

## Table of Contents

1	The Institute .....	3
2	Reflection .....	4
2.1	Vision, Mission, and Objectives .....	4
2.2	Thematic Groups.....	5
2.3	Academic Reputation, Relevance, and Vitality/Feasibility.....	6
2.4	Educational Program.....	7
2.5	Strategy .....	8
3	Assessment and Recommendations.....	10
3.1	Evaluation of Quality (including basis for scores).....	10
3.2	Evaluation of Productivity (including basis for scores) .....	10
3.3	Evaluation of Relevance (including basis for scores) .....	10
3.4	Evaluation of Vitality/Feasibility (including basis for scores).....	11
3.5	Assessment .....	11
3.6	Recommendations .....	11
	Annex 1 .....	13
	Annex 2 .....	13



# ICO – Interuniversity Centre for Educational Research

Evaluation Report  
International Peer Review  
Site Visit, November 15-16, 2010, Utrecht, the Netherlands

28/03/2011

*ICO is a research school with accreditation from the Royal Academy of Sciences. An international peer review is a requirement for re-accreditation. A committee was invited to conduct the international peer review according to the criteria of the Standard Evaluation Protocol (SEP). The committee members were professors Jan van Damme (University of Leuven, Belgium, Chair), Walter Doyle (University of Arizona, United States), Jan-Eric Gustafsson (University of Gothenburg, Sweden), and Detlev Leutner (University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany). The Committee received a self evaluation report from ICO and after studying this report, the Committee met for two days with several groups of ICO people (For the agenda of the site visit, see annex 1). Based on these discussions and an analysis of the documents that were made available, the Committee wrote this Evaluation Report (For the list of documents, see annex 2). In its evaluation the Committee used the criteria of the SEP: Quality, productivity, relevance, and viability.*

## **1 The Institute**

ICO, short for 'Interuniversitair Centrum voor Onderwijskundig onderzoek' [Interuniversity Centre for Educational Research], is an interuniversity research school for PhD students and (post doctoral) researchers in the domain of the Educational Sciences. At the start of the evaluated period in 2006, the research school was a cooperation of members of departments and research centres of the following nine universities: Eindhoven University of Technology, Leiden University, Maastricht University, Open University of the Netherlands, University of Amsterdam, University of Twente, Utrecht University, VU University Amsterdam, and Wageningen University. In 2010, Ghent University, the Erasmus University Rotterdam, the University of Antwerp, and the University of Groningen joined the ICO Network, which is a partnership program of ICO, as part of ICO's expanded efforts to cooperate with national and international partners.

ICO was established in 1988 and resulted from a partnership between the universities of Twente and Groningen that aimed to offer advanced courses to PhD students. In 1991 and 1992, Maastricht University and the University of Nijmegen, respectively, became members of ICO. Further initiatives in the beginning of 1993 by the ICO directorship encouraged participation of the University of Amsterdam, Utrecht University, Tilburg University and the Open University of the Netherlands. In 1994, ICO was formally accredited as a 'research school' by the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW). In 1996, Leiden University joined ICO and Wageningen University joined in 1999, making up 10 partners, covering almost the complete field of academic educational research in the Netherlands. At

that time, a new five-year period for ICO commenced following the accreditation for a second period by the KNAW. In subsequent years, the research group on educational psychology at Tilburg University was reduced and eventually terminated. Tilburg University withdrew from ICO in 2002. At the same time, the Eindhoven University of Technology decided to become a participant in ICO. From January 2004, the VU University Amsterdam has also become a participant. Due to internal university policies encouraging the development of local graduate schools, the universities of Nijmegen and Groningen decided to formally leave ICO in 2004 and 2006, respectively. In 2006, the ICO accreditation proposal for 2006-2011 was honoured by the KNAW. This third accreditation period will end December 2011.

## **2 Reflection**

### **2.1 Vision, Mission, and Objectives**

#### *Vision*

ICO educates the educational researchers of tomorrow. It does so in a powerful, research-based learning environment without borders, bringing its PhD candidates in contact with other junior researchers and senior researchers from universities and research institutes in the Netherlands and abroad. ICO offers coursework, provides networking opportunities, and safeguards the quality of supervision. Researchers educated by ICO achieve high professional standards and, thus, are responsible researchers, able to conduct the best research with a positive impact on educational practice.

#### *Mission*

The general mission of ICO is to organize postgraduate training in a strong research-based learning environment. PhD candidates learn to advance scientific theories for understanding processes and systems of learning and instruction. These theories concern (a) learning processes and characteristics of the learning environment, including the teacher, that influence the efficiency and effectiveness of the learning process; (b) the organization of the curriculum and the school in relation to learning and instructional processes; (c) the role of educational policies in influencing the functioning of schools; and (d) theories of examination and assessment. The kind of research conducted within ICO is largely based on empirical studies and concerns educational science itself (e.g., instructional design theories and curriculum studies) or builds upon theories from other disciplines, more specifically psychology (e.g., cognitive and social psychology), sociology, and economics.

#### *Objectives*

In the period 2006-2011, ICO had three main objectives: (a) Promoting the quality of postgraduate training for PhD candidates doing scientific research in the Educational Sciences; (b) promoting collaboration between universities that conduct scientific research in the Educational Sciences, and (c) promoting the quality of scientific research in the Educational Sciences, through improving post-graduate training and facilitating collaboration between universities.

### *Reflection on Vision, Mission and Objectives*

The evaluation committee considers the vision and mission of ICO as important and relevant. The existence of cooperation between educational researchers from most of the Dutch universities in the service of the above objectives, is rather unique and challenging, but we consider this cooperation as very appropriate and beneficial. Cooperation at an interuniversity level allows all institutions to better reach their objectives and especially to organise better postgraduate training for PhD candidates – both quantitatively and qualitatively – than would be possible within each of the institutes separately.

## **2.2 Thematic Groups**

The different elements in the ICO mission lead to the organization of six 'thematic groups'. These thematic groups can be regarded as Special Interest Groups. The thematic groups are responsible for the organization of ICO's thematic courses and also contribute to the ICO bi-annual schools. Moreover, in a thematic group researchers may discuss research results and research plans and prepare joint grant proposals and joint article submissions. Both researchers and PhD students participate in these groups. Two experienced researchers and one PhD student coordinate each group. For the 2006-2011 accreditation period, the ICO research programme is centred around six thematic groups. These groups were established around themes that reflect actual and promising developments in education and training. Furthermore, the themes reflect major topics in Dutch educational research.

Thematic Group I (Innovative Learning Arrangements) and Thematic Group II (Teaching and Teacher Education) focus on the micro-level of the educational process by studying the learner, the teacher, and the learning environment. The micro-level is also the focus of Thematic Group III (Domain Specific Instruction), but from the perspective of various content domains. Thematic Group IV (Educational Design and Curriculum Development) concentrates on the process of designing instructional arrangements, both at a learning environment and curriculum level. Thematic Group V (Schools and the Societal Context of Education) studies the macro-level of the educational process by focusing organizational aspects (schools, government, society). Finally, Thematic Group VI (Assessment, Evaluation, and Examination) specializes in questions around measurement of educational outcomes. Though each of the thematic groups has its specific research questions, theories and methodological approaches, ICO encourages collaboration between the thematic groups. Collaboration between thematic groups is also encouraged by the related development in ICO's research that shows progress towards more ecological valid situations (school and training situations) that involve large sets of variables and interdisciplinary perspectives.

### *Reflection on Thematic Groups*

The topics of the thematic groups are in evolution, as can be expected, and there are some cases in which overlap seems to be present. Some groups are more active than others. However, both phenomena are difficult to avoid. The extent to which ICO is responsible for the intensification of cooperation within and between different thematic groups is, of course, difficult to evaluate.

## **2.3 Academic Reputation, Relevance, and Vitality/Feasibility**

### *Academic Reputation*

ICO members publish their research in high-quality peer reviewed scholarly journals. In the past four years ICO staff members published 846 articles in (S)SCI and ICO journals. Fifteen percent of this set of articles was published in the Top 10 % journals relevant to the field. Further signs of academic reputation include awards (n = 32), invitations to address (major) conferences (n = 99), conference organisation activities (n = 73), editorships (n = 181), and memberships of academies (n = 9).

### *Relevance*

ICO strongly encourages the societal relevance of research conducted by its staff members, postdocs, and PhD candidates. Yet, ICO has a special position in this respect. ICO does not take direct responsibility for the societal relevance of the research conducted by the participating universities, but it aims to contribute to the societal relevance of this research indirectly through its educational program and activities aimed at information provision and collaboration: (a) informing relevant stakeholders in society about ICO's activities and promoting collaboration with these stakeholders; and (b) offering a course program and organizing educational activities that pay attention to the societal relevance of research, and (c) preparing PhD candidates not only for academic research positions but also for positions in educational policy and practice. Direct valorisation of results is not seen as a task of ICO. This is not to say that many of the results of research conducted in ICO are not readily applicable in education and training. They include design guidelines and principles, practical how-to models, and concrete instructional materials, tests, and courses originally developed for research purposes but also applicable for regular educational activities. Moreover, the question of how to valorise such results in education is studied in ICO's thematic groups.

### *Vitality/Feasibility*

ICO is a flexible network organization, making use of the facilities of its partner institutes. Its financial model is very light. The scientific director and general secretary are paid by a secretary contribution and, after subtraction of revenues from paying course participants, the remaining costs (including payment of educational director and educational secretary) are distributed among the participating universities. There has always been an interest to participate in ICO because ICO membership is generally seen as a proof of quality. This can be seen in the growth figures for both PhD candidates and staff members. The number of staff members steadily increased, despite the fact that the admittance requirements have become more and more strict (with, nowadays, a strong focus on international peer-reviewed publications). Thus, not only the quantity but also the quality of ICO staff increases. The number of PhD candidates also steadily increased, and is expected to increase further in the future because more and more teachers have an interest in doing in PhD. In order to further strengthen its national and international position, since 2009 bilateral agreements have been reached with new partners in Belgium/Flanders (Ghent University and the University of Antwerp) and the Netherlands (Erasmus University Rotterdam and the formerly affiliated partner Groningen University) to cooperate in the postgraduate training of PhD candidates. ICO aims to further develop this network in the future with international partners.

### *Reflection on Academic Reputation, Relevance, and Vitality/Feasibility*

The academic reputation of the staff members of ICO is documented in the reviews of the research programs of the different institutes. It is considered to be very high. The relevance and also the vitality and feasibility of ICO itself is also considered to be very high and is clearly shown by the increasing number of institutes which are members of ICO and the increasing numbers of staff members, post-docs and PhD students.

It was not clear to the committee, however, why ICO expects in the future more teachers as PhD students, since at this moment most of them are part-time students and in fact excluded from membership.

## **2.4 Educational Program**

### *Content*

The ICO educational program provides a conceptual basis and an organizing framework for supporting PhD students to achieve a high-standard level of their professional development as researchers in education and training. To this end, ICO establishes formal educational structures and informal networks of experienced researchers and PhD students to build a knowledge society and thematic communities of practice. The ICO educational program reflects the expertise in the school. A distinction is made between two classes of research competences: (1) thematically or domain-oriented, and (2) methodological. Thematically oriented coursework is provided by at least two master classes related to the ICO research themes. Methodological coursework is provided by at least one master class related to qualitative analysis, research methods (e.g., design research), advanced statistical analysis, or philosophy of science. The master classes are complemented by an introductory course, an "ICO Toogdag" (research retreat), and an international bi-annual School. Together, these require each student to present his or her PhD project three times: the first time during the Introductory course, the second time during the Toogdag, and the third time during the Bi-annual school. To offer high quality education for the PhD students enrolled in ICO, the bi-annual School cooperates nationally and internationally with other graduate schools with a similar purpose and profile. International students and prominent researchers participate in ICO activities as well. The PhD candidates and staff members are stimulated to take part in international conferences, workshops and other events, and ICO staff members act as visiting lecturers in PhD programs abroad.

### *Structure*

The program includes both compulsory and elective activities. Compulsory activities are the introduction course (200 hours); two thematic master classes (100 hours each); one methodological master class (100 hours); and one bi-annual School (100 hours). The thematic master classes are initiated by the thematic groups in a two-year scheme, taking into account the need of the students. Besides the thematic master classes at least one methodological master class is provided for each year. Once every two years an international bi-annual School is organized in cooperation with one or more partners abroad. From 2009 onwards, the introductory course is organized twice a year. Because of the high amount of new PhD students due to new (affiliated) universities there were too many applicants for the course. All educational activities of ICO are carefully evaluated, and the evaluation results are discussed in the Educational Committee and the Management Team.

### *Supervision and Monitoring*

Two important educational planning and monitoring instruments for PhD students are the Education and Supervision Plan and the ICO Monitor. In the Education and Supervision Plan a PhD student specifies course selection and supervision activities. A PhD project monitoring system has been adopted to increase student efficiency and success rates. The information provided by this system is evaluated by the ICO Scientific Committee.

### *Reflection on Educational Program*

The committee is convinced that the educational program provides highly effective support of the doctoral projects of the PhD students. We even had the impression that in some cases there was perhaps too much support, that is in the cases where PhD students had to present their project a fourth time (in a master class).

In some cases students had the experience that a needed master class was not organized at the right moment. This element has to be taken into consideration when considering the size of the thematic groups (see further).

For the committee it was a bit surprising to hear that several universities have organised a two-year research master for only a few students. We advise ICO to explore possibilities for more cooperation between these research masters and its own educational program.

The committee was impressed by the various ICO initiatives to supervise and monitor the work of PhD students and to permanently evaluate the educational program.

## **2.5 Strategy**

In the future, ICO will further increase the focus on its main goal, that is, promoting the quality of training for PhD candidates doing scientific research in the Educational Sciences. Its focus on promoting the quality of research as such is de-prioritized, because this function is increasingly taken over by local graduate schools. In this context, ICO will aim to involve new groups of PhD candidates in its educational program, such as teachers who work on their dissertation as well as international PhDs.

### *ICO's Educational Program*

With regard to the content of the program, a modification of—perhaps some of the—thematic groups is scheduled for the new re-accreditation period (from 2012 on). There are four reasons for this. First, the group Innovative Learning Arrangements has been growing very fast and developed subthemes that focus on authentic learning environments, multimedia learning, and computer-supported collaborative learning. Second, the group Assessment, Evaluation & Examination is paying more and more attention to authentic forms of assessment and peer- and self-assessment. Third, the size of the groups Educational Design & Curriculum Development and Schools & the Societal Context of Education decreased. And fourth, the educational neurosciences are rapidly becoming an important research approach in the Educational Sciences. Taken together, ICO thinks that these developments call for a reconsideration of the thematic groups. Ideally, all future thematic groups should:

- have enough staff and PhD members to be active;
- make it possible to connect to developments of current interest, such as calls for proposals of the Program Council for Education Research;

- have their counterparts in divisions of the Netherlands Educational Research Association (VOR) so that it is relatively easy to organize joint activities, and
- have the expertise to prepare and give specialized ICO courses that are complimentary to courses provided by local graduate schools and are thus of clear interest for PhD candidates in the Educational Sciences.

### *Future Organization*

With regard to the future organization, in 2011 all ICO partners who are prepared to do so will apply to the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences for re-accreditation for the six-year period 2012-2017. In addition, the cooperation with international partners in the ICO Network will be continued and further extended. Since the beginning of 2010, Ghent University, University of Antwerp, Erasmus University Rotterdam, and the former affiliated partner University of Groningen closely collaborate with ICO in this Network to offer a joint PhD program. Some of the current Network partners might decide to join ICO in the proposal for re-accreditation. But anyway, the ICO Network will be continued with the explicit aim to extend ICO with international partners. Furthermore, the aim is to move the ICO secretary from the Open University of the Netherlands to another ICO partner in the new accreditation period (2012 onwards). In this new situation, ICO no longer expects a secretary contribution from a host institution but will distribute all costs among the Network partners, in proportion to the number of PhD candidates they bring into ICO. To further increase efficiency, ICO is studying the possibility of combining the general secretariat and the educational secretariat into one secretariat, which will then be hosted by the new secretary university.

### *Cooperation and Network Building*

Finally, with regard to cooperation and network building, ICO will continue its negotiations with local graduate schools in order to ensure that the ICO course program has clear added value to the programs offered by local schools. Furthermore, the cooperation with the Netherlands Educational Research Association (VOR), the programme council for educational research (PROO), and the programme for policy-oriented research in primary education (BOPO) will be continued. ICO sees the cooperation between ICO thematic groups and VOR divisions as particularly important: They can strengthen each other because they both play an important role in the professionalization and enculturation of junior researchers. For example, this could mean that ICO PhD candidates collect in the future also credits by participating in professional activities organized by VOR divisions, whether or not in cooperation with ICO thematic groups. Finally, ICO aims to strengthen its European and international dimension, for example, by making agreements with new international ICO Network partners. It is becoming more and more important that PhD training takes place in a European and international setting. In our opinion, high-quality training of PhD candidates in a small discipline like the Educational Sciences cannot be properly organized on a local level; therefore, ICO will keep on promoting the quality of PhD training in the Educational Sciences on a national and international level.

### *Reflection on Strategy*

In general the committee has the impression that ICO has found a good balance between its own activities and those of the local graduate schools.

As for the plans to reorganise the thematic groups we consider first the idea that each network has a counterpart in a division of the Netherlands Educational Research Association (VOR). Although that would clearly have advantages, in some cases new problems can arise, e.g. in the case where an already small thematic group would be split into two. In case a thematic group is becoming rather big, a split in two groups can be considered. Another possibility is to allow some thematic groups to organise more master classes and activities in the bi-annual Schools and even in the regular program.

Organising a master class for only a small group of PhD students is probably less effective. We advise ICO especially in these cases to consider ad hoc cooperation with one or two international research centres to organise jointly a master class.

### **3 Assessment and Recommendations**

#### **3.1 Evaluation of Quality (including basis for scores)**

The committee was impressed by the good balance between the directors who have a clear vision on what they wish to reach and the participation of all involved groups in the preparation of the decision making and in the decision making itself. Although our first impression was that there were many different kind of structures, during the site visit it became clear to us that all parts of the whole structure were important building stones for the effective and efficient network organisation of ICO.

The high academic reputation of the staff members is demonstrated in two recent research reviews. The necessary resources are readily paid by the member institutes, and that can even be expected in the future as well (when the costs will be higher, as no secretary contribution will be paid by the host institution).

As a result of these different components—the master classes, the other activities within the thematic groups, and the evaluation of all the activities—the PhD training given by ICO to an important subgroup of the PhD students in Education in the Netherlands seems to have reached a high level of quality.

#### **3.2 Evaluation of Productivity (including basis for scores)**

As ICO is not a research centre or institute but mainly an interuniversity organisation to train doctoral students, we focus on the strategy to support their research work and to monitor it. We have the impression that ICO does everything necessary to reach these goals.

Although the productivity strategy seems to be excellent, the percentage of PhD's which have been finished within a period of four years still seems not to be optimal. Our impression is that also factors which are beyond the control of ICO are responsible for this phenomenon. Probably ICO could consider a more systematic monitoring of the integration of new candidates in a well functioning local research centre.

#### **3.3 Evaluation of Relevance (including basis for scores)**

The relevance of the PhD training which ICO is organising cannot be overestimated. Especially important is that the introduction of young researchers into the research community, made possible by peer cooperation and by contacts between novices and experts from different universities, is clearly successful in the experience of the people involved.

### **3.4 Evaluation of Vitality/Feasibility (including basis for scores)**

After a period in which one could have doubts about the feasibility of the interuniversity program of ICO, because of the decision of several universities to start local graduate schools, it seems now appropriate to be very optimistic about the future of ICO. The experiences with local graduate schools have made clear that a specific training as a researcher in education is beyond their scope. Thus an interuniversity approach is asked for. We were deeply impressed by the support for ICO offered by staff members, post-docs and PhD students we have met during the site visit. Also the growing number of members shows how robust and stable ICO is.

After reading the previous peer review on the period 1999-2003, we had the impression that several earlier comments were not taken into consideration by the management team or the Board of ICO. Initially, the fact that these elements were not treated in the self-evaluation report 2006-2009 was experienced by us as a negative point. During the site visit, however, it became very clear that there were good reasons not to implement some suggestions (e.g. a cooperation with ISED, the other interuniversity 'Graduate school') from the earlier review committee.

### **3.5 Assessment**

The possible scores are:

1 = unsatisfactory

2 = satisfactory

3 = good

4 = very good

5 = excellent

The evaluation of ICO by the Committee is as follows:

Quality: 4

Productivity: 4

Relevance: 4

Viability/feasibility: 4,5

### **3.6 Recommendations**

ICO is essentially a set of courses, an admission process for faculty and students, a set of standards for research productivity, and a collaborative effort to stimulate a variety of cooperative ventures. As such, it has proven itself to be an effective culture-building enterprise for the educational sciences in the Netherlands. Two of the most important issues facing ICO at this point in its history are related to: (a) the restructuring of the thematic groups and (b) the expansion of the ICO network to include international partners.

With regard to the first issue—restructuring the thematic groups—the committee agrees that this effort is timely and important. The current structure of thematic groups appears to no longer fit well to the community of educational researchers emerging in the Netherlands. Some groups are expanding, others are declining, and new specializations and directions are coming into view. Given that the thematic groups represent an important formal and informal anchor for culture building within ICO, the committee applauds this effort. At the same time, we caution that this is a crucial process for sustaining the ICO idea. In effect, restructuring the thematic groups is tantamount to defining the peer groups in educational

research in the country. We encourage the ICO leadership, therefore, to seek input from a broad spectrum of the education community and deliberate carefully about this issue.

With regard to the expansion of ICO to include international partners, it is clear that this issue is complex. At one level, the ICO “brand” has proven itself and stands for quality throughout the Netherlands. It is reasonable that other institutions within and outside the Netherlands will want to be a part of this movement. In addition, the informal networking and socialization that ICO provides will benefit from a wider matrix of participants. At the same time, this expansion effort has to be combined with the search for a new balance between the tasks of local graduate schools and those of an interuniversity cooperation (in line with the demand for complementarity between different programs in education, mentioned in the Nationaal Plan Toekomst Onderwijswetenschappen of the Committee de Graaf). The committee suspects that the expansion process represents a long-term redefinition of ICO’s role in graduate preparation in the educational sciences in the Netherlands. We encourage the ICO leadership, therefore, to view this process as a substantive rather than a technical process and exercise creativity in configuring ICO’s role in the future.

In addition to these broad issues, the review committee isolated four areas for comment. The first area has to do with the advanced planning and scheduling of courses. The ICO leadership is aware that advanced notice of course availability is not always adequate. It would seem that mapping course availability across a two year cycle would be important for student and faculty planning and solidify the relevance of ICO to graduate research preparation. Second, it would appear that completion rates for students remain low, especially in some thematic areas. Although this factor is not always within ICO’s control, attention should be given to how these rates can be improved. Third, the committee encourages ICO to consider whether a cooperation with the research masters already existing in several universities is possible. Finally, the committee had questions about the advisability of thinking about teachers as potential participants in ICO PhD programs. Although this is certainly an important population and a potential source of enrolment increases, it is not clear that these students can easily meet conventional ICO expectations in relation to the time available for preparing a PhD. Perhaps, ICO has to consider the possibility of two different ‘regimes’ to prepare a PhD.

In conclusion, the Committee has been impressed by the quality of the ICO work and its flexibility in reacting to changing circumstances.

## Annex 1

### Overview of the Site-Visit

Time	Meeting	#ICO members
09:30 – 10:15h	Closed Meeting Peer Review Committee	-
10:15 – 11:00h	Kick-Off Meeting ; Peer Review Committee, ICO Board, and ICO Directors	5
11:15 – 12:00h	Discussion with ICO Board, ICO Directors and ICO Management Team	12
13:30 – 14:15h	ICO Research Themes; presentation / discussion research theme coordinators	10
14:30 – 15:15h	ICO Staff Members; presentation/discussion with staff members	9
15:30 – 16:00h	ICO Education; general presentation educational program	2
16:00 – 16:30h	ICO Education; presentation of a prototypical ICO course	3
16:30 – 17:00h	ICO Education; guidance, supervision, and student counselling	2
Time	Meeting	Participants
09:30 – 10:00h	ICO Educational Committee; presentation/discussion	6-9
10:00 – 10:45h	ICO PhD Projects; presentation of two ongoing PhD projects	4-9
10:45 – 11:30h	ICO Postdoc Members; presentation of two concluded PhD projects and beyond	4-9
11:30 – 12:00h	Meeting with ICO Directors; final questions and remaining issues	2
13:30 – 15:30h	Reflection on findings / Preparing draft report	-
15.30 – 16.00h	Presentation of main findings by the Review Committee	Unknown

## Annex 2

- Overview of consulted documentation
- ICO Self Evaluation Report 2006-2009, ICO
- ICO Annual Reports 2006-2009, ICO
- Scientific Output ICO Members 2006-2009: Overview of references to articles published in (S)SCI journals and ICO journals, ICO
- Results ICO Monitor, ICO
- Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015, KNAW, VSNU en NWO
- Advice Re-accreditation ICO, June 2004, KNAW/ECOS
- Advice Re-accreditation ICO, June 2006, KNAW/ECOS
- Research Assessment Pedagogics and Education Science 2007, QANU.
- Research Review Teacher Training Institutes 2010, QANU.
- Midterm Review 2010, Eindhoven School of Education.
- Report of the Midterm Peer Review of the Research Program Research in Education 2008, School of Health Professions Education, Maastricht University
- Assessment Report on Mansholt Graduate School of Social Sciences and Social Sciences Chair Groups: International peer review 2009, Wageningen Universiteit.
- Sample ICO Dissertations, ICO
- Sample Education and Supervision Plans of PhD Students, ICO

