Guidelines for preparing and carrying out an MSc thesis

Forest and Nature Conservation Policy Group
Wageningen University & Research

FNP-80418
FNP-80421
FNP-80424
FNP-80427
FNP-80430
FNP-80433
FNP-80436
FNP-80439

Version September 2020

Forest and Nature Conservation Policy Group

Contents

1. Preface

This guideline is meant for students who plan to carry out MSc thesis research at the Forest and Nature Conservation Policy (FNP) Group. It is relevant for students in following the Policy and Society or Management specializations. These guidelines do not replace the many excellent textbooks providing an introduction into science or the writing of research proposals. Rather they aim to help students to orientate themselves in undertaking an MSc thesis with the FNP Group at Wageningen University, and to bring the best out of this period and contribute to their career. These guidelines are additional to the general information and terms of references for preparing an MSc thesis at Wageningen University.

The guideline provides information on the goal of the thesis, the thesis contract, admission requirements, responsibilities, the assessment procedure, plagiarism and the submission procedure of the final thesis. The appendices provide the forms related to the preparation, carrying out and finalizing the master thesis with FNP.

2. Introduction

2.1 MSc thesis: the peak of higher academic education

Writing an MSc thesis is seen as a major achievement for students in higher academic education and takes a prominent position within the MSc Forest and Nature Conservation program. After completing the introductory and specific courses, the MSc thesis sets a challenge to set up and carry out a scientific research project in an almost fully, self-responsible manner. This includes:

- Assuring the adequate delineation and definition of the research topic,
- Building a sound theoretical framework for orientation of the research,
- Collecting data in a systematic and verifiable manner,
- Analyzing the data critically,
- Presenting the results comprehensibly,
- Drawing sound conclusions based on a comprehensive discussion of the results,
- Showing the possible contribution of the research to the process of theory building as well as policy advice.

A great deal of independence is expected from the student in preparing the MSc thesis. The role of the supervisor is to guide the students' learning process rather than offering specific knowledge. In this respect, the relation between the student and the supervisor can be compared to the relation between a soccer player and his/her coach: it is the player who scores, but it is the coach who regularly provides the player with hints and tactics. In contrast to soccer, not only the goals count, but also the training process itself. Thus, the grading of the MSc thesis is not only based on the quality of the report but also on the qualities of the student as a scientist and the learning process.

Given the intensive training process, it is important that the expectations of both parties involved, the student as well as the supervisor, are made clear from the beginning. In order to avoid disappointments on both sides these agreements are laid down in written form in the 'thesis contract' at the very beginning of the training process (see Annex B and https://www.wur.nl/en/Research-Results/Chair-groups/Environmental-Sciences/Forest-and-Nature-Conservation-Policy-Group/Education.htm). Copies of the thesis contract go to the student and the responsible study adviser; the original remains with the administration of the responsible chair group (see chapter "administrative issues").

The rest of this chapter deals with the basic scientific and administrative preconditions to start preparing your MSc thesis. In chapter 2, the different phases in preparation of an MSc thesis are described. Chapter 3 touches on the content, organizational, and administrative procedures for successful completion of an MSc thesis. Finally, chapter 4 explains the rules and regulations connected to the thesis process. Annex A provides a checklist of the steps and actions to be taken and by whom during the thesis in chronological order.

2.2 The MSc thesis as a scientific product

Most MSc candidates already have some experience in carrying out research, e.g., in doing experiments or collecting empirical data during field courses or practical training periods. However, in working on their MSc thesis they are faced, usually for the first time, with the requirement that the thesis has to be scientific. What this means exactly is often not immediately clear.

Research often starts with an interest in a certain empirical phenomenon. The questions asked are often of an empirical or descriptive nature: "What conflict resolution mechanisms do forest owners prefer?", "who is participating in collaborative management approaches?", "how many farmers depend with their income on forest use?". For this empirical or descriptive research to become scientific, something extra is required. There has to be a scientific contribution that highlights what the significance of the findings is beyond knowing the answer to these questions. This is done by using theory.

The first way in which theory is important is by offering a general epistemological outlook on the world. Different research approaches and methods start from different epistemological positions and it is important that a master thesis clearly articulates and argues its position.

The second way in which theory is important is by offering taxonomies that will guide you in structuring the findings and will structure the shape of your answer to the questions you ask. Take for example the question about the conflict mechanisms. In order to start your research and in order to make sense of your result, you will need some idea about what kinds of conflict mechanisms you may encounter. A search of relevant literature will help you to design an appropriate conceptual framework to serve exactly this purpose. However, while this is important, it is in most cases not sufficient for a scientific contribution.

The third way in which theory is important is that it helps you to take the findings a step further by confronting them with current scientific debates. This is only possible if the research questions go beyond the level of empirical description. This, in turn is only possible if the objective and problem statement are of sufficient quality (which often means that they have to do more in terms of problem formulation than only identifying a gap in the literature). For example, in case you are interested in conflict mechanisms and you have found a suitable framework to categorize and make sense of these mechanisms, what can you now say about these. How do they connect with other studies? What does this mean for conflict studies? What does this mean for the management of conflicts? You see, now we start to get somewhere in terms of articulating a scientific contribution. This also shows that the final quality of the thesis is to a large extent already determined in the very early stages of the MSc thesis process.

We maintain the following standards for an MSc thesis:

- The thesis must be **theory-based**. Theories in this respect can be understood as sets of explanation systems for observable phenomena in the real world. The student's departure in enlightening real world phenomena has to be taken from existing theoretical literature. The student is furthermore expected to discuss and to reflect on his or her findings against the existing theoretical literature as well as empirical literature.

- The thesis must **meet standards of validity**. This is only possible if a clear line of argumentation through the existing theoretical and empirical literature is given, and the underlying assumptions are made explicit. Ideally, the original data should be added to the work (usually as a separate document, sometimes as an appendix) to allow the reader to verify the drawn conclusions. An important part of this is to be as detailed and transparent as possible about the methods for data collection that were used and the different steps in the analysis of the data.

2.3 Basic requirements and necessary skills

For the successful completion of an MSc thesis, certain knowledge levels as well as mastering certain skills are basic requirements. This means that students normally should start to work on their MSc thesis only after they have obtained at least 20 study points (ECTS) within the MSc program, with an adequate coverage of relevant courses in Forest and Nature Conservation Policy.

It is highly recommended to follow courses in social science theory and social science research methodology before starting the MSc thesis work. Sound knowledge of methods and tools for data collection as well as data analysis will be assumed as basis at the beginning of the thesis work and will not be touched upon during the supervision.

2.4 Supervision and feedback

The FNP *thesis coordinator* (Jim van Laar, jim.vanlaar@wur.nl) is the first point of contact for students thinking of doing a thesis with FNP. He will direct students to suitable and available supervisors, who will be staff within FNP.

The role of the *supervisor* to guide the learning process and not to provide specific knowledge on the thesis topic. Students therefore should not expect the supervisor to provide them with more than background information on the topic and some start literature. Finding relevant literature, working out a good problem statement, defining objectives and research questions, and elaborating a sound conceptual as well as methodological framework has to be carried out by the student independently.

The supervisor is the person that provides feedback at the different stages throughout the process of preparing the MSc thesis as well as controlling the process itself, including the contractual agreements.

No general rules on the frequency of supervision meetings exist – instead the frequency depends on the individual agreements between the student and the supervisor. It is the student's responsibility to signal the need for meetings with the supervisor in a timely fashion.

For the supervision process a maximum of 50 hours is allocated per student for a thesis of 36 ECTS. Taking into account time spent on administrative issues, time spent by the examiner who acts as a second reader, and the time spent during attending colloquia, the thesis rings and the examination meeting, this leaves *a total of around 35 hours spent by the supervisor on the individual supervision of the MSc thesis.* This is not a lot of time and it is the responsibility of the student to make the best use possible of that time. The average process involves six or seven individual meetings of 1 to 1.5 hours and supervisors may spend a total time on reading or commenting on drafts of a maximum of 25 hours. If organized well by the student, this should mean that in principle, the supervisor is able to read two drafts of the proposal and two drafts of every chapter of the thesis before the final versions of the proposal and thesis are submitted for grading. It needs to be clear that although students may demand more supervision, either this will be impossible, or it will be taken into account in the final grade.

The primary job of the supervisor is to give feedback. The essence of giving feedback is that the supervisor does not propose solutions but identifies problems. Students are expected to take the initiative to make sense of the feedback and propose their own solutions to the problems.

If for any reason the student is not satisfied with their supervision, the student should contact the thesis coordinator and the examiner directly. The role of the *examiner* is to read the final thesis report and assess its quality.

2.5 Facilities and special arrangements

It is recommended to the students to use work places that are provided by FNP. These work places are located at the A-wing of Gaia A.301 (building 101). Making use of this facility can be requested to Keen-Mun Poon (keenmun.poon@wur.nl) for the duration of the thesis research. Working in Gaia might be more inspiring than working alone and encourage interaction with FNP staff.

Other facilities that FNP offers are a small library of methodological handbooks and specific literature, software and recording devices. Students can request their supervisor to get access to these facilities.

Under certain conditions (e.g., carrying out research in the tropics, participating in larger projects) it might be necessary to come to specific arrangements departing from the regular procedures. In these cases, please contact your supervisor and your study advisor early enough for the necessary arrangements.

Steps in the MSc thesis preparation

2.6 First step: intake meeting with the thesis coordinator

Students that intend to do a thesis with FNP have to make an appointment with the FNP thesis coordinator Jim van Laar (jim.vanlaar@wur.nl) first before they can start. In this meeting the topic, the procedures of doing a thesis, and the selection of a potential supervisor will be discussed.

2.7 Selection of topic and supervisor

The next step in working on an MSc thesis is the selection of a topic. There are in principle four different ways to find a topic:

- Topics offered by the FNP group. Each academic year the FNP group organizes an information fair for students interested in carrying out their thesis work within the broad field of forest and nature conservation policy. During this information meeting student can select a topic from the updated list of thesis-topics on a first come, first serve basis or discuss their own suggestions. The thesis information fair is usually held around mid-January. The exact dates for the information meeting will be announced on the FNP website and through email. The topics offered originate from within the FNP group, mainly related to ongoing or planned larger research projects of the chair group that are carried out by staff, post-doc researchers and PhD students. Furthermore, topics are offered in co-operation with organizations in the field of forests and nature conservation policy, such as Staatsbosbeheer, Vereniging Natuurmonumenten, and Tropenbos. Topics are also posted on the FNP website. This list will be regularly updated.

- Topics proposed by the student: Students are encouraged to propose topics for thesis research themselves and to discuss this with FNP's Thesis coordinator first.

- Topics proposed by other chair groups or research organizations such as Wageningen Environmental Research (WENR). FNP welcomes cooperation. However, even though supervision may be shared, FNP has the final responsibility for ensuring that the thesis meets the quality standards set by FNP.

- Topics proposed by external organizations such environmental NGOs, companies or development organizations. FNP welcomes cooperation. A counterpart from an external organization may suggest a topic and may provide assistance during fieldwork, provide data or support access to places or research subjects. Generally the student is responsible for arranging details with the counterpart. Any such external counterpart does not have a formal role and is not involved in the thesis assessment. It is however common to acknowledge the counterparts role in an acknowledgement section of the thesis report.

Students are not allowed to start an MSc thesis without prior approval by FNP and must in all cases contact the FNP Thesis coordinator before starting their MSc thesis first.

In some cases it might be helpful to combine the MSc thesis work with an internship. This holds particularly true for MSc research that is done outside the Netherlands. In case the MSc research is carried out abroad, adequate scientific supervision must be guaranteed in the respective country (in most cases by selecting a second supervisor from a local university) or within the respective organization. Possibilities to carry out an MSc thesis abroad in different European countries do also exist within the Erasmus+ program (see: www.wu.nl/exchange).

All arrangements must be settled by the student in time before the start of the thesis work, and must be agreed upon by the supervisor at the Forest and Nature Conservation Policy group.

NOTE: It is in principle possible to start an MSc thesis any time of the year. It is strongly recommended that before starting the thesis work, a student has followed a research methodology course in social sciences and an MSc course dealing with the topic of research.

2.8 Preparation of a research proposal

After the selection of a topic, the next step is to sign the Wageningen University Master Thesis Agreement that is an official agreement between the student, the supervisor and the examiner. No MSc-thesis work can be started without a contract: the MSc thesis officially starts only after the student, and supervisor have filled in an MSc thesis contract (see Annex C). The idea of the contract is to provide clarity in advance of the training process, in order to make clear what the expectations and requirements are. At all times during the thesis process, the thesis process can be terminated (by means denoting an insufficient grade) if the student does not meet the agreements made in the contract.

The following step in the thesis work is the preparation of a consistent and comprehensive research proposal. The thesis proposal is a product of the process of preparatory research around the main research theme. Students must become familiar with the theoretical problems, the historical context and the empirical specificities of the theme to be able to define, in precise terms, what it is that will be studied, how it will be studied and what the expected scientific and societal contribution of the study will be. The research proposal has to be presented to a wider audience of students and staff after a go-decision given by the supervisor.

The research proposal consists out of the following parts:

Problem statement: giving the motivation for the selection of the topic and a clear delineation of the problem field, finally resulting in a concise problem statement. If done in a sound way, this implicitly and explicitly reflects the social and scientific relevance and contribution of the selected research topic. To be able to develop a clear problem statement, a preliminary investigation must be carried out to establish a sufficiently profound knowledge base to pose the concrete problems that will be researched. This includes a review of the most relevant theoretical and empirical literature, which ensures that the topic has not already been exhausted by other researchers.

Research objective(s) and research questions: stating clearly the scientific objectives of the research. Scientific objectives are very often expressed with terms like ‘to enlighten’, 'to understand’, ‘to explore’, 'to determine’, ‘to highlight’, ‘to verify’ etc. However, this is also complemented with the wider relevance of this understanding, exploration etc. This is often dubbed to the ‘so what problem’. Thus, a typical objective often starts with the phrase “in order to” followed by “ this research examines…..” It is important that the objectives of the research (1) are strictly related to the research topic and the problem statement, that is, that they do not change the focus by introducing elements not already implicit in the topic, and (2) that they exhaust the topic completely, that is, they do not leave out any object or relation already posited.

The research objectives should balance deepening theoretical knowledge, analytical capacities and techniques and methods of social research, against pragmatic reasons, such as the available time, actual research conditions (e.g., availability of resource persons, harvest seasons, hazards, political events), and the capacity and budget of the student. The objective should preferably be articulated in the first chapter or paragraph of the thesis or the proposal, however in some cases this is not feasible.

Subsequently, the research objective(s) should be translated into research questions, that is, stating the questions, which need to be answered in order to fulfill the research objective(s). In this respect, the research questions are an operationalization of the research topic. However, the research questions should not be mixed up with the operationalization of the research topic in a methodologically coherent manner for data collection (e.g., the questions in a questionnaire or in a structured interview) in the later stage of the research process (see step “carrying out the

research"). Instead, the research questions have to be analytically relevant. Often this is done by using the central concepts in the research questions. If those concepts are not mentioned in the first chapter or paragraph of the thesis or the proposal, it can make sense to put the research questions after the conceptual framework. Finally, research questions have to be knowledge questions. Common mistakes are to pose interventionist questions as research questions, for example "how can biodiversity conservation be improved" or normative questions like "how should we manage wild boar in the Veluwe".

Theoretical framework: The theoretical framework acts as a partial guide for the selection of the phenomena, which will come under study. Different theoretical frameworks emphasize different phenomena as important, thereby giving direction to the overall thesis work. In other words, the theoretical framework guides the student in his or her approach to the theoretical reconstruction of the topic. (see paragraph 2.2 for more on the role of theory in social science research). It is important to keep in mind that the theoretical framework should be an argumentation of the student through existing theories and concepts, finally resulting in the student's own conceptual framework. Working out the theoretical framework is therefore a creative act, rather than a descriptive exercise through existing literature. Literature that is offered in the more advanced courses FNP-31806 Social and Political Theories for Forest and Nature Conservation Research and FNP-32806 Science and Expertise in Nature and Environment are helpful to develop an theoretical framework.

The arguing against and with existing theories and theoretical concepts in developing the theoretical framework should always be done against the background of the research objective(s) and research questions. Even though almost everything seems to be connected with each other, the research objective(s) and research questions help in determining which theories and concepts are relevant for the student's thesis research and which not.

It follows that the research proposal is not a linear process. Instead, the problem statement, the objective and research questions and the theoretical and conceptual framework are always in conversation with each other and as the proposal develops, each of these will change multiple times.

Methodology: With the theoretical framework the student indicates *which* concepts are important to be looked at in answering the research questions. In this part of the proposal it should be explained *how* these concepts will be identified and assessed empirically. Methodology refers to the methods used to collect and analyze the data. The chosen approaches and methods have to be consistent with the theoretical framework, and specifically the epistemological position that the research takes. The student should look at the course material of the methodological courses he/she has taken.

Setting up a sound methodological framework requires arguing about the following points:

Identify the **character of the thesis work:** is it an explorative, or comparative, or interpretative, or analytical, or historical study? Is a case study approach chosen to exemplify a certain real world phenomena or does the thesis work aim at being representative for them? It is obvious that with the selection of the topic and the formulation of the problem statement the student already implicitly provided answers to many of these questions. However, only in making them explicit does the student allow for the discussion of his work, as the student's assumptions and logical framework can be examined.

Design the **data collection:** this step requires arguing about, and providing an answer to, the following questions:

(1) What is seen as *data* and from which sources of information (e.g., pictures, texts, individuals, groups) will be they be derived? Data can take on the quality of primary data (that is, generated by the researcher) as well as that of secondary data (new analysis of data generated by earlier research).

(2) What are the criteria for determining and delineating the sources of information (e.g. who will be interviewed? Why those policy documents and not the others? How many people will receive a

questionnaire? Why selecting this case study and not another?) The answers to these questions are partially dependent on whether qualitative or quantitative research methods are chosen (see next question). Usually, research relies on multiple sources of data (interviews, documents, etc) to allow for triangulation as a way to check the validity of the analysis.

(3) Which *methods* are employed to derive the data from the sources of information? The selection of adequate methods is dependent from on the sources of information, which are seen as relevant to find answers to the posed research questions. Here the student has to argue why a certain method (e.g., observations, interviews, content analysis) is most appropriate for the research topic at stake. In general, textbooks distinguish between quantitative and qualitative socio-empirical research methods. These refer to different assumptions about data and to different epistemological positions in social science research. E.g. you will need to argue whether you consider the data to be accessible in direct quantifiable (or measurable) qualities (e.g., the amount of cut timber) or whether the data can only be derived in an interpretative, qualifying way (e.g., the underlying motives of illegal logging). Often research will employ different methods. In those cases, theoretical consistency must be ensured because data obtained through different methods are not always commensurable.

(4) Which *instruments* within the group of methods will be used (e.g. questionnaires, semi-structured interview guideline, observation manual).

Design the **data analysis:** It should be pointed out that methods and instruments are necessary for the *data collection* (that is, to come from theory to data) as well as for *data analysis* (that is, to come from data to theory). Whereas students are most often familiar with basic methods of data collection, either quantitative or qualitative in nature, data analysis is often much more implicit and not codified in tools or instruments. But how do you cope with hundreds of pages of transcribed interviews? What are now the results of the interviews? Which statistical tests can be applied given the employed data collection methods? Students should therefore in advance inform themselves about the wide range of methods and the availability of respective instruments (e.g., statistical software packages such as R or SPSS, content analysis software such as Atlas Ti) for data analysis. Students can obtain more information on the software available on the campus computers from the IT Servicedesk. Software for students own computers can be purchased from surspot.nl or from the WUR-shop in the forum building.

Propose a **working plan and time scheme:** The research proposal should include a comprehensive working plan, indicating all the steps in carrying out the research, in a logical order. The steps should be distributed in a feasible manner over the available time period (in most cases 26 weeks for 36 credit points). The student should agree with the supervisor on the frequency of contact and deadlines for delivering (parts of) the thesis proposal and report.

Develop a **budget** (optional): for some types of fieldwork, such as students travelling abroad, the supervisor may request the student to elaborate a budget**.** This should include the costs of travel to and in the field study area; field assistance (e.g. translators, guides etc); equipment (e.g. external hard disk for backups); visa costs; insurance and daily living costs. The student should ensure that they have sufficient financial means to carry out the thesis and that this is understood and agreed upon between student and supervisor during the proposal stage (see also 4.2).

Obtain **approval for travel to risk areas** if you have in mind to go there: It is the students' responsibility to check that the area they propose to conduct fieldwork in is safe to travel to and work in. This can be done by checking on the website of www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/reisadviezen (only in Dutch). If the study area is coded as a risk area (colored yellow or orange), then students need to complete a Request form for Travelling to Risk Area(s) which includes a questionnaire upon which approval of requests for travelling to risk area(s) are granted. Relevant information with some web links can be found in Annex J. It is the travel policy of Wageningen University that students travelling to risk areas, is only allowed with the approval of WUR. Students are never allowed to travel to or through areas coded red. Sometimes small areas are not clear on the government website, and alternative sites such as form the French or British government advice to travelers can provide supporting information to guide the approval process.

2.9 Thesis proposal assessment and go/no-go-decision

The final research proposal is graded and forms the basis for a go- or no-go-decision by the supervisor for the further continuation of the thesis research. If the thesis is graded with a 5.5 or higher, this automatically implies a go decision and the student is allowed to continue the thesis research. In case a grade of a 5 or lower is given, the thesis process is ended and the student must start a new thesis to obtain his or her MSc degree.

The research proposal is graded according to the four criteria used for the evaluation mentioned below. They evaluate to what extent the student is able:

- To articulate a theoretically and empirically well-grounded and convincing problem statement.
- To formulate a clear question and a focused objective and/or testable hypothesis.
- To develop an appropriate methodological design, including a conceptual framework and appropriate methods for data collection and analysis.
- And to present the proposal in a clear and well-structured start colloquium.

The grade for the proposal is the first partial grade of the thesis grade (see Annexes H and I for the Thesis Assessment Form and the Thesis Assessment rubric).

The following procedure for completing and grading the thesis proposal applies:

1. In the contract, a specific date is agreed for the completion of the proposal (usually four to six weeks after the start of the contract, but this can differ when students are not available to work on the thesis for the expected 42 hours a week).
2. On that date, the quality of the proposal is discussed during a meeting (usually, this is the second or in some cases the third supervision meeting) by the supervisor and the student. In case of sufficient quality, the decision for a go is made during that meeting.
3. If on that date the proposal cannot be approved, the student gets one opportunity to repair the proposal. A deadline is set within two weeks and the revised proposal will be assessed by the supervisor and a second reader (examiner) and if this is deemed to be of sufficient quality a maximum grade of a 6 may be noted for the first three assessment criteria. If this is not of sufficient quality, a no-go decision is made.

The final proposal will be digitally stored by the supervisor on the common FNP drive in the folder FNP MSc thesis proposals. After the successful completion of the proposal, students can hold their start colloquium and receive the final grade of the proposal. All four assessment elements have to be sufficient in order to proceed.

2.10 FNP colloquium sessions

To allow exchanges between our MSc students carrying out their thesis research, students are required to attend the FNP colloquium sessions. Usually these are organized every first Thursday afternoon of each month. Each thesis student is required to:

1. Present their proposal at the start colloquium
2. Present their (draft) thesis results at a final colloquium
3. Attend a minimum of three full colloquia sessions or a minimum of 6 presentations of fellow students (in case three full colloquia sessions amount to less than 6 presentations)

Attendance of colloquia as well as other obligatory parts of the thesis trajectory can be registered on the form in Annex F.

Start colloquium

A start colloquium or presentation of the thesis proposal will take place before the fieldwork or data collection starts. The purpose of the proposal presentation as well as how it is organized can be found in Annex C.

Final colloquium

In order to present the major findings of the thesis research a so-called final colloquium will be given by the student. The purpose of this final presentation is to present the main research results to a wider audience of interested students and staff. See Annex D for additional information on the final colloquium.

2.11 Carrying out the research

When carrying out the research, special attention should be given to organizational, ethical and safety aspects. Possible economic, social and technical constrains (e.g. rainy seasons, harvesting time, holidays of respondents/interviewees) should be taken into account as much as possible in advance of the research work. If unforeseeable circumstances do occur, the research plan should be adapted after consultation with the supervisor.

The student has to respect social, cultural and interpersonal norms and standards. This holds particularly true for privacy aspects of organizations and persons. Before data collection, the student has to make agreements on how to deal with the identity of respondents in the thesis and how to organize feedback about the results of the research.

It is recommended to clearly document all research activities, findings and sources, including also seemingly small details. Analytical skills should be accompanied by organizational accuracy. Experience shows that this can save a lot of time when finally preparing the thesis report.

Also in the phase of carrying out the research it is recommended to keep in contact with the supervisor. The frequency and contact media (e.g. email, phone, what's app depending on the field location) should be agreed with the supervisor prior to fieldwork commencing.

2.12 Writing the thesis report

The research activities should finally result in a comprehensive, consistent and concise thesis report. The thesis report is on average is between 60 to 80 pages. It should be written according to scientific standards and using software to help layout the report (such as creating an automatic table of contents and page numbering). In general the thesis report is structured in the following way:

- **Title page**: including the following information:
  - Name of the student and registration number;
  - Title of the thesis research;
  - Name of the supervisor(s);
  - Name of the chair group and university;
  - Month and year of publication.

  A series number on the report is not required any more.

- **Acknowledgements: (optional)** Acknowledging the support of specific people, such as translators, communities, hosts and any external counterparts, financers or sponsors**.**

- **Table of content:** Providing the overview on the chapter structure with respective page numbers, tables of figures and tables and list of annexes.

- **Summary or abstract:** Providing a short, but comprehensive summary or abstract of the thesis. The length should not exceed one A4 page.

- **Introduction:** This part includes the problem statement (see also chapter "Research proposal"), the scientific objectives and in some cases also the research questions (see also chapter "Research proposal"). It can be completed by a characterization of the type of work (referring to the first question in the methodology part of the research proposal), a short outline and the structure of the subsequent chapters.

- **Theoretical Framework:** In this section the review of the theoretical and empirical literature and the reconstruction of the used theoretical concepts will be provided (see also section "research proposal"). The theoretical framework is very often completed by a conceptual model, in which the relations of the relevant concepts (e.g., behavior, action, values, community) of the applied theories are presented (see also chapter "preparation of a research proposal"). This chapter can also contain the research questions.

- **Research methodology:** Present the overall research design, i.e., the general approach of the study. Next, information is given on the used information sources, as well as the applied methods and instruments for selection of research locations and respondents, and methods for data collection and data analysis (see also section "research proposal"). In addition, the chapter should report the actual research process (e.g., also problems which occurred). If the research has been a case study, circumstances as well as the case should be described here. Finally this part includes information on relevant ethical considerations and how they were addressed in the research (guidance on ethical issues can be found in most methodology handbooks) as well as data management issues (see 4.6).

  The first three parts of the thesis will be based on the proposal but in many cases they will need updating and rewriting.

- **Results:** Present the results of your research. The challenge is to structure the results chapter in such a way that it facilitates the analysis, the answering of the research questions and the discussion of the objective. The results are often presented in more than one chapter, for example when part of the analysis involves a comparison.

- **Discussion and conclusio**n: This can be presented in one or two separate chapters. This section should not contain new data and all the ingredients necessary to answer the research questions should have already been presented. A useful structure is as follows:
  1. A succinct wrapping up of the findings in conceptual terms.
  2. Systematic answers to all the research questions.
  3. A discussion in which the findings are discussed in connection with wider relevant scientific debates. This is the literature used in the problem statement and the theoretical framework. New sources can be used here as well. The contribution of the thesis to academic debates should be clearly articulated and the objectives should be addressed.
  4. A reflection on the theoretical framework and the methods used (as well as the limitations of the study). This can be combined with point 3.
  5. Recommendations for practice or for further research (optional).

- **Bibliography:** In this section a list of *all* referred literature should be given, sorted in alphabetical order with the last name of the author. This section (like the theoretical framework) can be seen as a sort of "business card" for the researcher. Information given in the bibliography should be complete and accurate. The style for the different types of publications (articles in journals, books, chapters in books etc.) should be consistent. Some researchers prefer to mention information sources, such as policy documents and internet sources separately. If reference is made to information on the internet, the complete web-address should be given, and the date on which the information has been retrieved or accessed (*e.g., Ministry of LNV (2002): Dutch Forest Policy. Public brochure downloadable at http://www.lnv.nl/brochure.pdf. Information derived on June, 15th 2002*).

- **Annexes/Appendices**: The annex should include information, which can be missed in the direct text body, which, however, is relevant for the understanding of the research or of important steps of it. This could mean for example the inclusion of the original data, the list of interviewed persons, background information on the study area, the questionnaire, further detailed statistical analysis, etc. Note that also the annex pages should be numbered consistently with the general text.

The thesis structure reflects the standard chapters used for scientific reports: the 'Introduction'-section forming chapter 1, the 'Theoretical framework' forming chapter 2, and so on. However, different types of research (e.g., historical research, developing methods) might require a different chapter structure.

2.13 Final verbal examination

The aim of the final verbal examination is to reflect on the whole 'scientific training' process, which the student has undergone in preparing the MSc thesis and to place the MSc thesis in the ongoing scientific debates and the wider context of forest and nature conservation policy. The student, supervisor and the examiner participate in the final examination talk. The chair holder is acting as the examiner. The date for the final examination should be arranged at least three weeks in advance.

The examination discussion takes around about 45 minutes, comprised of about 30 minutes of questions and discussions, followed by a feedback and the announcement of the final grade. In preparation of the final examination discussion the student receives a thesis evaluation form (see 4.4 and Annex G), which has been completed by his or her supervisor(s). It is the student's responsibility to provide the supervisor(s) and the examiner with a hard copy and a digital copy of the final MSc thesis no later than two weeks in advance of the talk. The student should not neglect this rule, because it might delay the examination.

The thesis evaluation form does not yet contain a grade and can be modified on the basis of the verbal examination. In the beginning of the final examination discussion the student will be provided with the opportunity to react on the supervisor's evaluation. Afterwards the examiner or the second supervisor will pose questions about the wider context of the thesis topic, possibly including issues from earlier course work. After a short consultation between supervisor and examiner, the final grade will be announced to the student. The MSc thesis grade can only be recorded once all administrative issues (see following section) have been completed.

2.14 Grading

Grading is conducted in two steps. The first grade that will be obtained is based on the proposal and start colloquium and is the basis for the go- / no-go decision. To make the grading transparent, a Thesis Evaluation Sheet (Annex G), Thesis Assessment Form (Annex H) and rubrics to assess the proposal and the thesis are provided (Annex I). The grading is conducted using the standard grading scale used by Wageningen University ranging from 0 to 10, with a grade lower than 5.5 denoting a "fail". All of the main categories in the Thesis Assessment Form should be evaluated as at least 5.5 for a "pass". The final grade will be announced immediately after the final examination talk. The rubric used to guide the grading is shown in Annex I.

Conforming to Wageningen University standards, the grading is based on the research proposal (including the start colloquium), research competences, the quality of the thesis report and the final colloquium and the results of the verbal thesis examination. After the examination talk, the supervisors and the examiner together decide on the final grade and subsequently, the student receives an explanation of the grade. If students are graded as insufficient (under 5.5), they may be given one opportunity to repair their thesis. After successful reparation, the maximum grade a students can obtain is a 6. If after the repair, the grade is still insufficient (under 5.5) the student should look for another thesis topic. In some cases, for example if the supervisor believes that the thesis report and potential repair will be insufficient that a minimum of a 5.5 can be achieved, no opportunity for repair will be given and the thesis is grades as an insufficient.

Repeated delays or instances of missed deadlines or meetings may be reason to terminate the thesis process (see section about the thesis contract). If students are unable to make deadlines, meetings or other agreements, a timely notification to the supervisors is crucial. Depending on the reasons for delay, the supervisor may grant an extension. If considered appropriate, the supervisor can ask for proof (e.g. a doctor's notice). Students can also raise problems with their study advisor.

3. Rules and regulations

3.1 MSc thesis contract

The contract is signed by the student, the supervisor and the examiner. The supervisor gives the original of the signed contract to the secretariat and sends scanned copies to the student, the supervisor(s) and the FNP MSc thesis coordinator. The thesis coordinator sends a copy to the study advisor. The secretariat is at the same time responsible for including the student's name in the mailing list of all MSc-students at the FNP group, through which the MSc colloquia will be announced as well as other information will be distributed.

3.2 Costs associated with carrying out the MSc research

All MSc research should be planned in such a manner that no new project finances or external funding (such as grants) need to be acquired. The student should try to rely on existing administrative and logistic support from ongoing Wageningen University and Research projects where available, or external organizations. If additional finance is not found, all costs must be borne by the student.

3.3 Printing costs of thesis

The student must provide the supervisor(s) and the examiner each with one printed copy of the thesis. Reasonable costs for two copies (to the maximum of €15) can be reimbursed by the chair group. A copy of the reimbursement form is found in Annex K. Students can contact Keen-mun Poon (keenmun.poon@wur.nl) to submit the claim and for any questions. FNP's administrator Maria Pierce (maria.pierce@wur.nl) will transfer the amount to the student's bank account. Any additional copies must be funded by other means. In addition to the printed copies, the student must also submit an electronic copy (in pdf format) that will be forwarded to the library and stored in FNP thesis archive.

3.4 Thesis Evaluation Sheet

Written feedback on the student's performance during the 'training' process of preparing the MSc thesis will be provided through the FNP Thesis Evaluation Sheet. This sheet has been exclusively designed for FNP as a basis for the verbal examination (see Annex G).

The supervisor will fill in the thesis evaluation sheet after receiving the final version of the MSc thesis (at least two weeks in advance of the date for the final talk). The supervisor will provide the completed evaluation sheet to the student and examiner no later than three working days in advance of the final examination talk, in order to allow for the student's preparation of the talk.

3.5 Plagiarism and codes of conduct

The fact that all research directly or indirectly based on the intellectual work of others, on theories, their models or research findings, makes scientific writing a risky process, especially in an era in which possibilities to 'cut and paste' are overwhelming. Plagiarism - using the work of someone else without acknowledging it - is considered theft of intellectual property. When quoting, paraphrasing and summarizing the intellectual work of others, it is necessary to cite the source of that work – without exception.

A charge of plagiarism can have severe consequences. Wageningen University strongly insists on documenting sources. To avoid plagiarism, staff screen all work carefully and the University has made software available (e.g., TurnItIn) for this purpose. Supervisors are obliged to report all suspicions of plagiarism to the Examining Board and to student(s). After providing a hearing to the student(s) involved, the Examining Board decides if fraud has actually occurred and may punish the student(s) by preventing them from completing the subject (in his case from submitting the thesis) for up to one year. For further information see Student Charter 2017/2018 (https://www.wur.nl/en/Education-Programmes/Current-Students/student-charter-2017-2018.htm). Students are expected to be familiar with proper referencing techniques.

Also carefully read the plagiarism statement on the FNP website:. https://www.wur.nl/en/Research-Results/Chair-groups/Environmental-Sciences/Forest-and-Nature-Conservation-Policy-Group/Education.htm).

Students should take notice of and comply with ethical guidelines and codes of conduct. See https://www.wur.nl/en/Education-Programmes/PhD-Programme/Graduate-Schools/www.wur.nlwimek/PhD-information/Codes-of-conduct.htm and especially the Wageningen Code of Conduct for Scientific Practice https://www.wur.nl/upload_mm/c/b/b/fdf9936f-f790-4b1c-a238-1d2d592f79f9_Cide%20of%20conduct.pdf. Students doing research aboard also have the responsivity to check that they comply with research codes of practice in that country. For example, in Indonesia you need a research permit.

3.6 Copyrights of thesis and data management

MSc theses are normally entered in the E-articles depot of Wageningen University and are publically available as an open access publication. The author(s) remain(s) the copyright owners of the MSc thesis. However, FNP holds the copyrights of the data gathered and used. This means that the FNP group can use these data for further research and publications. FNP may seek the collaboration of the student concerned, but is not required to do so. In order to maintain transparency or confidentiality, primary data such as figures, numbers and transcribed interviews have to be stored in digital form with the FNP secretariat. Confidentiality of data and other information should always be checked on beforehand.

In case a publication (article, book chapter) based on the outcomes of the thesis project is considered by the student, the supervisor has to give permission for this publication. Generally the supervisor is named as one of the authors (often first author or second author) of any publication resulting from an MSc thesis, except when supervisors explicitly give permission to a student to publish without their involvement. Sometimes students are contacted by commercial book publishers to publish (parts of) the thesis. Students are advised to check thoroughly whether such offers are from reputable publishers.

Data Management is a term that describes the "*organization, structure, storage, and legal care for data used or generated during a research project*" (WUR, 2015). The ultimate goal of data management is to trace back the data from raw data to the published forms. That means that each step of the research process, from data collection, to data transformations, the final analyses, and the reporting needs to be documented and stored in a secure centralized location.

MSc thesis projects at the FNP-group (i.e. with a FNP-804xx code) are required to follow the guidelines of the Data Management Plan of the FNP group. In these FNP-data-guidelines the storage and traceability of data of FNP-research projects are explained. To support students who carry out an MSc thesis at the FNP group, separate instructions have been developed to guide the student through the data management process. These instructions can be found in Annex E. MSc students at the FNP group are obliged to follow the instructions; the MSc thesis will not be graded unless the MSc student satisfies the demands set.

3.7 Unforeseen problems

If the student faces problems such as delays, psychological or physical problems, both the supervisor and study adviser should be informed as soon as possible in order to make new arrangements.

Annex A: Checklist of actions and responsibilities

	Action	*Forms*	*Who*
1.	Contact with thesis coordinator		*Student*
2.	Advise students on available projects and supervisors		*Thesis coordinator*
3.	Fix thesis topic		*Student, supervisor*
4.	Student fills in and signs MSc-thesis contract, supervisor checks, agrees and signs	*Thesis contract*	*Student, supervisor*
5.	Examiner is appointed		*Head of the chair*
6.	Sign thesis contract	*Thesis contract*	*Examiner*
7.	Send completed thesis contract (pdf) to the FNP secretariat and thesis supervisor	*Thesis contract*	*Supervisor*
8.	Register MSc project and name of the student in the info-bulletin and for start colloquia		*Thesis coordinator*
9.	Registration of MS -project: ▪ providing copies of contract to a.) student, b.) supervisor, c.) FNP archive, d.) study advisor ▪ registering student in administrative system ▪ including student into FNP-students mailing list		*Supervisor, student administration*
10.	Prepare research proposal		*Student (supervisor)*
11.	Attend at least 3 colloquia sessions of other students, obtain signatures of attendance and participation	*Annex F*	*Student (thesis coordinator)*
12.	Present draft proposal at start colloquia, revise based on feedback and submit final version (pdf) to supervisor	*Annex F*	*Student (supervisor)*
13.	Grade research proposal, Go/No-go decision and submission of the proposal to FNP supervisor . Proposal stored on FNP network	*Thesis Assessment Form*	*Supervisor*
14.	Conduct thesis work		*Student*
15.	Upon agreement that thesis is near finalization, agree a date to present at final colloquia		*Supervisor*
16.	Arrange date for final colloquium presentation and present thesis		*Student, colloquium coordinator/secretariat (supervisor)*
17.	Submit thesis to Turnitin to check plagiarism		*Supervisor*
18.	Arrange date for the verbal examination with examiner		*Supervisor, secretariat (examiner)*
19.	Submit final thesis to supervisor and examiner (1 hard copy each and a digital copy) two weeks in advance of examination		*Student*
20.	Check fulfillment of requirements: participation at 3 colloquia meetings		*Supervisor*
21.	Fill in thesis evaluation form, send a copy to student and examiner 1 week in advance of verbal examination. Prepare Thesis evaluation form	*Thesis assessment form, thesis evaluation sheet*	*Supervisor*
22.	Verbal examination		*Student, supervisor, examiner*
23.	Grade thesis	*Thesis assess-ment form*	*Examiner, supervisor*
24.	Send thesis grade to secretariat and thesis coordinator	*Thesis assess-ment form*	*Supervisor*
25.	Deliver two final copies and 1 pdf-file of MSc thesis to secretariat (other copies dependent on arrangements)		*Student, (supervisor, secretariat)*

26. Send digital thesis data to the supervisor — *Student*
27. File thesis report and data on FNP network — *Supervisor*
28. Administrative finalization: — *Student administration*
    - grades to central administration,
    - delivering digital copy to library
    - deleting student from FNP_students mailing list after graduation

Underlined actions indicate main responsibility, (brackets) indicates other people concerned

Annex B: Thesis Contract Form

Wageningen University Master Thesis Agreement

This Wageningen University (WU) master thesis agreement serves to lay down agreements between a master student and a chair group. The agreement registers rights and duties of both parties and is a further supplementation and elaboration of the Higher Education and Research Act (WHW), Education and Examining Regulations and the Student Charter.

This agreement has to be completed for each master thesis by the student and a representative of the chair group before the start of the study activities.

The student and representative sign three copies of the form. Both receive a copy. A third one is send to a representative of the programme, the study advisor mentioned below.

When the agreement is modified the student will receive a copy of the adjusted form.

For complaints on the supervision or assessment the student can appeal to:
- The study advisor for advice and support
- The Examining Board for advice on procedures or an official complaint.
- The Examination Appeals Board.
- A dean or a Confidential advisor for students

For additional information see the explanation on page 4.

1. Information on student and chair group

Student: .....
Study programme: .....
Registration number: .....
Study advisor: .....

Chair group: .....
Supervisor(s): .....
Examiner b[1]: .....
Course code: .....
Examiner a[2]: _____

The student is informed upon the (written) guidelines and rules of the chair group for thesis students: yes/no

2. Prerequisite course(s)

Course code:	_____	Passed:	yes/no
Course code:	.....	Passed:	yes/no

3. Admission to the thesis

Study advisor ..... has stated that the student is qualified[3] for a master thesis and that the thesis is compulsory for the programme of the student.

[1] This name can be entered later.
[2] This can be the supervisor.
[3] This means that the student has completed all requirements for starting with this master thesis.

4. Title and planning

Title of the thesis project: _____

Date of start: _____

Date of completion thesis proposal: _____

Date of finish: _____

Special arrangements for planning: _____

5. Arrangements on supervision

(Arrangements about the type and intensity of meetings of student and supervisor on role and responsibilities when more supervisors or more chair groups are involved)

6. Arrangements on facilities

(Work place (office/lab), access to buildings and locations. Availability and use of equipment, materials and facilities, field work and travel in foreign locations)

7. Arrangements regarding the thesis report

(Language and lay out, time and format of transfer of results and data, agreements on secrecy of results and publicity of the thesis report, writing thesis as an article)

8. Arrangements for individual situations

(Circumstances beyond one's control, disability, absence for special reasons)

9. Assessment

The assessment form[4] for Wageningen University theses has to be used. The percentages in the assessment form that will be used are:

Learning outcomes (assessment criteria)	Percentage
A. Research proposal	10
B. Research competence	30
C. Thesis report	50
D. Colloquium	5
E. Examination	5

None of these five categories can be lower than 5.5.

The assessment will be done in week (on) .....

The verbal examination will be conducted in week .....

10. Signature

The student agrees to report any relevant change in circumstances which may affect the results of the project to the supervisor.

The student declares that they are acquainted with rules and procedures of the chair group and with the assessment form. The chair group declares to have provided the student with all relevant information (including rules, regulations, safety issues).

Wageningen,

	Name	Date	Signature
Student:	.....	.....	.....
Supervisor(s):	.....	.....	.....
Examiner a:	.....	.....	.....
Examiner b:	_____	.....	.....

[4] https://portal.wur.nl/sites/owi/kwaliteitszorg/Policy Documents and Forms/Thesis assessment form WU UK v9.xls

Explanation[5]

1. Information student and chair group
The study advisor has to be asked for advice on the student's qualifications for a master thesis. The study advisor has to be informed about arrangements the student wants to make to establish whether the student may take this thesis and to keep record of the student's progress.
The examiner will be the chair holder being responsible for the thesis. The supervisor takes care of daily supervision. A supervisor from an external organization cannot have a formal role and is not involved in the assessment. If more than one supervisors and chair groups is involved, each role should be explained under item 5. WUR employees outside the university section (e.g. researchers) can be regarded as supervisor like a WU lecturer.

2. Prerequisites
Chairs can require a maximum of two prerequisite courses (in total 12 credits) for starting a thesis. These prerequisites have to be published in the study handbook. The student has to pass the exam(s) to gain access to the thesis.

3. Admission to the thesis
The chair group (supervisor, coordinator education) should contact the study advisor personally to be informed about the student being qualified for starting with the master thesis.

4. Description and planning
In general reference can be made to a previously described project proposal of the chair group with subject and type of activities. It is considered very important that the student writes a detailed project description and is aware of all consequences with respect to type of activities, intensity and planning of work. If the student intends to interrupt the project for exams or leave the supervisor should agree in advance.

5. Arrangements on supervision
A supervisor will have his own rules for planning meetings with students, for involvement of co-workers. Especially when more supervisors and chair groups are involved it should be avoided that the student is confronted with conflicting rules and opinions. Only one supervisor should be the focal point for the student.

6. Arrangements on facilities
The chair group takes care of the facilities the student needs. In general it should be assumed that the student is not familiar with the policy concerning priorities for use of equipment and facilities, and is not aware who is in charge of them. It should be explained to the student that arrangements can never be a guarantee for availability and that because of unpredictable circumstances the thesis project may have to be adapted with respect to time planning and/or content. Chair group and student have to find solutions together.

7. Arrangements on report
Specific rules on the lay-out of a report, the transfer of data sets and processed results have to be agreed. The thesis project can be part of a larger project in which external partners are involved, or in which results may be generated that require confidentially. The university has rules on protection and embargo of scientific results. Thesis reports can be registered with a restriction on disclosure of contents. The examiners and supervisor(s), however, always need a full copy to assess the student. All master theses have to be uploaded to the Wageningen UR Digital Library through the PURE system AIR (in Dutch: Administratie, Inschrijving en Resultaten; Administration Enrolment data and Results). It is up to the involved chair group and student to decide whether the thesis will be made public or not in the Digital Library.

8. Arrangements for individual situations
Students can ask for specific facilities in the case of specific circumstances. The student and chair group can ask study advisor or dean for advice.

9. Assessment procedure
Examining Boards and Board of the Education Institute have decided[6] in 2006 that all chair groups of WU have to use the standard assessment form for theses and two examiners. The chair group can adjust the weight (percentages) of the assessment criteria on the excel-form. The student should be informed on this (item 9 of this agreement). The completed assessment form for the thesis has to be uploaded to the PURE system.

[5] This Master Thesis Agreement form is established by the Board of the Education Institute in September 2009: it is a revision of the Thesis Contract used at WU since January 1996.
[6] https://portal.wur.nl/sites/owi/kwaliteitszorg/Policy%20Documents%20and%20Forms/thesis-letter-061102.pdf

Annex C: Start Colloquium

A start colloquium is obligatory for every FNP-thesis student. The student will present his or her thesis proposal after permission given by the supervisor and before the data collection starts. During the colloquium the student presents the relevant parts of the proposal, like the problem statement, the objective and research question(s), and the methodological design. The time span for this is 10 minutes. The presentation will be followed by 20 minutes of discussion and the student will get the opportunity to receive feedback from the audience. This feedback might be useful to improve the final draft proposal one more time.

The FNP chair considers the participation in the colloquia series an essential aspect of doing an MSc project, as this platform offers excellent opportunities for both presenters and audience, to reflect on background, objective, theoretical frame, and methodological approach selected of own and other's research projects.

The aims of the start colloquium are the following:

1) For the individual MSc student:
- The presentation will serve as milestone for final clarification of thesis background, objective, theoretical frame, methodology and methods chosen for the further research to be carried out.
- The meeting and discussion will give opportunity to all students to meet the FNP scientists and fellow students doing their thesis at FNP.

2) For the group of MSc students at FNP
- Starters will get to know each other and get insight into structure, progress, potential problems, and appropriate solution strategies for doing MSc thesis work.
- Experienced MSc students will train their ability to detect potential pitfalls in the projects presented and may be ready to provide valid hints how to avoid or solve problems during the research progress.

3) For scientists at FNP
- Scientists working at FNP will become better informed on recent research projects and respective project backgrounds. Chances for joint approaches and potential synergies may become obvious.

The proposal presentation will be graded based on content of the slides and verbal performance of the student and the response to the questions from the audience. See also the rubric for assessing these in Annex I.

Annex D: Final Colloquium

Students working on their FNP Master Thesis have to give a presentation at the end of the thesis process as well.

The final colloquium is meant to share the results and new (scientific) insights with a broader audience of students and staff. The presentation will be followed by asking questions, discussion and reflection. The final colloquium takes place after the report has been completed and before the examination talk, since it is part of the grading.

FNP final colloquia sessions will usually take place on the first Thursday afternoon of each month in Gaia or Lumen.

To schedule the colloquium the supervisor must give permission (meaning that the thesis report is sufficiently advanced and near to completion) and the student must contact the FNP secretariat to set a date.

The meetings are organized in the following way:

- Presentation of 10-15 minutes for the presentation of the research.
- Active participation of the fellow students in the discussions (rather than only staff) and giving feed-back on the presentation skills with respect to performance and use of powerpoint slides.
- General discussion and defense of parts or entire research approach chosen by the student presenting (10-15 minutes)
- In total, the student has 30 minutes available for the presentation and the discussion.

Annex E: Guidelines for Data Management

The aim of this section is to explain the guidelines on the storage and traceability of data in MSc theses carried out at the FNP group with the ultimate goal to trace back the data from raw data to the published forms. That means that each step of the research process, from data collection, to data transformations, the final analyses, and the reporting needs to be documented and stored in a secure centralized location. This is important, because:

- it helps you to find and understand your own data
- minimises the risk of data loss
- ensures your data are preserved for the years to come
- facilitates the collaboration with other researchers
- increases the visibility of your research
- meets requirements of possible funders, journals and WUR
- increases transparency, reproducibility and verifiability

Roles and responsibilities
All FNP MSc thesis students are responsible for adequate storage of the raw and processed data that they produce according to the guidelines provided in this document. The data set for the finalized thesis should contain the following documents and files:

- the project proposal
- raw data files
- processed data files

The student is responsible for delivering all files to the supervisor; the way file transfer takes place (such as zip-file, usb stick) should be done in consultation with the supervisor. Make sure to use the structure as described in this appendix. The data management files should be delivered together with the final thesis. The FNP supervisor checks the files and is responsible for permanent storage on a secure location, together with the FNP secretariat. The grade of the thesis can only be registered after the supervisor approves the files handed in by the student.

The supervisor together with the secretariat is also responsible for storage of:

- the thesis contract
- the final thesis report
- the signed FNP thesis evaluation report
- the signed OWI evaluation sheet

Where to store
It is strongly advised NOT to store your data on a location that does not get automatically backed up (e.g. the harddisk of your computer/laptop, an external harddrive, a USB stick). We strongly advise the student to keep reliable backups during the whole thesis process and request the student to store all data on **a network with central backup services (especially, in the case of privacy sensitive data)**.

How to store your data
Designing a logical folder structure and consistently applying descriptive file names over time makes your research process more efficient. Some best practices are provided below.

File names and versions

Giving your data files a descriptive name - and consistently applying your naming strategy over time - will help you locate specific data later on. You might consider using some of the following information in your file names:

- Author/creator/research
- Project title
- Content

- Date
- Kind of data (preferably: YYYYMMDD, for chronical organization)
- Version

Try to keep names short. You shouldn't try to use all the above aspects in the file name. Moreover, if you want to separate the different elements of your file name, do not use spaces or characters like ?\!@*%{[<> in the file name because some software programs don't recognize file names with these characters. Instead, use underscore (file_name), dashes (file-name) or camel case (FileName).

Folder structure

It's important to have a logical folder hierarchy that allows you and us to understand where to find your files. For the data-set to be handed in for the FNP MSc thesis data set we prefer the following folder structure:

Start a main folder that has your unique wur-name.

Example:
S. Cooper, MFN student, starts in 2020 a thesis on Dutch climate change policy and forest management at the FNP group, supervised by prof. Arts. S. Cooper's UNA (unique wur-name) is coope001.

Main folder: Coope001

Three new folders are created under this main folder, i.e.

- ProjectProposal
- RawData
- ProcessedData

UNA	
	ProjectProposal
	RawData
	ProcessedData

Folder ProjectProposal

In this folder, store the project proposal, preferably in a pdf format.

Example:
S. Cooper, MFN student, starts in 2020 a thesis on Dutch climate change policy and forest management at the FNP group, supervised by prof. Arts. S.

Storage name project proposal: ProjectProposal_Cooper.pdf

Folder RawData

In this folder, store the raw data files (such as transcripts of interviews, excel/SPSS raw data from web-surveys, etc.)

Example:
S. Cooper has carried out several interviews in 2020. Part of the interviews are with experts and part with forest managers. All interviews were transcribed. The transcribed expert interviews are stored in one pdf-file, and the transcribed interviews with the managers are stored in one pdf-file:

Storage name expert interviews: ExpertInterviews_Cooper.pdf
Storage name managers interviews: ManagerInterviews_Cooper.pdf

Next to the interviews, S. Cooper has also carried out a web-survey. All data from the survey was transported to SPSS. This SPSS file (with a complete description of all variables, the labels, and the values) is also stored.

Storage name SPSS file: SPSSfile_Cooper.sav

Folder ProcessedData

In this folder, store the data files after analyses (such as SPSS data after variable transformations, removal of outliers, etc. and a description or computer code (e.g., SPSS syntax file)) containing the steps to go from raw data file to the analyzed data file, including a short clarification of the steps of the analyses in English.

Example:
S. Cooper analysed and coded the interviews (both those of the experts and the managers) using Atlas.ti 7.

Storage name expert interviews: ExpertsAnalysis_Cooper.hpr7
Storage name managers interviews: ManagersAnalysis_Cooper.hpr7

All data from the survey was analysed in SPSS. This SPSS file (including all steps of the analysis) is stored.

Storage name SPSS file: SPSSAnalyses_Cooper.spv

The folder structure of the overall data management is as follows:

UNA		
	UNA_MSc_MF_YYYY.pdf	
	Project proposal	….
	Raw data	…….
	Processed data	…….

Example: S. Cooper's folder structure is as follows:		
Coope001		
	ProjectProposal	ProjectProposal_Cooper.pdf
	RawData	Coope001_MSc_RD_2018_1.pdf Coope001_MSc_RD_2018_2.pdf Coope001_MSc_RD_2018_3.sav
	ProcessedData	Coope001_MSc_PD_2018_1.hpr7 Coope001_MSc_PD_2018_2.hpr7 Coope001_MSc_PD_2018_3.spv

Annex F: FNP thesis path overview of main activities

Thesis topic:

Supervisor(s):

1. Progress of planning and implementation of thesis research

Activity	*Date approved / presented / completed*	*Signature supervisor*
Thesis contract		
Research proposal (+ Go/No Go decision)		
Start colloquium at FNP		
Final colloquium at FNP		
Final discussion with examiner		

2. Participation in FNP colloquia meetings

Attendance of minimal three colloquium sessions

Date	*Titles of presentation*	*Staff signature*

Annex G: Thesis Evaluation Sheet

Student	
Thesis Title	
Credits	
Supervisor	

Proposal (study design)	
Problem statement	
Research question, objective or hypothesis formulation	
Methodological design	
Proposal presentation	

Research Competence	
Commitment and perseverance	
Initiative and creativity	
Independence	
Efficiency in working with data	
Handling comments and development of research skills	
Keeping to the time schedule	

Thesis report	
Relevance research, clearness goals, delineation research	
Theoretical underpinning, use of literature	
Use of methods and data	
Critical reflection on the research performed (discussion)	
Clarity of conclusions and recommendations	
Writing skills	

Final Colloquium	
Graphical presentation	
Verbal presentation and defence	
Examination	
Defence of the thesis	
Knowledge of the study domain	
Remarks	

Overall Grade

Summarizing the given arguments the work is graded with

Wageningen, ___ date ___

.....

(Signature Supervisor)

Annex H: FNP Thesis Assessment Form

Assessment thesis Wageningen University

Fill out the single-lined fields. Use a comma or a point as decimal sign, depending on the language chosen.

Name chair group		Fee Percentage per Chairgroup	
Name student		FNP	100%
Registration number		LSG2	0%
Study programme		LSG3	0%
Specialisation			
Code thesis			
Short title thesis			
Date examination			
Country (of fieldwork)	1		
	2		Signature
Supervisor chair group			
Supervisor outside chair group (if so)			
Second reviewer/examiner			

	grading mark 1-10	relative weight *
Proposal (study design)		10%
1 Problem statement		
2 Research question, objective or hypothesis formulation		0.00
3 Methodological design		
4 Proposal presentation		
Research competence		30%
1 Commitment and perseverance		
2 Initiative and creativity		
3 Independence		0.00
4 Efficiency in working with data		
5 Handling comments and development of research skills		
6 Keeping to the time schedule		
Thesis report		50%
1 Relevance research, clearness goals, delineation research		
2 Theoretical underpinning, use of literature		
3 Use of methods and data		0.00
4 Critical reflection on the research performed (discussion)		
5 Clarity of conclusions and recommendations		
6 Writing skills		
Colloquium		5%
1 Graphical presentation		
2 Verbal presentation and defence		0.00
Examination		5%
1 Defence of the thesis		
2 Knowledge of study domain		0.00

* Relative weights may be adjusted, provided this is agreed upon and recorded in the thesis contract.

TOTAL	0.00
FINAL GRADE	0.0

Comment by supervisor

Comment by 2nd reviewer/examiner

6-10-2015

Annex I: Rubrics for Assessment of the Proposal and Thesis

This rubric serves as guidance for supervision and grading, no rights can be derived from this document

Item	Grade					
	1-3	4-5	6	7	8	9-10
PROPOSAL						
1 Problem statement Knowledge of research context/problem domain	Absent, not or only limitedly described	Fails to cite relevant knowledge or misinterprets knowledge	Cites some of the context/problems, but more sources are available	Makes a link to most relevant knowledge sources	Provides a good overview of relevant knowledge sources	Provides a thorough and nuanced overview, including sources from different domains
Significance/legitimacy of the problem statement	Absent	Incomplete and/or unclear	Very basic and/or limited to a basic identification of a gap in knowledge	Identification of gaps in knowledge, some arguments for the significance of the work	Good description, showing the significance of the work	Extensive and clear, shows potential for a significant scientific contribution
2 Research question & objective or hypothesis formulation	Absent or very unclear, unrelated to problem statement	Poorly phrased, not researchable. Relation to the problem statement illogical and poorly described.	In principal researchable, but unclear phrasing/ wording. Link to problem statement logical but poorly articulated	Mostly clear and researchable. Relation to problem statement logical, but not well defined	Well-defined, researchable. Relation with problem statement logical and well defined	Well-defined, researchable. Relation with problem statement defined in an excellent way
3 Methodological design, data analysis/collection Theory	Absent, no discussion of underlying theory	Some discussion of underlying theory, but the description shows serious errors or uses inappropriate theory.	Basic, reviews of theory but no evaluation.	Overview of relevant theory, mostly reviewing, some evaluation. Positioning of the research is rudimentary.	Good and critical review and evaluation of most relevant theory. Positioning of research and choices made well justified.	Sophisticated review and evaluation, clear positioning of research in larger theoretical context. Identifies a convincing scientific niche
Operationalisation and conceptual framework, strategy for data analysis	Absent	Incomplete and unclear.	Basic understanding of concepts. No clear application to topic. Unclear link with research questions and methodology.	Basic understanding of concepts. Some problems in the application to the topic or in the relation with research questions and methodology.	Good understanding and application. Some aspects show originality. Clear links to theory and methodology.	Excellent understanding of concepts, original theoretical contribution, excellent application to topic and well defined links to methodology
Methodology	Research method is missing, or is poorly described poorly justified	Research method is incomplete, with problems in justification	Research method is described, but is incomplete and/or not	Research method is described accurately with sufficient	Good description of research methods, embedded and well	Original/innovative and methodological approach fully substantiated and

Item	Grade					
	1-3	4-5	6	7	8	9-10
	(e.g. does not match with the research questions).	(e.g. relation with the research questions is not clear.)	well justified.	justification	justified	described transparently.
4 Proposal presentation Graphical presentation	Presentation has no structure. Slides poorly prepared	Presentation has unclear structure. Most slides poorly prepared.	Presentation has structure but quality of slides is mixed. Use of text, tables, graphs and graphics often not appropriate	Presentation has a clear structure with only few exceptions. Slides are mostly of sufficient quality with appropriate use of text, tables, graphs and graphics	Presentation has a clear structure. Slides have a good lay-out with appropriate use of text, tables, graphs and graphics.	Presentation has a clear structure. Slides have a good lay-out with appropriate use of text, tables, graphs and graphics.
Verbal presentation and defence	Insufficient delivery and defence	Unclear and insufficient delivery. Response to questions often insufficient	Delivery is mixed:. Often hard to follow. Response to questions not always sufficient	Delivery mostly of sufficient quality, but with some exceptions. Response to questions mostly sufficient	Clear and engaging delivery. Response to questions shows good understanding.	Clear and engaging delivery. Delivery and response show full mastery of the subjects.
RESEARCH COMPETENCE						
1.1. Commitment and perseverance	Student is not motivated, escapes work and gives up regularly.	Student has little motivation. Tends to be distracted easily. Has given up once or twice, was unable to meet challenges	Student is motivated at times, but often sees the work as a compulsory task. Is distracted from thesis work now and then.	The student is motivated. Overcomes an occasional setback with help of the supervisor	The student is motivated and/or overcomes an occasional setback on her own and considers the work as her own project.	The student is very motivated, goes at length to get the most out of the project. Takes complete control of her own project.
1.2. Initiative and creativity	Student shows no initiative or new ideas at all.	Student picks up some initiatives and/or new ideas suggested by others but the selection is not self-motivated..	Student shows some initiative and/or together with the supervisor develops one or two new ideas on minor parts of the research..	Student initiates discussions on new ideas with supervisor and develops one or two own ideas on minor parts of the research.	Student has creative ideas in major parts of the research process (problematization, research design and approach, or discussion)	Creative and innovative ideas is most parts of the research process..
1.3. Independence	The student only conducts the thesis properly after repeated detailed instructions. No critical self-reflection at all.	The student needs frequent instructions and well-defined tasks from the supervisor and the supervisor needs careful checks to see if all tasks have been performed. No critical self-reflection at all.	The supervisor is the main responsible for setting out the tasks, but the student is able to perform them, but not always in an independent way. Student is able to reflect on functioning with the help of the supervisor	Student selects and plans the tasks and steps together with the supervisor and performs these tasks mostly independently The student occasionally shows independence in critical self-reflection	Student plans and performs tasks mostly independently, asks for help from the supervisor when needed. Student actively performs critical self-reflection on some aspects of their functioning	Student plans and performs tasks independently and organizes sources of help independently. Asks for help from the supervisor when needed. Student actively performs critical self-reflection on various aspects of their own functioning and performance.

Item	Grade					
	1-3	4-5	6	7	8	9-10
1.4. Efficiency in working with data Data analysis	Student is lost when using data. Is not able to execute a systematic approach to data collection.	Able to organize the data, but is not able to perform checks and/or simple analyses.	Able to organize data on a basic level and perform some simple checks or unable to analyse the data independently. The way the data are used does not clearly contribute to objective and research questions	Able to organize the data, perform some basic checks and perform basic analyses that contribute to the objective and research questions.	Able to organize the data, perform commonly used checks and perform some advanced analyses of the data that contribute to the objective and research questions.	Able to organize the data, perform thorough checks and perform advanced and original analyses of the data that contribute to the objective and research questions
Data collection	No strategy or planning for data collection. No skills in execution of methods.	Insufficient strategy, planning and execution	Rudimentary strategy for data collection. Poor execution resulting in poor quality data	Sufficient strategy and execution. Sufficient quality of data but more could have been done	Good and systematic strategy for data collection. Good execution of methods resulting in good quality data	Good and systematic strategy for data collection. Excellent execution of methods.
1.5. Handling supervisor's comments and development of research skills	Student does not pick up suggestions and ideas of the supervisor. Knowledge and insight of the student is insufficient and the student is not able to take action to remedy them.	Student needs detailed instructions, implementation is insufficient. There is some progress in the research skills of the student, but suggestions of the supervisor are frequently ignored.	Student needs detailed instruction and incorporates some of the comments of the supervisor, but ignores others without arguments The student is able to adopt some skills as they are presented during supervision.	Student needs instruction but student incorporates most or all of the supervisor's comments. The student is able to adopt skills as they are presented during supervision and develops some skills independently as well.	Student does not need instruction. Supervisor comments are weighed by the student, asked for when needed and incorporated appropriately. The student is able to adopt new skills mostly independently, and asks for assistance from the supervisor if needed	Student does not need instruction. Supervisor's comments are critically weighed by the student and asked for when needed. The incorporation of comments is appropriate and systematic throughout the thesis The student has knowledge and insight on a scientific level.
1.6. Keeping to the time schedule	No time schedule made or kept	No realistic time schedule, deadlines agreements are not met. No appropriate justification and communication	Mostly realistic time schedule, but no timely adjustment of time schedule. Problems with meeting agreements and deadlines and with appropriate justification and communication	Realistic time schedule, with some adjustments, Agreements and deadlines are mostly met. Sometimes appropriate justification and communication is lacking.	Realistic time schedule, with timely adjustments. Student organizes the process and communicates timely and appropriately.	Realistic time schedule, with timely adjustments. Student organizes the process and communicates timely and appropriately.
THESIS REPORT						

Item	Grade					
	1-3	4-5	6	7	8	9-10
2.1. Relevance research, clearness goals, delineation research Knowledge of research context/problem domain	Absent, not or only limitedly described	Fails to cite relevant knowledge or misinterprets knowledge	Cites some of the context/problems, but more sources are available	Makes a link to most relevant knowledge sources	Provides a good overview of relevant knowledge sources	Provides a thorough and nuanced overview, including sources from different domains
Significance/legitimacy of the problem statement	Absent	Incomplete and/or unclear	Very basic and/or limited to a basic identification of a gap in knowledge	Identification of gaps in knowledge, some arguments for the significance of the work	Good description, showing the significance of the work	Extensive and clear, shows potential for a significant scientific contribution
Research question & objective or hypothesis formulation	Absent or very unclear, unrelated to problem statement	Poorly phrased, not researchable. Relation to the problem statement illogical and poorly described.	In principal researchable, but unclear phrasing/ wording. Link to problem statement logical but poorly articulated	Mostly clear and researchable. Relation to problem statement not logical, but not well defined	Well-defined, researchable. Relation with problem statement logical and well defined	Well-defined, researchable. Relation with problem statement logical and defined in an excellent way
2.2. Theoretical underpinning, use of literature Theory	Absent, no discussion of underlying theory	Some discussion of underlying theory, but the description shows serious errors or uses inappropriate theory.	Basic, reviews of theory but no evaluation.	Overview of relevant theory, mostly reviewing, some evaluation. Positioning of the research is rudimentary.	Good and critical review and evaluation of most relevant theory. Positioning of research and choices made well justified.	Sophisticated review and evaluation, clear positioning of research in larger theoretical context. Identifies a convincing scientific niche
Operationalisation and conceptual framework, strategy for data analysis	Absent	Incomplete and unclear.	Basic understanding of concepts. No clear application to topic. Unclear link with research questions and methodology.	Basic understanding of concepts. Some problems in the application to the topic or in the relation with research questions and methodology.	Good understanding and application. Some aspects show originality. Clear links to theory and methodology.	Excellent understanding of concepts, original theoretical contribution, excellent application to topic and well defined links to methodology
2.3 Use of methods and data Methodology	Missing, or is poorly described poorly justified (e.g. does not match with the research questions).	Incomplete, with problems in justification (e.g. relation with the research questions is not clear.)	Described, but incomplete and/or not well justified.	Described accurately with sufficient justification	Good description, embedded and well justified	Original/innovative and methodological approach fully substantiated and described transparently.

Item	Grade					
	1-3	4-5	6	7	8	9-10
Analysis and presentation	Presentation of results unfocused and incoherent. Analysis fully missing	Some signs of analysis but presentation of results mostly unfocused and incoherent.	Some structure in the presentation of results, but analytical focus is largely missing or incoherent.	Mostly clear and structured presentation of results. Analytical focus weak and not always coherent.	Clear and structured presentation of the results. Analytical focus sufficiently developed so that relevance for the objective and research questions is clear.	Clear and structured presentation of the results. Excellent conceptual and analytical focus. Analysis directly relevant for objective and research questions
2.4. Critical reflection on the research performed (discussion)	No discussion and/or reflection on the research.	Minimal discussion of results within context of relevant, wider scientific debates. The contribution of the thesis is not stated. No reflection on the limitations of the study.	Minimal discussion of results within context of relevant, wider scientific debates. The contribution of the thesis is unclear. Some reflection on limitations	Reasonable discussion of results within context of relevant, wider scientific debates. The contribution of the thesis is articulated, but not very strong. Sufficient reflection on limitations	Good discussion of results within context of relevant, wider scientific debates culminating in a clearly articulated and well grounded contribution of the thesis. Good reflection on limitations	Excellent discussion of results within context of relevant, wider scientific debates. Articulates a strong scientific contribution that goes beyond the state of the art. Good reflection on limitations
2.5. Clarity of conclusions and recommendations	Conclusions and recommendations largely absent	Answers to the research questions unclear and incomplete. Recommendations absent, unclear, unsubstantiated or unconnected	Sufficient answers to the research questions, but mostly incomplete or a repetition of the results. Recommendations mostly clear but problems with substantiation and connection with the findings and conclusions	Answers to the research questions clearly stated, sometimes repetitive or incomplete. Recommendations mostly clear and appropriately substantiated and connected to the findings and conclusions	Answers to the research questions complete and clearly and succinctly stated. Recommendations clear and appropriately substantiated and connected to the findings and conclusions	Answers to the research questions complete and clearly and succinctly stated. Recommendations clear and appropriately substantiated and connected to the findings and conclusions
2.6. Writing skills	Thesis is badly structured. Information often placed in wrong location. Level of detail is inappropriate throughout. Irrelevant information given. Significant problems with spelling and/or grammar	Structure incorrect in some places, placement of material illogical in many places. Level of detail varies widely (information missing or irrelevant). Significant problems with spelling and/or grammar.	Main structure is correct and mostly relevant information is included. Placement of material and/or argumentative structure often illogical. Numerous spelling or grammatical errors	Main structure is correct and mostly relevant information is included. Placement of material in different chapters and/or argumentative structure mostly logical but not always to the point. Few spelling or grammatical errors.	All information presented is relevant and in the right place, with few exceptions. Structure is clear, appropriate and followed through consistently. Clear argumentative structure with a good flow. Few spelling or grammatical errors	All information presented is relevant and in the right place. Structure is clear, appropriate and followed through consistently. Writing style shows excellent command of language with clear argumentative structure and excellent flow. Few spelling or grammatical errors

Item	Grade					
	1-3	4-5	6	7	8	9-10
COLLOQUIUM						
3.1. Graphical presentation	Presentation has no structure. Slides poorly prepared	Presentation has unclear structure. Most slides poorly prepared.	Presentation has structure but quality of slides is mixed. Use of text, tables, graphs and graphics often not appropriate	Presentation has a clear structure with only few exceptions. Slides are mostly of sufficient quality with appropriate use of text, tables, graphs and graphics	Presentation has a clear structure. Slides have a good lay-out with appropriate use of text, tables, graphs and graphics.	Presentation has a clear structure. Slides have a good lay-out with appropriate use of text, tables, graphs and graphics.
3.2. Verbal presentation and defence	Insufficient delivery and defence	Unclear and insufficient delivery. Response to questions often insufficient	Delivery is mixed:. Often hard to follow. Response to questions not always sufficient	Delivery mostly of sufficient quality, but with some exceptions. Response to questions mostly sufficient	Clear and engaging delivery. Response to questions shows good understanding.	Clear and engaging delivery. Delivery and response show full mastery of the subjects.
EXAMINATION						
4.1. Thesis defence	Student is not able to defend the thesis. Responses show no understanding.	Student has difficulty to defend the thesis. Responses show insufficient understanding	Student is able to defend some basis elements and choices made in the thesis. Shows sufficient understanding in responding to questions, but with clear limitations.	Student is mostly able to defend the thesis. Responses show sufficient understanding, including awareness of most choices made and the limitations of the study. Limited ability to place thesis in a scientific or practical context.	Student is able to defend the thesis Responses show good understanding, including awareness of most choices made and the limitations of the study. Student is able to indicate where the work could have been done better and is able to place thesis in a scientific or practical context.	Defence is a free and open exchange of excellent scientific quality. Responses demonstrate full understanding and mastery.
4.2. Knowledge of study domain	Student does not master the most basic knowledge	The student does not understand all of the subject matter discussed in the thesis.	Student understands the subject matter of the thesis on a textbook level.	Student understands the subject matter of the thesis, including the literature used.	Student shows a good understanding of the subjects discussed in thesis: and is aware of current discussions in the literature related to the topic.	Student shows excellent understanding of the subjects discussed in the thesis and is able to connect the thesis to wider relevant scientific debates.

Annex J: Request Travelling to Risk Area(s)

Questionnaire for approval student's request for travelling to risk area(s)

The travel policy of Wageningen University & Research (version October 2018) states that travelling to risk areas is only allowed with the approval of the supervisor and in case of discussion by the chair holder.
Please send this form to the contact person of your unit/science group no later than two weeks before the scheduled departure date. Some very relevant websites are listed below. Take good notice from this information if you consider travelling to a risk area:

- https://www.wur.nl/en/Education-Programmes/Current-Students/Travel-policy-for-students.htm
- https://intranet.wur.nl/umbraco/en/frequently-asked-questions/what-must-i-do-if-i-want-to-travel-to-a-country-or-area-with-a-higher-or-visible-safety-risk/
- https://www.wur.nl/upload_mm/3/4/8/67f41150-264b-4f8c-a3cf-f7117dc7a146_Travel%20policy%20WUR.pdf

Annex K: Thesis printing costs reimbursement form

WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITEIT
WAGENINGEN UR

Reimbursement copy costs
Reimbursement: maximum € 15,00

☐ **Chair group Forest and Nature Conservation Policy (FNP)**

☐ **Chair group Cultural Geography (GEO)**

Date	
Name	
Address	
Zip code and place	
Registration number	
Thesis/course code	☐ FNP ……. ☐ GEO …….
Total amount	€
IBAN number	
Name supervisor	
Signature supervisor	

Please return this form along with receipts to the administrator, Maria Pierce, Gaia-building, 3rd floor, room B317