



JOURNAL OF THE

EUROPEAN HONORS COUNCIL

Note

Towards a New Honors Manifesto: Re-evaluating values, attitudes, and themes in Dutch honors education

Authors: Ron Weerheijm, Marike Lammers, Tineke Kingma, Julianne de Leeuwe, Annelies Riteco, Jaap Sanders, Isabel Sole Subirats, Lineke Stobbe, Elke Wagenaar, and Raymond ter Woord.

This document was created through collaboration within the various Dutch networks for honours education, initiated by the Honors Network UAS (Universities of Applied Sciences).

Correspondence: info@honorscouncil.eu

Received: December 5, 2025; Accepted: January 30, 2026; Published: February 3, 2026

1. Introduction

Honors education in the Netherlands is continuously evolving. While core ideas and values remain in place - for example around the importance of student-centered learning, societal engagement and coaching didactics -, specific implementations, discourses, and approaches change over time. It seems helpful for that reason to occasionally re-evaluate the shared principles around honors. It helps to position honors thematically, pedagogically, and strategically within an ever-changing Dutch higher education sector. It also helps to strengthen bonds and collaborations between honors programs across institutions and educational settings. Finally, it helps to create a shared understanding between educators, students, and management about the “how” and “why” of honors education, nationally but perhaps also internationally. This article aims to contribute to the continued development of honors education, both in the Netherlands and potentially at the European level. We aim to demonstrate how current developments in both society and education, regarding how talent development empowers students to reach their full potential, influence the strengthening of honors education, and how this translates into the core principles of that education.

An effective way to summarize a changing set of common principles and values is through the writing of a manifesto. In the Netherlands, a first honors manifesto was written at the end of the stimulating program for honors in the Netherlands, the ‘*Sirius Program*’, in 2014 (Janssen et al, 2014). The manifesto consisted out of seven “indicators” that were considered to contribute strongly to the identities of honors programs across the Netherlands at that moment. Since, these indicators have served as a reference point for staff and students across the Dutch educational sector. Now, ten years later, the time seems right to review and recalibrate that manifesto. Shifts in educational discourses, strategic priorities of institutions, and changes in demands from both teachers and students (OECD, 2018), have highlighted the need to critically re-evaluate and further develop the manifesto.

In the Netherlands particularly, there seems to be a growing urgency across institutions to strategically re-confirm and re-foreground the importance of honors. In an era in which the educational sector (nationally and internationally) is facing funding cuts and political uncertainties, an updated manifesto can play a key role in further embedding and strengthening the position of honors within higher education institutions, highlighting why honors is an important facet of a healthy higher education environment and highlighting its ongoing contribution to innovative student-centered approaches to learning within the sector as a whole.

This article describes the main characteristics of the 2014 manifesto and explains how this manifesto was updated and rephrased to form its current iteration. The decision-making process behind the updated manifesto is described just as some of the key similarities and differences between the old and new manifesto. Finally, the article looks ahead to the future and describes how the manifesto can be used (and if necessary updated again) in the years to come.

2. Looking back at the 2014 Manifesto

The first honors manifesto was produced at the end of the Sirius Program, which ran between 2008 and 2014. The goal of the Sirius Program's was to promote excellence programs across the higher education sector in the Netherlands. Sirius aimed to promote an ambitious study culture, develop dedicated support for highly talented students, and increase the overall quality of Dutch education. Through the Sirius Program, the Dutch government invested in total close to 50 million euros in the development of various excellence programs (OCW, 2008). The 2014 manifesto that was presented contained seven indicators or guidelines that were meant to position 'excellence education'. These indicators helped to shape what we now know as honors-programs across the sector in the Netherlands. Each indicator (listed in table 1) was contextualized, first by a short paragraph, and then by a full-page manifesto text.

Table 1. Key indicators from the 2014 manifesto

Seven key indicators from the 2014 manifesto

1. Learning is a personal journey
(Leren is een persoonlijke reis)
2. Dare to take a stand in society
(Sta op in de samenleving)
3. Talent development starts with the teacher/ educator
(Talentontwikkeling begint bij de docent)
4. Protect excellence programs as key places ('testing grounds') for innovative experimentation
(Behoud excellentieprogramma's als proeftuinen voor innovatie)
5. Talent development in primary education turns into student excellence in higher education
(Talent in het primair onderwijs groeit uit tot excellentie in het hoger onderwijs)
6. Collaborate with employers to provide challenging learning environments
(Bied samen met werkgevers uitdagende leeromgevingen)
7. Alumni are the capital of education
(Alumni zijn het kapitaal van het onderwijs)

Looking back now, one of the key aspects that immediately stand out when looking at the specific phrasings of the 2014 manifesto is the prevalence of the term 'excellence' (see figure 1, Manifesto 2014), both in the title of the manifest, as well as in the specific phrasings of the seven indicators. This is not a coincidence. Excellence was a key topic of the Sirius Program. In the last decade or so, however, many institutions in the Netherlands seem to have increasingly moved away from excellence-based discourses and programs. An important factor for implementing the Sirius Program and stimulate with that program the development from students, was what was called the "culture of sixes": students are satisfied when scoring a six (on a 1-10 scale) for tests and with that 'earn' their credits. From this culture, striving for more than a 6 was not a focus. The Sirius Program tried and (for the most) succeeded in that culture change (2015). While the term "excellence" is perhaps still common within vocational programs in the Netherlands (MBO), many higher education institutions seem to have steered away from the term, replacing it with alternative terminologies such as "talent", "talent development" and "ambition" instead. This shift in discourse has often gone hand in hand with aspirations to open up honors programs to wider groups of students and to communicate it as an increasingly inclusive and accessible educational route.

Although the term "talent" is mentioned in the 2014 document as well, it is mainly used in reference to various groups (pupils, teachers) *other* than honors students. For example, the manifesto states that "talent development starts with the teacher". In another section of the document the term "talent" is related to pupils in primary education. Talent development on primary education level is seen here as forming the basis for student excellence in higher education institutions. Here too, "excellence" seems the preferred formulation for students in higher education, while the discourse of "talent development" is directed elsewhere. In both examples, talent development is presented as a prerequisite for excellence, but it is not necessarily presented as a goal in and of itself. The importance of development of 'human potential' starting at a young age "[...] to maximize young people's opportunities for self-fulfillment and increase society's reservoir of creative problem solvers and producers of knowledge [...]" was illustrated earlier by (Renzulli, 2012).

Another aspect that stands out in the 2014 manifesto is the positioning of the teacher in relation to the student. In the first manifesto, the teacher is positioned as someone who carries the responsibility to provide the best conditions and contexts for excellence to arise in students. Educators are seen as the "starting point" of honors education. As such, they carry a huge responsibility. Little is said, however, about the dynamic interactions between teachers and students that may take place, or the opportunities for co-production and co-learning *between* teachers and students (Kingma et al., 2024) (Weerheijm & Voncken, 2024). In that sense, the learning community that is described in the first manifesto mostly speaks of communities of students (and, separately, communities of teachers), rather than a community in which multiple internal and external stakeholders learn with, and from, each other.

Apart from these points, many of the values and characteristics mentioned in the document seem true today as much as they did in 2014. The manifesto stresses the importance of student-directed learning, societal engagement, and creating challenging learning environments (in collaboration with employers). The manifesto speaks of giving student agency and autonomy, and of harnessing the strength, knowledge, and experience of alumni (Eshuis et al, 2024). The role of honors as a place of experimentation and innovation is highlighted as well (the so-called “*proeftuinfunctie*” in Dutch, “testing ground function”), as is the potential of honors programs to strengthen the link between different educational institutions, from more vocational to more research-intensive programs (Wolfensberger et al., 2004; van Eijl et al., 2024).

In that sense, much of what was described in the 2014 manifesto (figure 1) still applies today. Updating the manifesto therefore required not so much a complete overhaul, but more a strategic rephrasing and repositioning of the initial guidelines, in order to have it match more explicitly to today's educational contexts and discourses.

MANIFEST voor het excellentieonderwijs van de toekomst | 3

Manifest Oktober 2014

LEREN

is een
persoonlijke reis

Moedig studenten aan hun persoonlijke 'drive' te vinden en help hen om hun passie te ontdekken en er richting aan te geven. Geef hierbij ruimte aan nieuwsgierigheid en ambitie, maar ook aan het toeval waardoor nieuwe en onverwachte inzichten kunnen ontstaan. Bied studenten een community waarin zij met elkaar kunnen samenwerken en waarin zij elkaar kunnen inspireren.

Sta op in de SAMENLEVING

Geef studenten de kans om te leren en tegelijk van toegevoegde waarde te zijn voor de samenleving. Leer hen maatschappelijke uitdagingen te zien, te onderzoeken en aan oplossingen te werken. Zo dragen excellentieprogramma's bij aan de vorming van verantwoordelijke burgers die zich betrokken voelen bij de maatschappij en er een bijdrage aan leveren.

Talentontwikkeling begint bij *de docent*

Stel docenten in staat talent te ontdekken en tot bloei te laten komen en geef de docent de professionele ruimte die hier voor nodig is. Het open en innovatieve karakter van excellentieprogramma's vraagt om didactiek van excellentie waarbij studenten gestimuleerd worden hun passie te vinden. Dit stelt hoge eisen aan docenten. Durf te kiezen voor een didactiek die een brede ontplooiing voorstaat. Talentontwikkeling bij docenten zelf is onderdeel van de ontwikkeling van excellentie.

Behoud excellentieprogramma's als *proeftuinen* voor *innovatie*

Gebruik excellentieprogramma's om te experimenteren met nieuwe vormen van onderwijs. Koester deze ruimte en waarborg dat studenten en docenten deze vrije ruimte blijven houden. Vermijd dichtgetimmerde onderwijsprogramma's. Zorg voor een goede verbinding met de reguliere onderwijsprogramma's, zodat het gehele onderwijs van de experimenten en de innovatie profiteert.

Talent in het *po* groeit uit tot *excellent* in het *ho*

Behoud en ontwikkel de leer-netwerken tussen instellingen in het hoger onderwijs die binnen het Sirius Programma zijn ontstaan. Organiseer de samenwerking binnen de onderwijsketen (po, vo, mbo, hbo, wo), zodat er betere aansluitingen kunnen worden gemaakt tussen onderwijssectoren met betrekking tot excellentie en daarmee een inspirerende onderwijscultuur ontstaat.

Bied samen met *werkgevers* uitdagende leeromgevingen

Maak het mogelijk dat studenten leren in realistische contexten. Betrek daartoe het werkveld intensief bij excellentieprogramma's en organiseer dat studenten in het werkveld meekijken, meedoen en meewerken aan oplossingen van vraagstukken die impact hebben voor werkgevers en topsectoren.

Alumni zijn *kapitaal* van het **ONDERWIJS**

Zorg ervoor dat afgestudeerden van excellentieprogramma's zich verbonden blijven voelen met hun opleiding. Zij kunnen uit ervaring terugkoppelen wat de meerwaarde van excellentie is geweest voor hun ontwikkeling als professional en zijn rolmodel voor nieuwe studenten. Honours-alumni zijn de ambassadeurs van excellentie.

Figure 1. Manifesto 2014.

3. Something New, Something Borrowed: reformulating the Manifesto

The initiative to re-examine and update the first manifesto was first taken by colleagues from the Dutch Honours Network Universities of Applied Sciences (AUS) (*Landelijk Netwerk Honours HBO*), in June 2024. Raymond ter Woord (Saxion University of Applied Sciences) and Maarten Michielse (Hanze University of Applied Sciences) created a draft manifesto with help of input from colleagues from a variety of other institutions that are part of the Dutch HBO Honours Network. This first draft was then presented at the International Honours Conference “15 Years of Honours” in Enschede, the Netherlands, in 2024. At the conference, feedback was gathered from the audience and an extensive discussion was held on the precise formulation of different aspects of the renewed manifesto. Throughout this process, colleagues from the excellence programs in vocational institutions (Netwerk MBOe) and those of research-intensive universities (WCN Network) provided feedback and suggestions as well, including honors students from different programs throughout the Netherlands.

Between 2024 and the end of 2025 the draft text went through a number of iterations, based on suggestions and feedback from colleagues across the sector. A last and final change in formulation happened right after the summer of 2025, when the HBO honors network worked on some final adjustments to the precise formulation. One of the things that was adjusted in that final round of edits was the tone of the document. While the text is supposed to read as a manifesto, not all of the previous formulations were deemed to really fit the tone of a manifesto. The propositions laid out in the document were not always phrased strong and firm enough, it was felt. By adjusting the formulation here and there slightly, and by adding an introductory text stating the purpose of the updated manifesto, the character of the document became more enthusing and impactful, it was believed.

The borrowed and the new lie in the developments that have taken place in the intervening period of both manifestos, both in society and within education (OECD, 2018). Throughout the process of adding, editing, discussing, and again revising, some of the key values of the 2014 manifesto remained steady in place. Aspects such as student agency, autonomy, community, societal engagement, and room for experimentation were never really up for revision. There were, however, strong voices to rephrase other sections that focus heavily on excellence as a theme. Instead, the terms ‘talent’ and ‘talent development’ were embraced as a helpful alternative. Where ‘excellence’ seems to have a focus on a final ‘product’, the term ‘talent development’ focusses more on a continuing process of development. The reciprocity and equality between students and teachers (as well as between them and other actors) were seen as aspects that could be highlighted further. In that perspective, the new manifesto was taken as an opportunity to think more broadly about ‘community’ and who that might entail, as well as providing more explicit space for teachers co-learning with students.

One of the key challenges during the updating of the manifesto was to find descriptions that both represent unity in honors education across the sector, but at the same time provide enough room for differences between programs. The topic of intracurricular versus extracurricular honors education came up occasionally, for example. Phrasings that presented honours explicitly as extracurricular were abandoned on request. After all, different varieties of honors education have developed over the past decade-and-a-half, some of which are fully extracurricular, some of which are fully intracurricular, and many of which are a hybrid form between those two. The manifesto and its formulations needed to keep providing space for such differences.

The term 'passion' (in the sense of following your own "passions and ambitions"), was also reformulated after early drafts of the new manifesto. The term 'passion' did not sit well with every colleague as it seemed to connote an almost religious context. These discussions brought up the following question as well: "How much intrinsic ambition do we actually expect from our students?" After all, honors is not an end stage for students, but a trajectory, an opportunity to find, explore and further develop their ambitions ('t Mannetje, 2023). As such, the idea that prospective honors students should have their ambitions and motivations (let alone passions) already fully clear and present when they sign up for their honors trajectory, seemed counter to the actual developmental goals of honors (den Hertog, 2016).

Discussions were also held around the precise formulation of the role of honors in relation to regular educational programs. While most colleagues seemed to agree that honors has much to offer as a place of experiment and testing ground for new and innovative ideas in education, the idea that honors thus has an obligation to disseminate that knowledge was not fully embraced by everyone. While some argued that it is an almost moral obligation to share and disseminate successes in order for regular programs to benefit, others stressed how the value of honors lies first and foremost in the experience students and teachers get within the program itself. That is, the first responsibility of honors education lies with honors. Moreover, not everything that works within honors can easily be translated to regular educational programs (van Eijl et al., 2022). This is not to say, however, that honors has nothing to contribute to regular education. On the contrary, for some topics (such as student wellbeing, bounded freedom, coaching styles) honors has and still is contributing strongly. In short: honors *can* contribute ideas, approaches and successes to regular education, even if it is not its first *raison d'être* and cannot be reduced to that function alone.

4. Seven newly formulated key indicators

The seven key indicators that have been formulated in the updated 2026 manifesto, as a result of the processes described above, are listed in table 2.

Table 2. Indicators from the 2026 manifesto

New indicators from the 2026 manifesto	
1.	<i>Allow students to truly take the lead and allow them to further develop their autonomy together.</i> [Laat studenten echt de regie nemen, laat ze die autonomie samen verder ontwikkelen]
2.	<i>Help students to find out what gets them enthusiastic and engaged, no matter in what area of expertise.</i> [Help studenten hun bevlogenheid te ontdekken en te ontwikkelen, op welk gebied dan ook]
3.	<i>Regard everyone as a learner, including the teacher and professional.</i> [Durf iedereen als lerende te zien, óók de docent en professional.]
4.	<i>Embrace the experiment, the unknown (or the not yet known). Not everything needs to always work out immediately.</i> [Omarm het experiment, berust in het (nog) niet weten. Niet alles hoeft altijd (meteen) te lukken.]
5.	<i>Coach others as equals. Be ready to question or flip pre-existing roles, in order to gain surprising new insights.</i> [Coach op basis van gelijkwaardigheid. Durf bestaande rollen te bevragen, om te draaien, om zo samen tot verrassende nieuwe inzichten te komen.]
6.	<i>Focus on personal ánd professional learning within communities. Let students and educators feel truly safe, seen, and heard.</i> [Zet in op persoonlijk én professioneel leren in gemeenschappelijkheid. Laat studenten en docenten zich geborgen, gezien en gehoord voelen.]
7.	<i>Keep education open and dynamic by creating space for students and teachers.</i> [Zet het onderwijs niet vast, maar creëer ruimte voor studenten en docenten.]

These seven indicators can be seen as each individually important for education, therefore in the following paragraph we support these indicators with literature that shows its meaning for education. In this way, the indicators from the manifesto are given a firm foundation in current literature. What's remarkable is that all seven indicators are often simultaneously recognizable in honors education. This makes honors education unique and, as mentioned before, the "testing ground" it is for lecturers and often also for students.

1. Allow students to truly take the lead and allow them to further develop their autonomy together.

Autonomy is, together with competence and community, an important factor in education to give students the opportunity to develop themselves. See for more background: Reeve & Jang (2006) Kingma et al. (2018) Weerheijm & Voncken (2024) Kingma (2025).

2. Help students to find out what gets them enthusiastic and engaged, no matter in what area of expertise.

Engagement is a fundamental important issue in education. If students don't know 'why they are doing this', there's little point in introducing topics they don't feel connected to. Finding that connection is an important task of education. For more background see: Bovill et al. (2011) on how students can be involved as co-creators of education; Jang et al. (2010) on how support and structure can keep students involved.

3. Regard everyone as a learner, including the teacher and professional.

Wicked problems are often named as 'challenging' for students and seen as an important factor to get students involved (Scager, 2013). When a problem can be named 'wicked' (Rijsdijk, 2020), the knowledge how to solve is often also absent with the teachers. So, a different approach as teacher is needed, see Fahraeus (2013) or Weerheijm & Voncken (2024).

4. Embrace the experiment, the unknown (or the not yet known). Not everything needs to always work out immediately.

Organizing 'experiment' or the 'unknown' can be done in different ways. Kapur (2008) finds this in 'productive failure' and how to deal with that in education, or Carvajal (2006) in a module as City as Text which can be implemented in education in different ways, organizing different kinds of 'labs' in which complex issues are met are felt as 'experimental learning' by students (Miltenburg & Weerheijm, 2019).

5. Coach others as equals. Be ready to question or flip pre-existing roles, in order to gain surprising new insights.

Coaching is one of the core activities in education, effective coaching is even more important. Felten et al. (2023) describe well how close-by coaching, organized or casual, can be made effective in education.

6. Focus on personal and professional learning within communities. Let students and educators feel truly safe, seen, and heard.

In evaluations, students often give back that honors education has a much broader impact on them and helps them to develop professionally and personally as described by Holterman-Nijenhuis et al. (2022) (Lappia et al., 2014).

7. Keep education open and dynamic by creating space for students and teachers.

A fixed curriculum seems to offer little room to incorporate current developments or events. Responding to complex issues often requires a specific educational approach (Fortuin et al., 2020) (Rijsdijk, 2020). Incorporating what students experience within the curriculum can also be productive (Fahraeus, 2013).

5. Conclusion: An Ever-Evolving Manifesto

While the key indicators mentioned above together form the official outcome of the updates and revisions of the honors manifesto, they are not an end product. On the contrary, one of the outcomes of the development process around the updated manifesto is the acknowledgement that a manifesto such as this is always necessarily a living document. What is seen as crucial and important now, might perhaps seem less central to the honors programs of the future, or might need further rephrasing and/ or elaboration. As such, the Dutch Honors Network plans to re-examine and, if necessary, update the manifesto again every three to four years.

In the meantime, the current iteration of the manifesto (the 'Honors Manifesto 2026') will be presented to different governance bodies of the Dutch educational sector, such as *de MBO Raad, de Vereniging Hogescholen en de Universiteiten van Nederland*, as well as the Dutch secretary for Education. We hope that the manifesto can function as a good starting point to renew the dialogue on, and interest in, honors across the Dutch education sector.

We believe our insights can ultimately benefit the European level as well. In the development process of the 2026 Manifesto, we learned that our key factors don't differ per university, or between research or vocational universities, but that they clearly apply to "the student" and are therefore more broadly applicable. We also aim to deepen, research and showcase aspects of the different indicators that are highlighted in the renewed manifesto, in order to keep illustrating the value honors has within the educational system as a whole. Finally, we hope that the updated manifesto will (just as the previous iteration did) make possible further dialogue and collaboration between different educational institutions inside and outside of the Netherlands around common themes and goals.

References

't Mannetje. (2023). *Let them flourish: enhancing higher education students' well-being*.

<https://doi.org/10.33612/diss.569997153>

Bovill, Cook-Sather, & Felten. (2011). Students as co-creators of teaching approaches, course design, and curricula: implications for academic developers. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 16(2), 133–145.

Carvajal. (2006). City as Text applied to an Honors Study Abroad Program: Exploring Madrid. *New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*, 20(3), 34–42.

<http://education.fiu.edu/newhorizons>

den Hertog. (2016). *X-factor for innovation: identifying future excellent professionals*. ISBN 978-90-365-4253-1

Fahraeus. (2013). Learner-Centered Teaching: Five Key Changes to Practice. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 13(4), 126–131.

Felten, Lambert, Artze-Vega, & Miranda Tapia. (2023). *Connections Are Everything: A College Student's Guide to Relationship-Rich Education*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Fortuin, Uiterweer, Gulikers, Oonk, & Tho. (2020). Training students to cross boundaries between disciplines, cultures, and between university and society: Developing a boundary crossing learning trajectory. *SEFI 48th Annual Conference Engaging Engineering Education, Proceedings*, 752–760.

Holterman-Nijenhuis, Annedien Scheper-Pullen, Eshuis, Visscher-Voerman, & Lammers. (2022). Studentwaardering honoursonderwijs over vijf jaren. Een inspiratie voor het reguliere onderwijs. *Tijdschrift Voor Hoger Onderwijs*, 39(3/4), 45–59.

Jang, Reeve, & Deci. (2010). Engaging students in learning activities: It is not autonomy support or structure but autonomy support and structure. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(3), 588.

Kapur. (2008). Productive failure. *Cognition and Instruction*, 26(3), 379–424.

Kingma. (2025). *Teaching behavior in the context of honors education in higher education*. <https://DOI.org/10.33612/diss.1163557401>

Kingma, Heijne-Penninga, & Wolfensberger. (2018). “Offering freedom” as a teaching strategy for honors students. *Journal of the European Honors Council*, 2(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.31378/jehc.7>

Kingma, Smits, Jaarsma, & Voogt. (2024). What need-supportive and need-thwarting teaching behaviors do university teachers use in their honors classes? An observational study. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 6, 100331.

Lappia, Weerheijm, Pilot, & van Eijl. (2014). *Gesprekken met honoursstudenten: over persoonlijke en professionele ontwikkeling*. Hogeschool Rotterdam. https://hbo-kennisbank.nl/details/sharekit_hr:oai:surfsharekit.nl:053b3a7b-936c-42af-9a58-531b15e63b58

Miltenburg, & Weerheijm. (2019). *Powerful Learning Environments, a guide to designing Innovation Labs*. https://hbo-kennisbank.nl/record/sharekit_hr/oai:surfsharekit.nl:b94b5125-556c-4e29-895e-731acf0b434f

OECD. (2018). The future of education and skills: Education 2030. *OECD Education Working Papers*.

Reeve, & Jang. (2006). What teachers say and do to support students' autonomy during a learning activity. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98(1), 209. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.98.1.209>

Renzulli. (2012). Reexamining the role of gifted education and talent development for the 21st century: A four-part theoretical approach. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 56(3), 150–159. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986212444901>

Rijsdijk. (2020). *Value Creators: A New Concept to Address Wicked Challenges*. FIG Working Week 2020; Smart surveyors for land and water management. Amsterdam, 10-14 May 2020.

Scager. (2013). *Hitting the high notes: Challenge in teaching honors students*. Utrecht University.

Sirius. (2015). *Niet reguleren, maar uitdagen: de vele wegen die leiden naar excellentie. Overall auditrapport Sirius Programma 2008-2014*.

van Eijl, Pilot, & Weerheijm. (2022). From honors education to regular education: learning from the content of innovations. *Journal of the European Honors Council*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.31378/jehc.167>

van Eijl, Weerheijm, & Pilot. (2024). From honors education to regular education: the motivation and role of honors teachers as linking pins in innovations. *Journal of the European Honors Council*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.31378/jehc.219>

Weerheijm, & Voncken. (2024). Teachers with autonomy-supportive teaching behaviour in honours education: their recommendations and interventions. *Journal of the European Honors Council*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.31378/jehc.217>

Wolfensberger, van Eijl, & Pilot. (2004). Honours Programmes as Laboratories of Innovation: A Perspective from the Netherlands. *Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council-Online Archive*, 141.