



Position statement Executive Board
Wageningen University & Research

Regarding the WASS clusters peer review assessment (2015-2021)

According to the Strategy Evaluation Protocol (SEP 2021-2027) the Wageningen School of Social Sciences (WASS) clusters have been evaluated. An assessment committee of independent experts assessed the performance of WASS and its research clusters based on a self-evaluation and a site visit.

The Executive Board has received the final report of the assessment committee, and has read it with interest. The Executive Board is pleased to read that the committee concludes that WASS can be regarded as a top international institute for social sciences applied to life sciences. Moreover, the Executive Board is content that WASS has taken up the recommendations of the previous evaluation committee, resulting in good progress in integration of chair groups and inter- and transdisciplinary collaboration. The Executive Board would like to thank the peer review committee for carrying out the evaluation.

The response to the main recommendations of the committee has been put together by the responsible bodies WASS and its clusters and the Executive Board has integrally accepted the response, that describes how the recommendations will be addressed and how the outcomes of the research evaluation will be used to further strengthen WASS's performance. The Executive Board encourages WASS and its clusters to further enhance collaboration between chair groups.

Also on a general (WGS-wide) level the committee makes useful recommendations. We are in the middle of a 'Recognition and Rewards' trajectory and agree with the committee that the coming years should be used to reform the Tenure Track system, thereby having an eye for the improvement of international recruitment of professors. Moreover, the Executive Board agrees that (even more) collaboration within and between research units is desirable and will investigate the possibilities of further integration and institutionalisation of the research units. Regarding PhD education we will assess the need and possibilities to organise interdisciplinary PhD training. Lastly, the Executive Board agrees that a clear alumni policy is beneficial for all and will improve the monitoring of the career paths of our PhD graduates.

Progress on follow-up actions will be monitored in our yearly quality assurance cycle.

The assessment report together with the response to the recommendations will be published on the WUR website, together with summaries of the WASS self-evaluation reports and the case studies.

Wageningen
University & Research

DATE
December 19, 2022

OUR REFERENCE
2300519

POSTAL ADDRESS
P.O. Box 9101
6700 HB Wageningen
The Netherlands

VISITORS' ADDRESS
Wageningen Campus
Building 104
Droevendaalsesteeg 4
6708 PB Wageningen

INTERNET
www.wur.nl

CoC NUMBER
09098104

HANDLED BY
Pieter Munster

TELEPHONE
+31 (0) 317481686

EMAIL
pieter.munster@wur.nl

DATE
December 19, 2022

PAGE
2 of 2

With kind regards,



Prof. dr Arthur P.J. Mol
Vice-president of the Executive Board

Wageningen School of Social Sciences Peer Review 2021: Responses by the research units

In this report, the research units evaluated during the Peer Review of Wageningen School of Social Sciences (WASS) in September 2021, react to the outcomes delivered by the international Peer Review Committee chaired by Professor Guido van Huylenbroeck. This review encompassed 5 clusters of chair groups and the graduate school.

- A. Wageningen School of Social Sciences (WASS)
- B. Centre for Space, Place and Society (CSPS)
- C. Wageningen Centre for Sustainability Governance (WCSG)
- D. Economics
- E. Communication, Philosophy, Technology (CPTe)
- F. Business Science
- G. WASS reaction to general recommendations

A. Wageningen School of Social Sciences

The Board of WASS reacts to the Peer Review Committee 2021 recommendations:

1. Reinforce the WASS community

Recommendations	Response WASS
The financial system at Wageningen University makes implementation of a common strategy and shared research lines difficult in WASS. The Committee recommends WASS to advocate giving the Board of WASS more formal influence in core procedures, for instance the recruitment of new PhDs.	WASS will discuss this with WU management. WASS will enhance efforts to reinforce the research community and achieve shared research lines.
Given the trend of 3 years scholarships, the Committee recommends to make available additional funding for the fourth year.	WASS will install an ad hoc working group of WASS fellows to discuss possibilities and share best practices in finding funding for the fourth year, in case of a three year funding scheme.

2. Intensify interaction with the PhD community

Recommendations	Response WASS
The Committee recommends to organise formal meetings between the Scientific Director and the PhD council, at least twice a year.	Introduce three-monthly meetings of the Scientific Director, the PhD programme manager and the PhD council.
WASS should organise regular focus groups to support the PhD candidates; the focus groups may also serve as a source of information on the causes of delay.	WASS is going to organise focus group meetings with specific groups of PhD candidates (chair group level, sandwich PhDs, external PhDs) to collect information on the PhD programme and the causes for delays in finalising PhD projects.
The role of the PhD representative in WASS, research units and chair groups should be discussed and made explicit.	WASS will discuss the role of PhD representatives with the PhD council, and will propose the PhD council to aim for one PhD representative per research unit.
WASS should lower the already low barrier for PhD candidates and postdocs to appeal in case they are not sufficiently enabled by their chair groups.	WASS will organise regular individual meetings with all PhD candidates. The Netherlands Centre of Expertise for Doctoral Education specifically recommends this for the end of the second year. This is a crucial moment in which many future

delays can already be detected, while there is still time to solve issues.

WASS will also continue to organise the annual round table of the Scientific Director and the postdoctoral researchers in WASS.

WASS in cooperation with the other graduate schools takes action to reduce inequalities of rights and opportunities between PhD candidates in different categories.

3. Monitor and improve supervision

Recommendations	Response WASS
Contributions of academic staff to the WASS PhD education programme should be stimulated by providing higher financial compensation for contributing groups.	WASS agrees with the recommendation, which requires more funding for the graduate schools; we will discuss this recommendation with the other graduate schools in the WGS meeting to explore the support for a joint action towards the board of WUR.
WASS has to make sure that supervisors take the Training and Supervision Plan (TSP) seriously and enable PhD candidates to build their networks, take courses and visit conferences.	Continue informing PhD supervisors about the meaning and importance of the TSP, e.g. via improving the explanation of the expectations in the TSP approval letter and by informing the research coordinators in the annual visit of the research units.
PhD supervision courses and workshops should become mandatory for all supervisors as a recurring training.	The Course Professional in Supervision is mandatory for academic staff in tenure track. WASS also offers peer consultation groups for experienced supervisors, while in cooperation with the other graduate schools regular lunch workshops are organised. WASS will continue organising, advocating and renewing the training, workshops and peer consultation for supervisors.
WASS should consider making a case for extending the <i>ius promovendi</i> to a broader set of categories (e.g. UD1, UHD2) in order to lower the number of PhD candidates of promotors. Junior academics should receive recognition and credits for their supervisory activities.	WASS will make expectations explicit for supervisors. WASS will organise and stimulate discussion about the culture of supervision in chair groups and research units. No follow up. WASS supports the Wageningen University policy to grant the <i>ius promovendi</i> to the tenure track associate professor 1 and to other experienced associate professors who can apply for the <i>ius promovendi</i> with the Academic Board. The burden of supervision with chair holders is already significantly lowered by this policy.
WASS should actively monitor the compliance with the WUR Authorship Guidelines.	Improve monitoring the quality of supervision and the use of the WUR Authorship guidelines, via the end-of-second year interview, the exit interview and in the new exit survey in Hora Finita.

4. Improvements and innovations with regard to the PhD programme

Recommendations	Response WASS
WASS should dig deeper to root out the causes of delays of PhD projects. Investigate correlations between the quantity of PhD candidates and the quality of supervision, between PhD duration and teaching duties.	WASS will improve the quality of the data with regard to the time to degree in cooperation with the other graduate schools. WASS will organise focus groups to investigate the causes of delays in PhD projects. In addition, WASS will explore

	<p>the causes through individual interviews with PhD candidates after two years and through the exit interview.</p> <p>Introduce an 'after 4 years' conversation with each PhD candidate who has not finished after the contract end date; discuss causes, solutions and planning.</p> <p>Install a working group to investigate the introduction of an advisory committee and a procedure for the go/no go decision by the supervisors.</p>
All PhD candidates should have the opportunity to teach. Teaching should be compensated by lengthening the PhD project.	No follow up. There is a clear policy at Wageningen University for teaching by PhD candidates.
WASS should develop a policy to stimulate career orientation for PhD candidates.	WASS is already developing a policy to stimulate career orientation for PhD candidates, possibilities to prepare for specific career paths and stimulate the conversation about career plans between the PhD candidate and the supervisors.
WASS should further develop models to enhance cohesion by cohort building and bring PhDs together within or across research units. An already successful model is the PhD writing retreat.	WASS plans to stimulate cohesion by organising more PhD activities on locations outside Wageningen.

B. Centre for Space, Place and Society

General remarks

The CSPPS board and community is very happy about the review results, and we are proud to see the appreciation shown for our work and the ways in which we have operationalised the cluster. Our strong governance structure, manner of collaboration and clear future vision is appreciated and our aim and ambition is to follow these compliments up in the years to come.

Recommendations	Response
Continue to strengthen the common governance and the sharing of resources between the chair groups.	The CSPPS is administratively governed by the CSPPS board, engaged coordinator and scientific director. Consisting of the four chairs, the board approves the overall activities, strategy and budget, and coordinates HR policy across the CSPPS. The engagement coordinator and scientific director set out the scientific strategy and help coordinate and organise central and cluster activities. A key priority for CSPPS is to continue to strengthen common governance and identify optimal synergies in administration.
Share your cross-chair group governance with other research units as a good practice.	We will pursue this on SSG departmental council level (where three of the four chairs reside) and through WASS, to which all four chair groups belong.
Further allocate resources to the clusters and related collaborative activities such as the transformative learning hub and writing retreats for PhD candidates.	The clusters are already well resourced, but we will endeavour to allocate further internal resources (financial and otherwise) and external resources to fund cluster and collaborative activities. As identified in the review report 'flagship' cluster activities like the Transformative Learning Hub have been identified and they will (also) be supported.
Continue the integration and development of other fields of knowledge that could further strengthen your research themes.	Non-CSPPS WUR researchers are encouraged to participate in clusters relevant to their expertise and interests, which fosters and broadens research collaborations within WASS and WUR and integrates other fields of knowledge.

<p>Continue transferring your transdisciplinary integration expertise to early career researchers through specialised teaching and training.</p>	<p>Within the clusters, PhD training and ECR support happens informally, and a convivial academic culture is nurtured. PhDs, Postdocs and ECRs take a leading role in many clusters. The CSPA director will make it one of her priorities to further professionalise PhD, Postdoc and ECR support, as well as the coordination of specialised teaching and training. Moreover a PhD cohort plan has been made and chairs are recruiting PhDs on this basis cross chair groups and beyond.</p>
<p>Step up your efforts to create and demonstrate actual policy impact.</p>	<p>We will do so by strengthening our existing central pillars of societal and policy impact, which are themselves based on cutting-edge, critical constructive research: 1) sharing knowledge through diverse channels with partners, including citizens/civil society (e.g., through social media); 2) critical reflections on and engagements with policy; 3) influencing the public debate; and 4) direct engagement in the implementation of policies and programmes by societal actors.</p>
<p>Take the next step in your ambitious aim to operationalise and institutionalise non-standard criteria for research quality.</p>	<p>For CSPA, this mainly refers to wonder, beauty, meaning and value. We aim to workshop these criteria in the first year to operationalise them as criteria for research quality and develop a plan on this basis for their further development.</p>

C. Wageningen Centre for Sustainability Governance

The report of the review committee has been discussed in the WCSG. The general message of the committee is that we are performing at a high level and that we should continue to develop our joint research programme with the goal of further raising the profile of sustainability governance at Wageningen University and beyond.

We take four key points of advice from the report.

First, we acknowledge the advice to further invest in WCSG as a collaboration between the four participating chair groups, and continue with our plans to expand our partnership to the Consumption and Healthy Lifestyles chair group. In 2022 we will full integrate CHL into the WCSG.

Second, we will further consider the expansion of our joint research programme to more explicitly reference questions around structural inequality and power dynamics, inclusion and justice, intersectional vulnerabilities as they relate to questions of participation, inclusivity, and governance. These questions will not replace the programme we presented during the review, but will provide a basis for reflection moving forward.

Third, we will continue to reflect on the committee's call for our work to be further embedded in the wider domains of Wageningen University. We largely interpret this recommendation as a point of encouragement given our work is already embedded in core Wageningen themes of climate change, biodiversity and feeding the world, we acknowledge the committee's recommendation to even further advance questions of governance in these domains.

Finally, the committee's suggestion to incorporate societal actors in discussions regarding the organisation of the WCSG, rather than only on a project basis, is something we will also incorporate in our further development of the governance structure of the centre and our various projects moving forward.

We note that three other key points raised by the committee are already part of the workplan of the WCSG, or covered by the individual chair groups.

First, we have an extensive range of research activities that are transdisciplinary in nature – that is, working directly with stakeholders. We appreciate that not all activities were highlighted in our report. Nevertheless, the inclusion of stakeholders in terms of participation and co-production are central to the vast majority of our projects. Some recently completed projects include the NWO funded Smart Governance project worked directly with private standard and traceability organisations. Other, newly funded projects, including the NWO SDG project and NWO RET project, continue with this work. This approach to research will remain central to our work moving forward.

Second, we understand that the committee's focus on moving from competition to collaboration with other Dutch Universities emerged from the SWOT analysis we provided. However, we would like to underline the opportunities we are already building through existing partnerships with the technical university partnership (4TU – Wageningen University, Eindhoven University of Technology, Technical University Delft and the University of Twente) and the Wageningen-Utrecht-Eindhoven alliance. We already have a wide range of collaborative projects with these and other universities on a project level (e.g. TRANSGOV project with the Copernicus Institute at the University of Utrecht) and shared research centres including the Maritime Research Centre in partnership with the University of Amsterdam. The enhancement and expansion of these collaborations in the future is part of our vision.

Third, the advice to invest further in research on international climate agreements and urban environments is well taken and reflects our already extensive programme related to both of these research themes. This includes work on climate transparency and climate adaptation – also noting that Assoc. Prof. Robbert Biesbroek is also one of the lead authors of the recent IPCC report. We are also one of the founding social science groups in the Amsterdam Metropolitan Solutions – a global partnership between Delft University of Technology (TU Delft), Wageningen University & Research (WUR) and Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). These areas will continue to be part of our programme moving forward.

We finally note a further three points raised by the committee that do not factually represent our current work.

First, we acknowledge the committee's enthusiasm over our incubator programme. However, their observation that these incubators do not include faculty from different chair groups and difference levels of seniority is incorrect. The eight incubator projects we have funded to date have been purposefully inclusive of multiple chair groups and include faculty ranging from professors to PhDs researchers. One of our incubators on science communication was conceived, submitted and run by PhDs.

Second, the committee's suggestion that we should work on issues beyond the SDGs and more in the global North does not accurately reflect the current scope of our work. WCSG research is global in focus. Apart from work in the Netherlands and the EU, our (empirical) research extends to other countries in the global North including China, the United States, Canada and Australia. In addition, we have an active research presence in regions and countries in the global South. This global perspective is explicit in our three future research lines. Our recent jointly acquired research project on the SDGs is exemplary of this – including researchers from Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda. Furthermore, this work is directly related to the EU given its focus on policy coherence between international donors. It is, as all of our work, ultimately global in focus - reflecting the challenges of a sustainability agenda for both the global North and South in a globalized world.

Finally, we feel that the recommendation to broaden our range of publications beyond purely academic output does not reflect our current strategy and practice. As presented in Appendix 7 of our report, we already have a wide range of professional and media outputs – including a regular column in the national NRC newspaper. We do agree with the committee's recommendation that more weight could be given to these outputs in the tenure track evaluation system.

D. Economics

General remarks

The comments of the committee were generally very positive and therefore encouraging. We were especially happy with the assessment of the committee that our section is 'world leading in its niche' and 'excels in theory-driven empirical research with a commitment to rigorous analysis'. The recommendations were generally in line with our own vision of the future steps we should take to further develop as a section. Considering the comments as a whole, we feel confident that we are on the right track. It should be noted that there are (institutional) limits to the extent that some recommendations can be taken on board.

Recommendations	Response
Invest in your reputation as a world-leading centre of expertise in your niche by articulating a proactive communication and engagement strategy.	We will be working on this together with the new communication expert of the department, Eugenia Leon Alvarado.
Continue to equalize the teaching load between staff members.	We feel encouraged by the committee in our intention towards a just division of teaching. However, in some cases efficiency and institutional boundaries restrict us from reaching this goal: spreading of the educational "burden" across individuals affects group income and may have implications for the tenure track. Nevertheless, this is something we will explore and discuss.
Consider to more frequently become a small but pivotal partner in large research consortia.	Strategies with regard to joining consortia are at the group level. Some groups aim to join large consortia, others aim mainly for individualized grants. We cherish the freedom and autonomy of groups and individuals to develop their own strategies.
Continue to apply and refine the unit's version of the WUR tenure track system.	We especially appreciate the support for the pilot project and are indeed continuously improving our approach.
Allow people who excel in research to do less in other areas of assessment and vice versa.	Similar to point 2, specialization in research and other areas is not consistent with the philosophy behind the TT. Although we have the intention to allow more diversity in assessment (as evidenced by our TT pilot project), we do have to take these institutional boundaries into consideration.
Continue to offer methodology courses at the master level for incoming international PhD students, but consider developing them as some sort of pre-PhD programme instead of making these course part of the PhD programme.	This is on the radar. We are currently developing and teaching methods courses in collaboration with Utrecht University. We also want to encourage prospective students to participate in online courses on specific topics, following a "diagnostic test" of potential deficiencies.
Make an effort to transcend hierarchical structures; give more prominence to junior members of staff.	We did not recognize the remark about strong hierarchical structures within the section. We like to think of ourselves as an open and inclusive team.

E. Communication, Philosophy, Technology, Education

In this document we briefly outline our reaction and potential follow-up concerning the recommendations provided by the WASS research evaluation committee, addressed to the cluster CPTe part of the evaluation. We respond per comment, in the order of the recommendations provided.

Recommendation 1: Continue to strengthen the common governance of the unit and the sharing of resources between chair groups, so that they can be more aligned

This comments reflects the observation that the section is already jointly governed to a high degree, but we think that the next step is to integrate CPT and ELS more. To realize this, we have installed a structure in which research coordinators meet regularly and collaborate, for instance now in writing this response and in exploring and proposing mutual interests and areas in which the different groups can complement each other. Proposals are discussed at chair group level ultimately the research coordinators jointly give input to chairholders who are responsible for final decisions about strategy and research investments at section level.

This also implies that we seek to enhance communication and staff involvement by more structured and open communication, also providing staff and PhDs avenues for sharing and catalyzing ideas and other input. Examples are to organize cluster/section-wide PhD sessions, share resources more (rooms, meetings), make sure support staff collaborate where possible between chair groups.

Recommendation 2: Find more strategic focus, but make sure that the choice of topics is based on a genuinely shared interest

Re-assess the current themes, determine if new/additional themes are needed given expansion of section with ELS and the arrival of new chair holders (sometime leading to small adjustments in chair group foci), or if existing themes can sometimes be reformulated. Three topics are now explored to become focus of joint research:

- Trustworthiness of information. This topic deals with ethics and responsibility, the learning and stimulation of argumentation, collaboration and other modern skills, the role of technology and channels of communication and the inclusion or exclusion of certain groups in society.
- Responsible innovation, with a specific emphasis (though not exclusively) on digitalization.
 - o We are currently discussing how digitalization and (online) information trustworthiness can also be a broader research area, in which we can combine current developments (a new AI ELSA lab (PHI), and the expertise that the new professors Rens Vliegthart and Sanne Kruijemeier (COM) bring in.
- Deepening our doing and studying research ethos, also as a route towards societal impact

We are planning to combine resources to invest in these themes. Moreover we are foreseeing more joint grant applications, joint PhD and postdoc projects, and other research activities across the groups.

In the coming years several conferences in Wageningen offer the potential to work together as a section. Examples are the 2023 conferences ERSCP and SCORAI, EurSAFE, and the 4TU Biannual Conference Ethics and Technology. As section we explore possibilities to formulate joint research tracks or symposia in these conferences.

Recommendation 3: Encourage interdisciplinarity without compromising disciplinary contributions

For each of our groups it is essential to have their own disciplinary identities and foci. We promote these by chair group-specific themes, research seminars and grant applications.

As a section, we pick a few strategic themes and grant applications (e.g. INREF) where staff of all four groups can contribute to, in collaboration with key partners from other chair or science groups.

Recommendation 4: Find new journals and other outlets for interdisciplinary research

The separate groups already publish in interdisciplinary journals. New journals could be identified after selecting one or more key topics that connect all chair groups in the section. Also, reformulate our output targets for section such that they become more diverse (not only journal publications, but broad impact

outlets, including professional journals or websites). Finally, in our chair groups we also indicate the most important disciplinary journals.

Recommendation 5: Expand your research profile through the integration of other disciplines such as policy studies or science and technology studies, where this makes sense

The PHI chair (Verweij) and ELS chair (den Brok) are chairs of 4TU.ETHICS and 4TU.CEE, respectively. Joint projects have been started in the cluster on the topic of ethics in engineering education, both at the WUR as well as 4TU level. Also, projects have been started on the role of technology in collaboration, learning/teaching and communication. Finally, we could bring together more our existing projects, for example via our website.

Recommendation 6: Reflect on the conditions required to fulfil the different needs of scholarship

As a cluster, we will ensure active engagement and participation in new TT policy developments, and the Educational Career Path, investigate the potential of leadership rotation within chair groups and the cluster, and so on. It would be good to smartly connect other activities to this, such as innovation grants, education grants, etc. Also, we will allow staff to deviate from TT conditions, such as taking more time or even stop at certain levels (not all need to become personal professor).

Other ideas are to identify different career paths and let the ones on the same type of career path support each other as peers. Develop an approach for facilitating diverse career paths within CPTe, including criteria and HR policy to match.

Recommendation 7: Increase efforts for more diversity

Develop awareness of the extent and ways in which diversity is constricted in CPTe, and why. This could be with the help of an external facilitator - to subsequently develop matching strategies to address diversity. Also analyze specific areas for more diversity. Diversity seems smaller in upper TT and management levels (especially in terms of gender), and diversity also differs between chair groups. Relate policy efforts to point 6 as well.

We will also lobby for (WASS) policies that facilitate diversity in PhD tracks, e.g. external PhDs, professional PhDs etc.

F. Business Science

General remarks

We look back positively on the peer review report and the meeting of our section with the peer review committee. The process of focussing on our joint mission, vision and strategy, as well as sharing our scientific and societal impact has been worthwhile. We appreciate the overall positive evaluation made by the committee of our research unit, which we see as an encouragement to further capitalise on the synergies between the chair groups.

<u>Recommendation</u>	<u>Response</u>
Stick to your current research plan by publishing high quality papers in both agri-food and business fields.	We will keep doing so. This is a logical outflow of our research. It is also part of an evaluation exercise in the Business Section to define what we consider high-quality research within the boundaries of SFDORA.
Do not mimic general business schools, but stick to your specific niche, by continuing to research in and publish on the agri-food value chain.	Section Business Science thanks the peer review committee for strengthening and supporting our view in this.
Train future agri-food managers and leaders who need good economic knowledge but also sufficient	Students have the opportunity to gain knowledge from different groups by choosing

knowledge of the socio-natural-technical processes behind food transformation and selling.	specific courses. Our study advisors guide them in this. PhDs and academic staff train their leadership skills on the job by starting from disciplinary business sciences perspectives that are connected and integrated in interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary projects.
Continue to capitalise on current and emerging opportunities by focusing on digitalisation, sustainability and health.	Currently these three themes have our priority.
Connect more closely with key stakeholders, while further shaping your future research strategy.	This is one of our focal points for the near future. There is an active basis of stakeholders with whom we collaborate intensively already and it is the explicit objective of the Business Sciences section to structure and align this even more with the research strategy.
Revisit the strategy periodically to ensure that it is still topical, contemporary and relevant.	Will do. We aim to review our strategy periodically (at least annually) in a dedicated strategy meeting. We will collect input from our staff members and other stakeholders to review topicality, practical and academic relevance and related to contemporary issues.
Promote your successes more; show the world how good you are.	We have a dedicated website communication officer and are reconsidering our communication strategy together with the communications department.

G. Wageningen School of Social Sciences reaction to general recommendations

The Peer Review Committee has also provided valuable recommendations that are not specifically in the mandate of the graduate school. WASS will present views from the social sciences, and develop vision and strategy regarding the following issues:

Peer Review Committee	Response
Reinforce innovation power by further integration and institutionalisation of the research units; stimulate collaborative thinking with regard to vacancies. Share and rotate management roles and evaluate leadership.	WASS continues to stimulate collaboration between the chair groups and across research units. WASS will also continue to advise the boards of SSG and ESG on this topic.
Improve international recruitment of professors, develop a benchmark for diversity and avoid overlap in having full professors with similar profiles; assess the needs within WASS and international tendencies in disciplines and research domains rather than taking continuation of a chair group as point of departure.	WASS will discuss this recommendation for improving the recruitment of professors with the board of the university, SSG and ESG.
Simplification of the organisational structure by bringing all social sciences units under WASS and the Social Sciences Group.	This recommendation is not within the remit of WASS.
Stimulate interdisciplinary research and organise interdisciplinary PhD training. Create more critical mass on interdisciplinary research themes.	WASS is going to support the development of larger research programmes to stimulate cooperation between the graduate schools and will discuss this within the setting of WGS with the dean of research and the rector of the university.
Improve follow-up of career paths of alumni.	WASS will advise the rector to improve data collection by the Wageningen University alumni office and to develop a clear alumni policy with regard to PhD graduates.

WASS is currently involved in a WGS working group, which aims at developing diverse PhD trajectories in line with the variety of careers our PhD population pursues. This implies that the current learning targets of the Wageningen University PhD programme have to be revised to allow for more variety in output and support different career choices.

Reform the tenure track system.

This is an ongoing discussion. WASS collaborates with other graduate schools in the working group Recognition and Rewards which will come up with proposals for improving the tenure track system.