**PROJECT PROPOSAL FOR REGISTRATION AND/OR APPROVAL OF A PROJECT**

**Department(s):**Choose an item.

**Chair Group(s):** Click here to enter text. (please mention the chair group(s) supervising the project)

**Date:** Click here to enter text.

Please read the **instructions** at the end of this form carefully before filling out each item and insert text electronically.

─────────────────────────────────────────────­

1. NAME of PhD candidate: Click here to enter text.

Planned date go/no go decision: Click here to enter text.

─────────────────────────────────────────────­

2. PROMOTOR(S): Click here to enter text.(please mention name, titles and chair group)

 CO-PROMOTOR(S): Click here to enter text.(please mention name, titles and chair group)

 ─────────────────────────────────────────────­

3. PROJECT TITLE: Click here to enter text.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

4. SUMMARY of problem definition, objectives and research question(s):

 *(A maximum of 250 words is applicable; please, add word count)*

Click here to enter text.

─────────────────────────────────────────────­

5. DESCRIPTION of the research project, explicitly including the following issues:
*(A maximum of 2400 words is applicable, excluding the references; please, add word count and line numbers)*

* Detailed problem definition, research objectives and research questions
* Theoretical framework
* Methodological design
* References (bibliographic)

Click here to enter text.

─────────────────────────────────────────────­

6. SOCIETAL RELEVANCE AND EXPECTED SOCIETAL IMPACT

(see instructions attached to this form for more detailed explanation)

*(A maximum of 400 words is applicable, please add word count)*

Click here to enter text.

─────────────────────────────────────────────­

7. STARTING DATE AND YEAR OF GRADUATION

 Starting date: Click here to enter text.

 Year of graduation: Click here to enter text.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

8. WORK PLAN

 a. Detailed work plan for the first year of the research project

b. A rough work plan for the second part of the project, including an indication of the number of months to complete the education programme (TSP), if applicable.

1. Publication planning (see recommendations for co-authorship)
2. Data management: Is the data management plan for this specific project according to the data management policy of the chair group? If not, please explain.

9. Are referee report(s) of this project available? [ ]  Yes / [ ]  No

 (if applicable, please submit this (these) referee report(s) together with the proposal)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

10. SUPERVISING TEAM

1. If the supervising team is extended beyond the promotor(s) and co-promotor(s), please mention the members (name, titles, affiliation) of the team.

Also indicate who is acting as DAILY SUPERVISOR.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name + title | Organisation (and chair group if applicable) |
| Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. |
| Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. |
| Click here to enter text. | Click here to enter text. |

2. What are the motivation for the composition of the supervising team?

Click here to enter text.

3. Relevant publications (5 maximum) of, and related projects by the supervising team members.

Click here to enter text.

4. If applicable, please indicate which agreements have been made with local partners for supervision abroad.

Click here to enter text.

Click here to enter text.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

11 Describe the potential ETHICAL DILEMMAS regarding the programming of your PhD research (see instructions attached to this form for more detailed explanation).

 Click here to enter text.

Please note that this WASS procedure will not provide ethical clearance! Ethical approval is mandatory for all research activities involving human participants, *see the instructions below.*

─────────────────────────────────────────────­

12 FINANCING: How is the project financed?

[ ]  University financed (First flow of funds)

[ ]  Externally financed by an acknowledged Dutch research institute such as NWO/STW/WOTRO/KNAW (Second flow of funds)

[ ]  Externally financed other; please describe the funding (Third flow of funds)

─────────────────────────────────────────────­

13. CO-OPERATION: with which organisations outside WU

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The Netherlands | Other universities: |  |
|  | Institutes, experimental stations: |  |
|  | Ministries, other organisations: |  |
| International organisations, such as FAO/IFPRI/OECD: |  |
| Foreign universities and organisations: |  |

─────────────────────────────────────────────­

14. SIGNATURE

 (co) Promotor PhD candidate

 Name: Name:

 Date: Date:

 Signature: Signature:

─────────────────────────────────────────────­

15. NAMES, EMAIL ADDRESSES AND EXPERTISE OF POSSIBLE REVIEWERS

Please name at least two reviewers (*name, affiliation, including e-mail*), who will be able to give an independent judgement on the scientific quality and feasibility of the research project. These reviewers should preferably be fellows, candidate fellows or post-docs from WASS, or from another WU graduate school, but external to the chair group(s) involved in the project. Whenever expertise is difficult to find within WUR, the reviewers may be external from another university or research institute. The supervisory team should have approached the reviewers to confirm their willingness and availability to do the review.

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE APPLICATION FORM FOR APPROVAL OF A PROJECT**

**Provide a clear description of your research project, which is understandable – at least in its general description – for non-specialists.**

**Send this project proposal by e-mail to the secretariat,** **wass@wur.nl**

**Instructions for each question:**

**1. Name PhD candidate**

**2. Promotor(s)**

**The promotor** bears the main responsibility for the project. Provide names of promoter(s) and/or co-promoter(s) including the name of the chair group. Please, indicate who fulfils the daily supervision.

**Please note** that all Wageningen supervisors should be member of a Wageningen graduate school, and at least one of the supervisors should be a WASS fellow.

**3. Title**

Formulate the title as concisely and specifically as possible.

**4.** **Summary of problem definition and objectives**

This summary should serve to explain the title of the research project in more detail.

This text will be used for research summaries, for instance in the publicly accessible NOD database.

A *maximum of 250 words is applicable. Please, add word count.*

**5. Description of the research project**

 This constitutes the core of the project application. The description of the research project needs to be understandable and accessible to a broader audience of social sciences experts and not only domain experts.

In total you may use *a* ***maximum of 2400 words*** *(excluding the references). Please, add* *word count and line numbers.*

It is up to you how to describe the project but make sure to provide sufficient information for the reviewers to understand the following issues:

**\* Detailed problem definition, research objectives and research questions**

The problem definition includes a concise description of what is the problem, why it is a problem. It should also describe the setting or context of the problem. In addition, you should refer to already available research results and knowledge, based on literature study and indicate where there are still omissions in knowledge and/or (theoretical) understanding. The problem definition should lead to the formulation of your main research objectives and their translation into specific research questions that will guide your empirical research and allow you to reach your main objectives.

**\* Theoretical framework**

Here you explain how you approach the defined problem theoretically. What is the theoretical framework chosen, how is it embedded in the literature and why is this framework relevant? How will your research then contribute to theoretical development and scientific knowledge and understanding from a disciplinary and/or interdisciplinary point of view?

**\* Methodological design**

Here you explain how the research objectives are met and how you intend to answer your research questions. This includes information about your research methodology in terms of data collection and data-analysis, as well as the selection of research area and research group(s). Please make sure to not only describe your methodology but also to explain the appropriateness of your choice, given your research objectives and questions as well as your theoretical approach. Also indicate whether the required data/information is available.

**\* References**

Include here the references in the usual way for scientific reporting.

**6. Societal relevance and expected societal impact**

You may use a **maximum of 400 words** to reflect on your expectations and strategy with regard to societal relevance and expected societal impact. Not every WASS project has a direct aim with regard to societal impact. However, WASS expects all researchers to be able to reflect on the benefits of their research for society and be accountable towards society for their choices and actions.

(a) To what extent does your research respond to societally relevant issues?

(b) What can be expected from your research project in terms of:

* societal debate/discussion (e.g. sustainability, equity, democratisation, globalisation etcetera)
* Who are the (possible) stakeholders that could use or be impacted by your research (e.g. policy makers, practitioners, the general public, companies, etc.)?
* How will your research have societal impact (e.g., will it give management guidelines, will it help stakeholders address an issue by means of evidence summarised in a policy brief, will you provide a design or prototype, a process set-up, etc.)?
* How are you going to work with stakeholders and why (e.g. will you communicate through popular media, social media, will you engage through workshops, will you do this during or after the research)?

(c) Explain your strategy to achieve your aims with regard to societal impact and the available budget.

**7. Intended starting date and year of graduation**

Provide here the information on the time necessary for a graduation, given restrictions such as part time PhD or search time for a candidate, if applicable.

**8. Work plan**

(a) Give a description of the proposed activities to be carried out in the first twelve months of the period.

(b) A more concise description will suffice for activities to be carried out in the remainder of the subsidy period. Here information should be provided on whether there is sufficient time to complete the education programme (TSP), given the profile and/or background of the candidate and/or fitting courses in the work schedule.

Under (c) include the intended scientific publications in the form of e.g. a dissertation, contributions to scientific or societal meetings, report or articles to scientific journals.

(d) Every chair group has a data management policy according to which researchers handle and save research data. Please explain, if you have additional issues or have agreed to deviate from the regular data management policy.

**9. Available referee reports**

If referee reports are available you are requested to submit them together with the proposal. This also holds for critical reports, but you are free to add your comments on such reports.

If it concerns an individual and single project assessed and granted by NWO or KNAW, please, submit the review reports and the NWO/KNAW letter together with your proposal.

**10. Supervising team**

**1. The table** refers to the people who will be directly involved in the implementation of the research project, including the PhD candidate who will carry out the research project. For each person the list should include the initials and title(s) and to which university/department/chair group or institute this work can be accounted for. Also indicate who fulfils the daily supervision.

**Please note** that all Wageningen supervisors should be member of a Wageningen graduate school, and at least one of the supervisors should be a WASS fellow.

**2.** Explain the choice for the current **composition** of the supervising committee and how the supervising team covers the subject of the research proposal.

**3. Relevant publications of the supervising team and related projects**

Mention the main publications of the members of the supervising team related to the problem definition and research objectives **(not more than five)**. Please, explain how this research project is embedded in the research performed by the research group?

**4. Agreement with local partners**

In what way does the national and/or international collaboration influence the feasibility of the research? In case of a sandwich PhD construction, is supervision in the country where the research will be performed adequate? Which agreements have been made on payment and time available to carry out the research?

**11 Ethical dilemmas**

 Ethical dilemmas and decisions should be seriously considered in the programming of research proposals. Ethical dilemmas deal with potential harm to society, people, animals and ecosystems and with the potential use or abuse of research results.

Relevant aspects are:

* The funding organisations of the PhD research and their interest in the research results (conflict of interest)
* Research methods: animal experiments; involving people in your experiments, biotechnological research
* Research location: research carried out in countries where human rights are violated

Relevant questions may be:

* For whom is the research question relevant;
* Who can profit most of the research outcomes;
* Which development is supported by this research;
* Does the research support sustainable development; etc.

In general there are no good or wrong answers to ethical dilemmas, but it is very important to present your own considerations clearly and transparently.

WASS can decide that ethical approval is necessary for approval of the project in the graduate school. You will then be referred to a relevant ethical committee.

*Please note that ethical clearance for your research can only be granted by the ethical committees at Wageningen University & Research. Please note that ethical review for research plans involving human participants is mandatory at Wageningen University and Research.*

Wageningen University has various relevant ethical clearance procedures. The WUR Research Ethics Committee ([REC](https://intranet.wur.nl/umbraco/en/about-wur/integrity-social-safety-ethics/wur-rec/)) provides advice and ethical clearance for all non-medical research plans with human participants. The “Medisch Ethische Toetsingscommissie” assesses research projects according to the legal criteria for medical research. Animal experiments should be approved by the Animal-Experiments Committee (DEC). Do not hesitate to contact WASS if you need more information on ethical clearance or ethical committees.

**12. Financing**

Please tick the box to state how the project is financed. If more than one way of financing is used, tick more boxes and specify the most important one.

**13. Co-operation**

Provide here the external co-operation that has been arranged already or would be relevant for this project.

**14. Signature**

The printed version should be signed by the chair of the group or of the department and by the project leader. The electronic version only requires their names.

**15. Names, addresses and expertise of possible reviewers**

Please, provide names, affiliation and e-mail address of at least two reviewers with relevant expertise in relation to this research proposal. The reviewers mentioned have been contacted by the supervisory team. They should have expressed their willingness and availability to do the review within 3 weeks.

The reviewers should preferably be fellows, candidate fellows or post-docs from the WASS or from another WU graduate school. Whenever expertise is difficult to find within WUR, the reviewers may be external from another university or research institute.

*If it concerns an* ***individual/single*** *project that has been assessed by NWO/KNAW, WASS will not assess the project again with reviewers and approve the project automatically.*