminary scores. In the final session, the review committee discussed all preliminary scores and finalised them. Based on the preliminary assessments and notes taken during the interviews, the committee members wrote an assessment of the institute for which they had been appointed as first reviewer. The second reviewer verified and added to this assessment after which the secretary used it for the report. The chair and an additional committee member were requested to write the review on the Dutch Educational Sciences and Pedagogical Sciences. The total draft report was verified and added to by the review committee before being presented to the institutes concerned for factual corrections and comments. The comments were reviewed by the secretary and incorporated in the final report in close consultation with the chair and other committee members. The final report was presented to the Board of the Universities and to the management of the institutes.

This report describes the findings, conclusions and recommendations of this external, peer review of the seven institutes. The review committee aimed to review each institute based on its own objectives and aims and in relation to programmes and institutes worldwide. Although seven Dutch institutes were included in the review, the review committee tried to refrain from a ranking of the seven institutes.

1.5 Application of the SEP scores

The review committee used the criteria and categories of the SEP and would like to make a number of remarks with respect to using of the SEP scores that should be taken into careful consideration when comparing the outcomes of this review with any other research review according to the SEP. The review committee is of the opinion that the scores in this report cannot be compared to the scores in the previous report(s). Furthermore, the review committee agreed that for a score 1 (excellent) the review committee had to be unanimous that the major part of the work in the institute deserved the judgement *One of the few leading institutes worldwide*. As to the other categories, because SEP prescribes only use of whole numbers and no intermediate categories (such as 1.5 or 2.5), it follows that the present category *very good* covers a broad range. In line with this remark the review committee decided to use the score 2 (very good) for research quality, relevance to society and viability rather broadly, meaning that the range of this score encompasses the range from just above 'good' to 'almost excellent'. It should therefore also be interpreted in close connection with the qualitative comments in the text. Finally, according to the current SEP, the units of review are the institutes. Within each research institute often a number of research groups or research lines are combined, each with its own quality, relevance and viability. The review committee combined all results, including the interaction within the institutes, into its findings and scores.

2. Dutch Educational Sciences and Pedagogical Sciences

2.1 Strengths

First, it is important to note that the existence of a regular, rigorous, and impartial review procedure for academic institutes in the Netherlands is a laudable strength of the system. The process is one that requires considerable investment of time and energy from the institutions that participate in the review, and that has financial costs as well. The review committee was deeply impressed by the care that had been taken in preparing institute reports, and the candour with which participants in the process answered questions and responded to the committee's concerns.

The overall picture the review committee formed was one of considerable strength and resilience in these institutes and departments whose work is organised around issues of human development and education. The institutes, considered as a single research community, covered a remarkable breadth of topics and approaches, but all were committed to identifying and addressing the prescribed research priorities, and all showed evidence that they were effectively promoting the learning and the development of predoctoral scholars. ICO is just one of the mechanisms that ensures a strong network of connections among researchers at Dutch universities as well as with those working in universities outside the Netherlands. Structures are in place to facilitate collaboration among researchers at different universities, as well as with university scholars and other educational, municipal, and non-profit agencies, generating rich collaborative networks. Furthermore, all of the institutes reviewed rejected strict disciplinary boundaries in their research and teaching, and several made interdisciplinary work an explicit goal. Furthermore, representatives of all the institutes avowed a commitment to promoting quality over quantity in scholarly production.

Committee members were particularly impressed by the doctoral candidates interviewed. We noted that they were universally enthusiastic, ambitious, confident, and committed to producing high quality and relevant research. They reported feeling well supported, and like members of a community – even the external and parttime candidates. Their high level of satisfaction clearly reflected the quality and intensity of supervision to which they had access. Though the specific arrangements for supervision varied somewhat across the institutes, as did the number of PhD candidates supervised by individual staff members, all the local arrangements were reported to be fully satisfactory. The combination of courses and support from ICO and local graduate schools was much appreciated by students experiencing both.

In addition, the infrastructure of most institutes is very good, and university administrators clearly understood the importance of supporting infrastructure. The infrastructure includes laboratories, but also access to methodological support and to contacts with important community partners and sources of funding. An additional aspect of infrastructure of particular importance to the doctoral candidates was training in research ethics, either through ICO or through a local research training course.

A striking and admirable feature of all the institutes reviewed was their attention to the practical implications of their work (the so-called valorisation dimension), while at the same time they were generally achieving success in meeting or exceeding targets for quality and quantity of scholarly output. The review committee was offered clear evidence of concern among those interviewed that the research being carried out could influence both policy and practice. The presence in many of the groups of parttime PhD students, who were engaged in practice settings while conducting research, creates an additional source of attention to developmental and educational questions drawn from actual practice, and informs the nature of the research designed and carried out.

Many of the academics working in the institutes reviewed have solid international reputations as leaders in their fields. They are active in external committees and agencies, both in the Netherlands and internationally, in ways that both confirm and expand their reputations.

The academic standing and research excellence of the faculty members at the various institutes was enhanced by their exploitation of opportunities to work abroad, to host students and visiting scholars from abroad, and thus to establish productive collaborations with European and Anglo-American scholars working in slightly different traditions. The review committee also noted consistent attention to offering such opportunities for research visits to labs in other countries to junior scholars, PhD candidates, postdoctoral fellows, and not-yet tenured faculty members. In addition, some of the institutes were strategic about attracting and supporting international PhD candidates, some in residence

and others being supported at a distance. These international connections have great potential for broadening the knowledge base of all involved.

Another general strength of the institutes reviewed was their lack of dependence on single sources of funding. Typically, the research activities were supported by national grants, European funding, as well as contract work in some cases. The government schemes of payment to institutes for completed PhDs both provide substantial financial support to some groups and incentivise support to PhD candidates to ensure their timely completion of their dissertations.

In short, the strengths of this collection of institutes were many, most importantly across the entire group of institutes the convergent and complementary research agendas that range from early childhood through professional education and that incorporate attention to many different learning environments and contexts. All the institutes had mechanisms in place for ensuring high-quality research that has the potential to deliver guidance designed to improve practice.

2.2 Areas of concern for the future

The quality of research in institutions of higher education everywhere in the world is threatened by the volatility of the research funding base. The standing and status of social sciences, including pedagogical and educational sciences, forms an additional barrier to securing external funding. These challenges are clearly present for the institutes reviewed in this report and run the risk of undermining their efforts to support junior scholars and to find internal funding that can be invested in ways that raise the likelihood of external funding.

The problem is exacerbated by the decline in numbers of students taking courses and enrolling in bachelor's and master's programmes provided by the institutes reviewed. Since funding to the departments depends to some extent on student numbers, the general shift of student interest to areas other than human development and education is a current and looming threat.

One consequence of the financial insecurity associated with uncertainty around student numbers is the growth in the use of temporary contracts for junior faculty members, and the unwillingness of university administrators to risk extending contracts of even very promising scholars beyond the limit that would require permanent appointments. Promising junior scholars are thus sometimes forced to consider abandoning academia, with the result that the research agendas on which they have been working might be undermined or disrupted.

Another consequence of the financial challenges and lack of trust in the likelihood of an academic future for those with a PhD is the growth in the number of parttime doctoral students and the pressure on them to complete their degrees efficiently. While the review committee noted above that parttime PhD candidates have the advantage of bringing issues from practice more robustly into the academy, at the same time they can bear an excessive burden.

Financial challenges drive researchers into choosing safe questions and familiar research topics – ones for which securing funding is easier. This can result in a reduced focus on the promotion of interdisciplinary research, which is inherently less predictable and may be seen as riskier. Furthermore, the need for institutional financial security can induce administrators to put pressure on staff to increase their workloads, by prioritizing teaching with its direct institutional financial rewards, with negative consequences for engagement in research and for the health and welfare of the faculty members.

In addition to this complex of issues related to financial uncertainties, there is a range of social changes with accompanying opportunities and challenges that we encourage these (and other) institutions of higher education to anticipate and plan for. One is the wide range of ongoing technological developments and their potential impact on the kind of research that is conducted and valued. There is, for example, the potential for expansion of the use of 'big data' in the social sciences; such a shift will require technical and analytic skills that may not be sufficiently focused on in the current research training. At the same time, an understanding of how such shifts in technology and analysis get reflected in higher education and in research policy is crucial; the review committee notes a general decline in integration of history related research within the social science institutes reviewed.

An associated challenge is the lack of a clearly articulated strategy around public engagement. Ultimately, support for research from public money, either within the Netherlands or in Europe more broadly, will depend on public support for and appreciation of the value of the work social scientists engage in. Despite the relatively low esteem of social sciences, including pedagogical and educational sciences, it holds great potential value as a source of input to social policy and the design of learning supports. That value will be best realised if researchers engage in co-design and co-production of knowledge with the affected communities, and if there is open and effective communication about the value of the researcher's input to the enterprise.



Emphasis on the local value of the research being undertaken should not, however, lead to neglect of international and global challenges to which the work of the institutes reviewed here is relevant. Increasingly, local challenges are connected to global events: for example, migration with its consequences for schooling and for social cohesion is related to ethnic/civil conflicts as well as to climate-change-induced food shortages. Local practices to respond to sudden shifts in demographics of a school district are mere band-aids if not related to the larger phenomena that cause such shifts.

Particularly in light of these global phenomena and their influence on the population in Dutch schools, the review committee was disappointed to encounter very little attention in any of the institutes reviewed to issues of diversity. While the staffing reports referred to diversity, this was typically defined predominantly as gender diversity. Indeed, in the fields of human development and education, it is not difficult to achieve a high percentage of female researchers – typically in other countries the challenge is to prevent these fields from becoming exclusively female. In addition to gender diversity, though, the nature of developmental and educational work demands attention to ethnic and language diversity. As asylum seekers and economic refugees continue to migrate to the Netherlands, understanding their situation and accommodating their children in Dutch schools would be easier if members of their ethnic/religious/language groups were represented among researchers and in universities. Given its long history of labour market immigration and its post-colonial relationships, the Netherlands has the benefit of many citizens of Turkish, North African, and Caribbean descent.

While, as noted above, there are procedures in place to ensure that doctoral candidates (and, presumably, employed research staff and faculty members) are made aware of ethical issues related to research (intellectual property rights, plagiarism, authorship rights and responsibilities, human subjects' protections); these issues are becoming ever more complicated and fraught, and international collaborations can introduce additional tensions. Thus, the review committee cautions that the content of research-ethics training courses should be reviewed regularly and expanded and elaborated as needed.

Finally, the institutes would do well in the future to collect systematic data in two areas which were acknowledged as important but for which success was not in all cases quantified: the post-doctorate career trajectories of PhD graduates, and the actual use of the many cited contributions to practice. Tracking graduates' career trajectories is a relatively straightforward task, that simply needs to be institutionalised. Tracking the actual utility of the products of research meant to improve practice (e.g., parent guides, curriculum units, reading interventions) requires more methodological innovation, but if the need for tracking is anticipated, it can be accomplished.

2.3 Guidance for future evaluations

The review committee greatly valued the clear structure of the reports submitted, the open and honest conversations that were part of the review process, and the qualitative as well as quantitative evidence provided. The committee also valued the general document that explained the structure and culture of Academia in the Netherlands. The committee noted, though, that the reports were more accessible for committee members who had participated in this process previously, and who thus had some understanding of the historical trajectories of the institutes reviewed. Important information was extracted during the interviews about the culture of each institute. Though the review committee makes no value judgments, it recognised the relevance to understanding the institute reports of dimensions of institutional culture such as collaboration, researcher autonomy, nurturance, top-down versus bottom-up decision making, and prioritisation of teaching. Those preparing future reports are cautioned that an unbiased international review committee may need considerable orienting background information. This is particularly the case for those institutes that are undergoing major restructuring. Evaluating their status can require more information about their history than may typically be provided.

Assessment of the institutes



5. Institute of Education and Child Studies, Leiden University

5.1 Introduction, strategy and targets

The Institute of Education and Child Studies at Leiden University is one of five institutes of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences. Until 2016 the research in the Institute was divided into three programmes that were conducted under the responsibility of one Scientific Director. In 2016–2017 the Institute underwent an important revision of the organisational structure, with specific focus on institutional cohesion, collegial relations and transparency. Furthermore, the three previously separate research programmes were merged.

The research mission of the Institute as stated in the self-evaluation report is to 1) conduct innovative, high-quality research that provides insight into major issues concerning socialisation, education, and child development; 2) contribute to evidence-based practice, interventions, guidelines and policies; 3) raise public awareness about issues related to increasing child well-being across settings and based on state-of-the-art research. All of these elements are interconnected and mutually informative. The research agenda of the Institute is determined through both top-down and bottom-up processes. The former is set in motion by the Executive Board in strategic decisions in response to salient thematic developments, for example in the national and international research agenda. Bottom-up mechanisms include those where the scholarly expertise of academic staff leads to the identification of valuable substantive research directions that strengthen the research programme. The three main strategies to achieving the mission are research excellence, translational research and public outreach.

The review committee recognises that the timing of this research review presented the Institute in Leiden with particularly difficult challenges. It is clear that the Institute is still in considerable flux due to the widespread changes that have been put in place to deal with the difficult working practices that had become entrenched prior to the assessment period and were still in effect at its beginning. The appointment of a new Research Director was one strategy to ensure change; it was thus unfortunate that she could not attend the meeting due to acute medical reasons.

5.2 Research quality

The Institute has an international very high reputation for research on child development. Productivity and the high quality of research output have been undoubted strengths of the Institute during the assessment period. Its staff have produced journal articles that are highly cited, with particular strength in the field of developmental psychology. There were notable successes in winning external funding, including four NWO grants, an ERC consolidator grant and a FP-7 ICT grant. These aspects of the Institute's research are clearly excellent. However, it would be wise to monitor various areas that are critical to achieving excellence in research quality. Research income appeared somewhat weaker than research output. Taking into account the research FTE, total annual research expenditure showed very little change across the assessment period compared with other institutes, and the average annual research income seems modest by international standards for a research Institute with 43 scientific staff. In shaping the future direction of the Institute, it is important for its leaders to show ambition in setting funding targets in order to help the Institute maintain its research reputation.

The review committee considered the Institute's research mission statement to be substantive, but rather generic, in that it is applicable to almost any group undertaking child development research. The management team could have provided more compelling arguments in the self-evaluation report for what makes the Leiden Institute and its research unique.

The review committee fully supports the reorganisation of the Institute and the management's efforts to inculcate an open, collaborative and supportive working environment. Non-tenured staff members attested to the relative success of these efforts, even in these early stages, in changing the working atmosphere and increasing their sense of agency. It is understandable that the management team does not want to impose new, top-down strategies on staff in this period of restructuring, preferring instead to stimulate bottom-up initiatives.

5.3 Relevance to society

The review committee recognises that Relevance is a fairly new assessment criterion and that strategies for achieving societal impact of academic research are likely to be in development. The Institute clearly produces research that has societal relevance, and the self-evaluation document showcased the collaboration with clinicians via the TRIXY Expertise Center, as well as the development of intervention materials for promoting positive parenting and supporting children's reading. Although more examples were provided, including a number on dissemination to the public, the description of many examples of societal relevance was focused primarily on the underpinning research (e.g., randomised controlled trials), and more information on the ways in which this research has informed professional practice would have enhanced this section of the document. While addressing societal relevance is established in some of the Institute's research areas, mechanisms for capitalising on the potential real-world impact of research need to be fully embedded within all research areas. The Institute would thus benefit from establishing clear procedures for (a) exploiting the impact of its research beyond academia, (b) quantifying societal impact, and (c) considering how its research can be used to influence policy.

5.4 Viability

The Institute has successfully transcended a difficult period, demonstrating its capacity to reorganise itself after the departure of notable and highly productive colleagues. The review committee fully supports the management's goal of focusing less on h-index and appointing new staff on the basis of how well they will fit into the newly developed research areas. This strategy could build the foundation for a much stronger Institute in the long run. The major short-term challenge will be to maintain productivity and research quality while honouring this goal.

There are a few worrying signs. A decrease in student numbers and direct funding is predicted in the self-evaluation report, but this does not appear to be regarded as problematic, despite the fact that the percentage of the Institute's funding that comes from direct sources has risen dramatically over the assessment period (from 38% in 2012 to 68% in 2017), although it was mentioned by the institute that part of this results from spending savings on PhD positions. The view that "research productivity can be maintained through efforts to obtain external funding" (self-evaluation report, page 12) needs to be evaluated in light of the increasingly competitive funding environment. While the mechanisms described for increasing funding (informing staff about funding opportunities, seed money for writing applications) are solid, it is not clear whether they are aggressive enough to increase success in capturing external funding. In order for the Institute's new research culture to be successful, clear procedures will need to be in place to encourage and help every member of staff to apply regularly for research funding. In the absence from the management team of the new (current) Research Director during the interview, the management team were not able to elaborate further on the Institute's future research strategies.

Staff raised concerns about workload and the low percentage of time allocated to research. These issues were not mentioned in the self-evaluation report, but will clearly need to be addressed in an equitable fashion to support and nurture early career researchers. The research methods and statistics area appears important for the Institute's future research success, and opportunities to collaborate with methodologists were mentioned by researchers as a strength of the restructured Institute. However, members of the methodology group voiced concerns about their ability to support all requests for involvement in collaborative projects. As a major short-term priority, the Institute should ensure that proper resources are provided for this research area.

The review committee recognises that the new management board members have been in post for a very short period of time and that planning is thus at an early stage; nonetheless, a board consisting of only two people is a vulnerability, and somewhat at odds with the Institute's goal of fostering greater staff involvement and collaboration.

Despite these many challenges, some real strengths are present that led the evaluation committee to considerable optimism about the ultimate viability of the Institute. These strengths include: the presence in the Institute of senior and highly productive researchers, who have demonstrated their capacity to be productive in research, to compete successfully for funding, and to collaborate with research leaders from abroad; the commitment of ongoing support and opportunities for new appointments from the Dean; the palpable sense among the staff that a new culture of collaboration and mutual support has been initiated. These three factors suggest that the Institute, with careful management, could emerge from its difficult period with significant strengths, and that at the review its viability will be assured. However, it is critically important that the management team has a viable strategy which it can communicate successfully to the Institute's researchers. To this end, more attention needs to be given to the actual processes and procedures that the Institute can put in place in order to achieve its goals. According to the committee the Institute is working hard on moving forward and important steps are taken.

5.5 PhD training

PhD candidates appear to be well supervised, and the numbers of PhD candidates supervised by individual members of staff are appropriate. However, completion rates for fulltime PhD candidates within 5 years are low (47% across the assessment period), and the Institute should seek to improve this rate over the next 6 years.

PhD candidates feel that they have a voice and consider themselves important members of the Institute. The review committee approves of the new strategy for giving all PhD candidates similar budgets and opportunities for research visits and conference attendance. The PhD candidates would value more information and guidance on career planning and recommended that career planning should be formally incorporated into the yearly evaluation interviews and discussions with supervisors.

The PhD candidates reported that they did not yet feel part of a single community and would welcome more integration with PhD candidates across the research areas. The group of PhD candidates who attended the meeting with the review committee lacked diversity in degree structure (parttime, external, etc.), gender, or ethnicity, and the majority were Leiden master's graduates.

5.6 Research integrity policy

The Institute has clear integrity policies that are distributed to all new scientific staff members, including the VSNU code of conduct, amendments by Leiden University in its Regulations on Academic Integrity and the APA ethics code. Research integrity is an explicit part of PhD training, both in course format and in regular supervision, group discussions and thematic meetings. This training includes data management and storage.

5.7 Diversity

The Institute recognises that there is a lack of gender and ethnic diversity in both its students and staff. The Institute's national campaign targeting adolescents and parents from more diverse cultural backgrounds is a very positive step toward increasing student diversity in the coming years. The review committee recommends making similarly strategic decisions to attract a more diverse pool of applicants for Faculty posts.

5.8 Overview of the quantitative assessment of the Institute

For the Institute of Education and Child Studies the review committee comes to the following assessments according to SEP:

Research quality:	excellent
Relevance to society:	very good
Viability:	good

10. National Research School: Interuniversity Centre for Educational Sciences (ICO)

10.1 Introduction

The Interuniversity Centre for Educational Sciences (ICO) unites all research in the domain of educational sciences in the Netherlands and a substantial and increasing part of the research domain in Belgium. ICO educates the educational researchers of tomorrow by bringing PhD candidates in contact with other junior researchers and senior researchers from universities and research institutes in the Netherlands, Belgium and abroad. ICO offers coursework, provides networking opportunities, and safeguards the quality of supervision.

The general mission of ICO is to organise postgraduate training in a strong research-based environment. PhD candidates learn to advance scientific theories for understanding process and systems of learning and instruction. ICO has three main objectives: first, promoting the quality of postgraduate education for PhD candidates doing scientific research in the educational sciences; secondly, organising courses, lectures, seminars, symposia, colloquia, and joint publications, and thirdly, stimulating internationalisation and international collaboration within the research area.

10.2 Quality of ICO and of guidance, supervision, and training of PhD candidates

The ICO is a multi-institutional undertaking designed to support doctoral studies in the area of learning and pedagogy in The Netherlands and Belgium, by providing courses, summer schools, research guidance, and opportunities for students to network with each other and with scholars from abroad. Thus, ICO supports not only the students who participate in its programmes, but also the universities from which those students come, by supplementing the university-based courses and research training.

The quality of the ICO offerings is maintained by virtue of the rigorous criteria that have to be met if institutions and individual PhD candidates are to be accepted as members. Because ICO can call upon faculty from all the various members, the range of research issues addressed is much broader and more diverse than an individual graduate programme could provide. This must be considered a strength; although the depth of work in any particular area is likely to be less than in individual organisations, students can usefully combine their ICO experiences with additional courses and activities in their home institutions.

The general principle of involving PhD candidates in a broader research/training consortium is an outstanding feature of the Dutch Educational Science institutions, which could usefully serve as a model for universities in other settings where such arrangements do not exist. The broad support for the programme, and thus the involvement of important researchers, is high. The workshops offered at ICO conferences provide both excellent learning opportunities and unique networking opportunities. The academic reputation of the leaders is high, and the international visibility is good. Doctoral candidate participants in the ICO were universally enthusiastic and positive about its value – not just the doctoral candidates brought to the review committee by ICO itself, but also those from other institutions being reviewed. They noted that the ICO activities offer a safe space for them to try out ideas on how to function as junior researchers, and that ICO support for finishing the thesis work is very helpful. Furthermore, they noted that ICO offers help in thinking about careers, including opportunities outside academia.

One area in which the quality of the ICO programme could perhaps be strengthened is the selection – and continuous participation – of international partners. The partners seem to have been selected rather incidentally, rather than strategically chosen to complement the strengths of the core members or to respond to the emergent needs of students.

Another area of weakness shared by ICO and all the other institutions reviewed was lack of attention to, or at least of success at, ensuring the PhD candidates served and the faculty involved represent the full diversity of the larger society, in particular of the schoolchildren who will be affected by the research being carried out. Diversity is an issue of quality because research that ignores a significant proportion of the students being educated in Dutch and Belgian schools fails to acknowledge the full range of developmental trajectories or learning and teaching challenges.

It would be unproductive to compare the quality of the ICO to the other institutes reviewed, since its mission, organisation, and criteria for success are so unique, and because its quality to some extent reflects theirs. The key dimension of

evidence for ICO's quality is that it fulfils a crucial role within doctoral education in the Dutch-speaking world. In other words, if the ICO didn't exist it would have to be invented. So then the agenda becomes one of considering how it might be better rather than whether it is good enough.

Given its unique function, it is appropriate to evaluate the ICO in particular on the quality of its guidance, supervision, and training of doctoral candidates. The committee received ample evidence that ICO was contributing in substantive and responsible ways to the guidance, supervision, and training of PhD candidates who had the opportunity to participate in its programmes. This evidence came, not just from the PhD candidates interviewed as part of the ICO presentation to the committee, but also from PhD candidates who were interviewed about their experiences as part of the evaluations of the six university departments of pedagogical and educational sciences.

The full range of PhD candidates interviewed noted a number of features that contributed to their very positive evaluation of the ICO programme, including:

- the complementarity of the ICO programme with the resources available from their home universities
- the opportunities for networking across disciplinary and institutional boundaries offered by the ICO programmes
- the responsiveness of the ICO education programming to needs and desires expressed by the PhD candidates

In short, it seems clear that the ICO makes a strong contribution to the professionalization of developmental and educational scholars in The Netherlands, by providing resources that would stretch the budget and capabilities of any of the individual universities.

10.3 Relevance to society

Maximizing relevance in doctoral training requires paying explicit attention to mechanisms by which educational/developmental research can be connected to practice. In other words, the training itself should incorporate attention to a range of models of research practice relationships. While the ICO could provide more explicit focus on this topic in its training, nonetheless the presence in its ranks of increasing numbers of PhD candidates drawn directly from practice offers rich opportunities to integrate problems of practice with doctoral training. In addition, the ICO offers support to PhD candidates interested in writing for a practice-based audience.

Bringing together PhD candidates from a wide range of universities does contribute to the awareness among the young researchers of issues of societal relevance, as they observe and participate in many activities which are clearly beyond their own dissertation work. In addition, they and the course leaders acquire new understanding and encounter new topics that can then be introduced to their home institutions.

The relevance of the ICO activities to the PhD candidate participants is optimised by a process of open, democratic exchange with the educational committee. Candidates reported that their requests for specific courses were acknowledged and taken seriously, though they could not always be responded to, and that their interest in a variety of possible career trajectories is welcomed and supported within the ICO trainings. Thus, ICO contributes to the development of junior researchers who have the opportunity to learn about societal impact and who are aware of different strategies of valorisation.

10.4 Viability

The viability of the ICO derives in part from the crucial role it plays in doctoral training in the Netherlands and Flanders. In addition, the current leadership has recruited a robust array of participating institutions, thus ensuring a broad base of support within the academy and has developed an evidently practical and effective leadership mechanism and succession plan. The institution, despite its size, geographic and disciplinary distribution, and administrative unwieldiness, is well organised and well directed. The PhD candidate participants reinforced the importance of ICO to their scholarly development, while at the same time expressing a desire for more differentiation between introductory and advanced courses, and more use of blended and on-line learning options.

The strengths of ICO are simultaneously its potential threats: ICO is a robust network of many strong partners and thus quite viable by nature, because losing one or two institutions would not seriously affect ICO's existence and its qualities. On the other side, ICO's viability depends on the willingness of the participating higher education institutions to continue their participation and to urge their students to participate. These institutions, however, are increasingly involved in a competition which is ruled by economic, management, and policy forces rather than by research issues. This could affect future willingness to contribute to ICO, and it is already visible in the quite limited resources available to the

ICO. Nonetheless, ICO has achieved a size that its directors consider appropriate, and opportunities for further growth are available. From an international point of view, the value-added of such a network to the breadth and depth of research training, and its cost-effectiveness for the participating institutions are both substantial strengths that should be maintained and extended.

Because the ICO does not have the institutional stability of a traditional university department, it is valuable to comment on its administrative rigor. The administrative rigor of the ICO relies in part on the willingness of the participating universities to contribute fiscal and human resources to its functioning. The committee saw no hesitation among the various university representatives that were interviewed to continuing the current level of support and participation, recognizing as they do both the value-added of the ICO to their own training programmes and the extra burden each of them would have to bear if the ICO resources were not available.

Furthermore, as noted in the report, the ICO is functioning effectively as an independent organizational unit, located at Maastricht but with its own budget and administrative structure. Maastricht University and the administrative leadership of ICO are to be commended for being willing to invest in the guidance and maintenance of the ICO structure.



Appendix 1: SEP scores

Category	Meaning	Research quality	Relevance to society	Viability
1	World leading/excellent	The research unit has been shown to be one of the few most influential research groups in the world in its particular field	The research unit makes an outstanding contribution to society	The research unit is excellently equipped for the future
2	Very good	The research unit conducts very good, internationally recognised research	The research unit makes a very good contribution to society	The research unit is very well equipped for the future
3	Good	The research unit conducts good research	The research unit makes a good contribution to society	The research unit makes responsible strategic decisions and is therefore well equipped for the future
4	Unsatisfactory	The research unit does not achieve satisfactory results in its field	The research unit does not make a satisfactory contribution to society	The research unit is not adequately equipped for the future

Appendix 2: Programme of the site visit

Sunday 13 January – preparatory meeting	
17.00	Preparatory meeting of the review committee in the hotel
19.30	Dinner
MONDAY 14 JANUARY – ICO NATIONAL RESEARCH SCHOOL	
8.30	Preparatory meeting
9:00	Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Prof. dr. Diana Dolmans, Scientific Director of ICO, Maastricht University – Prof. dr. Liesbeth Kester, Educational Director of ICO, Utrecht University – Prof. dr. Pauline Meijer, Chair of the ICO Board, Radboud University Nijmegen – Prof. dr. Douwe Beijaard: member of ICOs Scientific committee and Examinations committee, member of the ICO Board, Eindhoven University of Technology – Rob Kickert MSc, ICO PhD member, Chair of the Educational Committee, Erasmus University Rotterdam – Drs. Caroline Vonk, Executive Secretary of ICO, Maastricht University, Utrecht University
9:45	PhD candidates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Eva Janssen MSc, Utrecht University – Marieke Veltman MA: Part time PhD candidate, Windesheim University of Applied Sciences/University of Amsterdam – Loes de Jong MSc, Leiden University – Anne de Brujin MSc, University of Groningen – Daury Jansen MSc, University of Amsterdam
10:30	Reflections and preparatory next meetings
MONDAY 14 JANUARY – MAASTRICHT UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF HEALTH PROFESSIONS EDUCATION	
11:00	Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Prof. dr. Jeroen van Merriënboer, Professor of Learning and Instruction Research Director SHE – Prof. dr. Diana Dolmans Professor of Innovative Learning Arrangements, Representative of staff – Dr. Anique de Bruin PhD coordinator – Jolien Pieters, MSc representative of PhD candidates – Prof. dr. Cees van der Vleuten Professor of Education Scientific Director of the Graduate School of Health Professions Education.
11:45	Staff <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Prof. dr. Pim Teunissen, Professor of Work-based Learning in Health Care – Dr. Pascal van Gerven, Associate Professor, Coordinator PhD Research Proposal Writing Course – Dr. Karen Könings, Associate professor, member Ethical Committee. – Dr. Janneke Frambach, Assistant professor, support Qualitative Research – Dr. Renée Stalmeijer, Assistant professor, support Qualitative Research – Dr. Maryam Asoodar, Assistant professor, instructional design and e-learning
12:30	Lunch
13:00	PhD candidates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Lorette Stammen, MSc – Serge Mordang, MSc – Stephanie Meeuwissen, MSc – Carolin Sehlbach, MSc – Alexandra Kölm, MSc, International PhD candidate (via Skype) – Joey Nicholson, MSc, International PhD candidate (via Skype) – Adam Szulewski, MSc, International PhD candidate (via Skype) – Ikuo Shimizu, MSc International PhD candidate (via Skype)
13:30	Reflections + preparing questions management
14:00	Management
14:30	Reflections + preparing next meetings
MONDAY 14 JANUARY – UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM: RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT & EDUCATION	
15:00	Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Prof. dr. Agneta Fischer, Dean Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences (Prof. Social Psychology on Emotions and Affective Processes) – Prof. dr. Frans Oort, Director of the Research Institute of Child Development and Education (Professor of Methods and Statistics) – Dr. Patty Leijten, Director of the PhD Programme of Child Development and Education (Assistant Professor in Research Programme of Child Development)

15:45	Staff
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Prof. dr. Carla van Boxtel (RPEDU), Professor of Domain Specific Learning, Teaching and learning of history – Dr. Elise de Bree (RPEDU), Assistant professor of Developmental Disorders and Special Education, Psycholinguistics and dyslexia – Dr. Lisa Gaikhorst (RPEDU), Assistant professor of Educational Sciences, Professional development of urban teachers – Prof. dr. Henny Bos (RPCD) Professor of Preventive Youth Care, Sexual and gender diversity in families and youth – Prof. dr. Geertjan Overbeek (RPCD) Professor of Preventive Youth Care, Parenting interventions – Prof. dr. Geert-Jan Stams (RPCD) Professor of Forensic Child and Youth Care, Forensic pedagogy
16:30	Break
16:45	PhD candidates
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ceren Abacioglu, MSc (RPEDU), PhD candidate of Educational Sciences – Hanne Duindam, MSc (RPCD), PhD candidate of Forensic Child and Youth Care – Sevinc Göksen-Zayim, MSc (RPEDU), PhD candidate of Domain Specific Learning – Daury Jansen, MSc (RPEDU) PhD candidate of Educational Sciences – Brechtje de Mooij, MSc (RPCD) PhD candidate Preventive Youth Care
17:15	Reflections + preparing questions management
17:45	Management
18:15	Reflection institutes day 1
TUESDAY 15 JANUARY – LEIDEN UNIVERSITY: INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION AND CHILD STUDIES	
8.30	Preparatory meeting
9.00	Management
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Prof. dr. Paul Wouters, Dean of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences – Prof. dr. Judi Mesman Scientific Director of Education and Child Studies from January 2013–June 2016 Professor of the interdisciplinary study of societal challenges – Prof. dr. Lenneke Alink, Scientific Director Professor of Forensic Family Studies – Dr. Marielle Linting, Director of Studies Associate Professor of Research Methods and Statistics
9.45	Staff
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Prof. dr. Paul van den Broek, Professor of Cognitive and Neuro-biological Foundations of Learning and Teaching, Educational Sciences – Prof. dr. Hanna Swaab Professor of Clinical Neurodevelopmental Sciences – Dr. Marga Sikkema-de Jong, Associate Professor of Learning and Behaviour Problems in Education – Dr. Ralph Rippe, Assistant Professor of Research Methods and Statistics – Dr. Shelley van der Veen, Assistant Professor of Parenting, Child Care and Development
10.30	Break
10.45	PhD candidates
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Nienke Bouw, MSc, PhD candidate Clinical Neurodevelopmental Sciences – Renate Buisman, MSc, PhD candidate Forensic Family and Youth Care Studies – Merel van Vliet, MSc, PhD candidate Parenting, Child Care and Development – Amy de Bruïne, MSc, PhD candidate Educational Sciences – Elise Swart, MSc, PhD candidate Learning and Behaviour Problems in Education
11.15	Reflections + preparing questions management
11.45	Management
12.15	Reflection and lunch
TUESDAY 15 JANUARY – UNIVERSITY OF GRONINGEN: NIEUWENHUIS INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH	
13.30	Management
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Prof. dr. Kees Aarts, Dean – Prof. dr. Hans Grietens, Director of Research Institute
14.15	Staff
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Prof. dr. Klaas van Veen, Pedagogy and Effectiveness of Teacher Learning (Chair) – Prof. dr. Roel Bosker, Educational Effectiveness (Chair) – Prof. dr. Alexander Minnaert, Special Needs Education, Youth Care and Youth Studies – Prof. dr. Greetje Timmerman, Special Needs Education, Youth Care and Youth Studies – Dr. Nelleke Bakker (associate professor), Education in Culture
15.00	Break
15.15	PhD candidates
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Renske de Leeuw, MSc, Special Needs Education, Youth Care and Youth Studies – Mariëlle Osinga, MSc, Special Needs Education, Youth Care and Youth Studies – Pieter van Rees, MSc, Education in Culture – Marij Veldman, MSc, Educational Effectiveness – Irene Poort, MSc, Pedagogy and Effectiveness of Teacher Learning

15.45	Reflections + preparing questions management
16.15	Management
16.45	Reflection institutes day 2
<hr/> WEDNESDAY 16 JANUARY – UTRECHT UNIVERSITY: DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION & PEDAGOGY <hr/>	
8.30	Preparatory meeting
9.00	Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Prof. dr. Marcel van Aken, Professor of Developmental Psychology, Dean of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences – Prof. dr. Marian Jongmans, Professor of Special Education, Vice-Dean (graduate education) of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences – Prof. dr. Jan van Tartwijk, Professor of Applied Educational Sciences, Chair of the Department of Education & Pedagogy
9.45	Staff <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Prof. dr. Susan Branje, Professor of Adolescent Development and Socialization, Head of the section Youth & Family, Dept. Education & Pedagogy – Prof. dr. Maja Dekovic, Professor of Clinical Child and Family Studies, Head of section Clinical Child & Family Studies, Dept. Education & Pedagogy – Prof. dr. Catrin Finkenauer, Professor of Youth Studies, Head of section Interdisciplinary Social Sciences: Cultural Diversity & Youth, Dept. Social Sciences – Prof. dr. Paul Leseman, Professor of Special Education, Head of section Special Education: Cognitive and Motor Disabilities, Dept. Education & Pedagogy – Prof. dr. Tamara van Gog, Professor of Educational Sciences, Head of research, section Education, Dept. Education & Pedagogy
10.30	Break
10.45	PhD candidates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Monika Donker, MSc, Member of the PhD Council of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences PhD candidate section Education – Lydia Laninga-Wijnen, MSc, PhD candidate section Interdisciplinary Social Sciences: Cultural Diversity & Youth – Stefanos Mastrotheodoros, PhD, PhD candidate section Youth & Family – Marije Stolte, MSc, PhD candidate section Special Education: Cognitive & Motor Disabilities – Rianne van Dijk, MSc, PhD candidate section Clinical Child & Family Studies – Mare van Hooijdonk, MSc, PhD candidate section Education
11.15	Reflections + preparing questions management
11.45	Management
12.15	Reflection and lunch
<hr/> WEDNESDAY 16 JANUARY – UTRECHT UNIVERSITY FREUDENTHAL INSTITUTE <hr/>	
13.30	Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Prof. dr. Isabel Arends, dean – Prof. dr. Sjef Smeekens, Vice-dean research, – Prof. dr. Guther Cornelissen, previous head department Mathematics – Prof. dr. Toine Pieters, Head Freudenthal Instituut – Prof. dr. Wouter van Joolingen, scientific director
14.15	Staff <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Prof. dr. Paul Drijvers, professor of Mathematics Education – Prof. dr. Bert Theunissen, professor of History and Philosophy of Science – Dr. Arthur Bakker, associate professor Mathematics Education – Dr. Christine Knippels, assistant professor of didactics of biology – Dr. Hieke Huistra, assistant professor of history of science and medicine – Dr. Ralph Meulenbroeks, assistant professor of didactics of physics
15.00	Break
15.15	PhD candidates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Rosa Alberto, MSc – Melde Gilissen, MSc – Sietske Tacoma, MSc – Berrie van der Molen, MA – Anne van Veen, MA – Luhuan Huang, MSc
15.45	Reflections + preparing questions management
16.15	Management
16.45	Reflection institutes day 3

THURSDAY 17 JANUARY – OPEN UNIVERSITY: WELTEN INSTITUTE

8.30	Preparatory meeting
9.00	Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Prof. dr. Saskia Brand-Gruwel, Dean – Prof. dr. Marcus Specht, Chair research group TELI – Prof. dr. Renate de Groot, Chair research group FEEEL – Prof. dr. Rob Martens, Chair research group T2 – Prof. dr. Marjan Vermeulen, Educational Director – Dr. Jeroen Winkels, Academic Affairs OU
9.45 –	Staff <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Prof. dr. Hendrik Drachsler, HL (TELI) – Dr. Jose Janssen, associate professor (TELI) – Dr. Kim Dirkx, assistant professor (FEEEL) – Dr. Jerome Gijselaers, assistant professor (FEEEL) – Dr. Karel Kreijns, associate professor (T2) – Dr. Gino Camps, associate professor (T2)
10.30	Break
10.45	PhD candidates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Kevin Akkermans, PhD-student (TELI) – Alessandra Antonaci, PhD-student (TELI) – Sharisse van Driel, PhD-student (FEEEL) – Laurie Delnoij, PhD-student (T2) – Zyxban Wolfs, External PhD student
11.15	Reflections + preparing questions management
11.45	Management
12.15	Reflection and lunch
13.00	Overall reflection
15:00	Presentation of first conclusions

Appendix 3C: Quantitative data – Institute of Education and Child Studies, Leiden University

Table 1 Publications Leiden University

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Average	Total
Articles (refereed)	85	81	100	108	110	107	99	591
Articles (non-refereed)	10	15	11	7	0	3	8	46
Books	0	1	3	1	5	3	2	13
Book chapters	16	25	16	19	19	14	18	109
Subtotal	111	122	130	135	134	127	126.5	759
PhD theses								
Internal	8	9	10	12	6	11	9	56
Total	119	131	140	147	140	138	136	815

Table 2 Funding Leiden University

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Average
	fte	fte	fte	fte	fte	fte	%
Direct funding	16.09	21.78	25.58	28.46	36.22	30.32	26.4
Research grants							
National	13.53	13.37	14.48	18.7	10.15	8.22	13.1
European	6.99	7.42	5.02	2.19	2.54	3.38	4.6
Contract research	5.52	5.67	8.33	7.36	3.84	2.83	5.6
Other							
Total research funding	42.13	48.24	53.41	56.71	52.75	44.75	49.7
Expenditure in k€							
Personnel	2280	2709	2955	3174	3071	2732	2820.2
Other costs	777	1054	865	449	385	892	737.0
Total expenditure	3057	3763	3820	3623	3456	3624	3557.2

Table 3 Staff Leiden University

	2012		2013		2014		2015		2016		2017		Average	
	n	fte	n	fte										
Scientific staff	37	9.4	41	10.8	47	12.0	45	11.9	44	10.7	43	10.4	43	10.9
Postdocs	8	3.8	8	3.7	7	3.4	12	6.0	13	7.5	10	6.7	10	5.2
PhD candidates	23	19.7	31	26.4	31	27.0	30	26.4	29	25.2	26	23.3	28	24.7
Parttime PhD candidates	22	9.5	25	9.1	28	10.8	30	11.4	24	10.7	18	6.6	25	9.7
Total research staff	90	42.4	105	49.9	113	53.2	117	55.6	110	54.0	97	47.0	105	50.4

Table 4 PhD duration and success rate, fulltime, Leiden University

Enrolment			Graduated in 4 yrs		Graduated in 5 yrs		Graduated in 6 yrs		Graduated in >= 7 yrs		Not yet finished		Discontinued		
Fulltime	M	F	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
2009	0	9	9	2	22%	5	56%	7	78%	7	78%	0	0%	2	22%
2010	0	9	9	2	22%	3	33%	6	67%	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%
2011	0	8	8	2	25%	3	38%	5	63%	8	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2012	1	12	13	5	38%	7	54%	9	69%	(9)		4	31%	0	0%
2013	0	8	8	1	13%	4	50%	(4)		(4)		3	38%	1	13%
2014	0	11	11	0	0%							10	91%	1	9%
Total	1	57	58	12	21%	22	47%	31	69%	36	88%	18	31%	4	7%

Table 5 PhD duration and success rate, parttime, Leiden University

Enrolment			Graduated in 4 yrs		Graduated in 5 yrs		Graduated in 6 yrs		Graduated in >= 7 yrs		Not yet finished		Discontinued		
Parttime	M	F	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
2009	0	1	1	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
2010	0	0	0	0											
2011	0	0	0	0											
2012	0	0	0	0											
2013	0	1	1	0	0%	0	0%					1	100%	0	0%
2014	0	2	2	0	0%	1	50%	(1)		(1)		1	50%	0	0%
Total	0	4	4	0	0%	2	50%	2	100%	2	100%	2	50%	0	0%