

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Sociology, Anthropology, Demography e Geography

Panel Members

Sue Scott (Chair)	University of York, United Kingdom
Apostolos Papadapoulos	Harikopio University of Athens, Greece
Arne Dulsrud	Oslo Metropolitan University, Norway
Csaba Szalo	Masaryk University, Czech Republic
Diane Richardson	University of Newcastle, United Kingdom
David Inglis	University of Helsinki, Finland
Hannah Bradby	Uppsala University, Sweden
Marta Soler Gallart	University of Barcelona, Spain
Theo Wubbels	Utrecht University, The Netherlands

R&D Units

Centro de Estudos das Migrações e das Relações Interculturais (CEMRI)	Universidade Aberta (UAberta)
Centro de Estudos de Geografia e Ordenamento do Território (CEGOT)	Universidade de Coimbra (UC)
Centro de Estudos Geográficos - Universidade de Lisboa (CEG)	Instituto de Geografia e Ordenamento do Território da Universidade de Lisboa (IGOT/ULisboa)
Centro de Estudos Sociais (CES)	Centro de Estudos Sociais (CES)
Centro de Estudos Transdisciplinares para o Desenvolvimento (CETRAD)	Universidade de Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro (UTAD)
Centro de Investigação e Estudos de Sociologia (CIES-IUL)	ISCTE - Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL)
Centro de Investigação em Antropologia e Saúde (CIAS)	Universidade de Coimbra (UC)
Centro em Rede de Investigação em Antropologia (CRIA)	Centro em Rede de Investigação em Antropologia (CRIA)
Centro Interdisciplinar de Ciências Sociais (CICS.NOVA)	Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas (FCSH/UNL)
Centro Interdisciplinar de Estudos de Género (CIEG)	Instituto Superior de Ciências Sociais e Políticas (ISCSP/ULisboa)
Centro Lusíada de investigação em Serviço Social e Intervenção Social (CLISSIS)	Fundação Minerva - Cultura - Ensino e Investigação Científica (FMinerva)
CSG - Investigação em Ciências Sociais e Gestão (CSG)	Centro de Investigação em Sociologia Económica e das Organizações (SOCIUS/ISEG/ULisboa)
DINÂMIA'CET-IUL, Centro de Estudos Sobre a Mudança Socioeconómica e o Território (DINÂMIA'CET-IUL)	ISCTE - Instituto Universitário de Lisboa (ISCTE-IUL)
Instituto de Ciências Sociais da Universidade de Lisboa (ICS-ULisboa)	Instituto de Ciências Sociais da Universidade de Lisboa (ICS/ULisboa)
Instituto de Sociologia da Universidade do Porto (IS-UP)	Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto (FL/UP)
Unidade de Investigação em Educação e Intervenção Comunitária (RECI)	Instituto Piaget, Cooperativa para o Desenvolvimento Humano, Integral e Ecológico CRL (IPiaget)
Unidade de Investigação em Governança, Competitividade e Políticas Públicas (GOVCOPP)	Universidade de Aveiro (UA)
Unidade de Investigação Interdisciplinar - Comunidades Envelhecidas Funcionais (Age.Comm)	Instituto Politécnico de Castelo Branco (IPCB)

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Sociology, Anthropology, Demography e Geography

R&D Unit: Centro de Estudos das Migrações e das Relações Interculturais (CEMRI)

Coordinator: Maria Natália Pereira Ramos

Integrated PhD Researchers: 52

Overall Quality Grade: WEAK

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 2
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 2
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 1

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

While the general research strategy of the Centre states an aim to develop interdisciplinary research on migration and intercultural relation it will be hardly achieved successfully in its recent form of organisation. The Centre is more focused on social impact seeking training and knowledge dissemination activities than to achieve an internationally embedded excellent scientific research. Research groups could be more adequately designated as thematic units which combine research, training and dissemination. This situation can be explained by the Centre's functioning as a part of the University seeking public service by providing distance education, thus the burden to participate in training and dissemination does not make possible to focus more on basic scientific research activities. The further development of the Centre's research performance would require an establishment of its institutional autonomy which would make possible to achieve a balance between basic scientific research and other activities. Certainly, one can find at the Centre research themes and initiatives with a prospect like a project applying gender perspective on iconographic discourse, the utilisation of visual anthropology and the focus on intercultural education.

The Centre can be characterised by its thematic diversity and a decentralised organisational strategy. In respect to the publication practices of its integrated researchers there seems to be an emphasis on achieving high figures of publications without any focus on internationally recognised academic journals and publishers. In what regards to achievement related to research based projects, one is faced with a variety of particular themes, while there seems to be a coherence related to the core topic of migration, it is not clear how could these particular projects generate 74 books, 222 book-chapters, 142 proceeding chapter and 264 peer-reviewed articles while engaging up to 59 integrated researchers during the given period. Part of the explanation seems to be given by the large scale participation of integrated researchers in educational and training activities of the University the Centre belongs to. For instance, the research group investigating migration was involved in a huge variety of publications and research activities; nevertheless, it is not clear how are these two activities related. The activities of the research group investigating intercultural communication seem to be more focused. While intercultural education provides a good opportunity for organisation of disseminating events, it would be beneficial to deepen the involvement of the Unit members in empirical research, too. The research group investigating gender relations while represents the smallest unit of the Centre by its historical focus, that also takes into consideration the relationship between gender and ethnicity, demonstrates a considerable international and interdisciplinary involvement. Beside a considerable participation in training activities, the Unit was able to develop an innovative interdisciplinary project applying gender perspective on iconographic discourse. From the perspective of emerging trends in the international academic field there is a sociologically highly relevant potential in the further research application of visual anthropology as well as in the gender based interpretation of iconographic representations.

Activities of the Centre take into consideration the institutional requirement of internationalisation; nevertheless, these cooperative relationships are often only indirectly connected to the main research profile of the Centre, that is migration. The area in which the Centre is able to successfully concentrate its human resources and institutional performance is constituted by collaborative practices is oriented on the social impact of scientific knowledge. The Centre developed cooperation with civil society associations and it is involved in training activities. The demographic structure of the Centre is rather imbalanced. It lacks a considerable number of young researchers who will be able to secure the institutional continuity and development of the Centre in the future.

In respect to the sustainability of research as well as the future development of the Centre it is crucial how is the Centre's relationship to PhD students and post-doctoral junior researchers institutionalised. In generally electronic

forms of communication are the usual forms of supervision and collaboration. Other specific forms of an electronic-online platform for cooperation with supervisor and research group collaborators are not available. In the case of PhD students, internal communication networks are centred on the supervisor, sharing knowledge and experience among students is minimal and not institutionalised. Any formal representation of PhD students or junior researchers interests is missing. All interest related issues are mediated by supervisors and coordinators. PhD students work on their research projects mainly without any kind of funding. There are also junior researchers performing research and providing publications to the Centre entirely on a voluntary basis.

The recent form of institutional organisation of research at the University (Universidade Aberta) has to be regarded as a serious challenge to the sustainability of the Centre as a research organisation. However, the Centre's answer to this challenge is a further mobilisation of resources without any considerations to reorganise its institutional structure and its relationship to the University. Perhaps any transformations related to the division between teaching, social impact related activities, project administration, basic and applied research could be conceived in close cooperation with the University. One can detect a clearly negative incentive to participate in international projects caused by an institutional preference for extensive teaching and publication. The circulation between teaching and research positions is not a usual practice. Thus, to achieve further internationalisation of research performance oriented to Horizon Europe collaborations, Marie Curie Actions as well as ERC grants, a more reflective institutional strategy building would be required.

It is important to mention that the main bulk of researchers seem to be engaged in part-time research on a voluntary basis, which is not exactly contributing to the Center research effectiveness and engagement to internationalisation. The dominant mentality is towards researching Portuguese and Lusophone populations which in a way limits the scope of the Centre research. To sum up, the Centre is advised to take more determined steps towards developing a research agenda and objectives in alignment with the internationalization trajectory that enables visibility and excellence. The strategic decisions which need to be taken should be the result of collaborative and reflexive efforts as well as following the consultation of related research institutions and the wider institutional setting.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Sociology, Anthropology, Demography e Geography

R&D Unit: Centro de Estudos de Geografia e Ordenamento do Território (CEGOT)

Coordinator: Ana Paula Santana Rodrigues

Integrated PhD Researchers: 65

Overall Quality Grade: GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 3
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 3
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 3

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 667 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 3

Programmatic Funding: 153 K€.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

CEGOT's research is problem-oriented and focuses on the spatial aspects of social issues/problems. To address place-based problems it has relied on integrating various geographical approaches and interdisciplinary research. CEGOT has had significant dynamics over the years, supported by the fact that it has been entrusted with public funding for targeted place-based interventions. Moreover, the focus has been on specific research objectives which are very important for building CEGOT reputation over the years and it seems that there is a systematic endeavor towards this direction. CEGOT achievements seem to be based on systematic research and intensive work.

CEGOT has specialized in the geographies of health, while it has particular strengths in the areas of Urban Environmental Health, Seasonal Environmental Hazards and Health Equity. Moreover, its focus on applied Physical Geography research has enabled it to carry out intensive research on the drivers and consequences of climate change, forest fires and other natural and environmental hazards. The involvement of CEGOT in the creation and development of public policies for territorial planning, in the context of the national agenda, should not go unmentioned. The geographical position of the Centre has allowed it to be involved in local/regional projects, while also it participated in the revision of the National Program for Spatial Planning Policies (2016-2018). There are emerging fields of research in the area of socio-spatial dynamics of knowledge and innovation and more particularly regarding smart city research and the understanding of places as sites of economic valuation.

CEGOT has a significant record of published papers in international journals (137 Scopus-indexed papers for the period 2013-2017), it has been actively involved in (private and public) national and international (H2020) projects related to its areas of specialization, and participates in well-established international networks. Moreover, its members were involved in editing and publishing research in relevant scientific fora (Journal of Geography and Spatial Planning; Journal Cadernos de Geografia; The Dictionary of Applied Geography).

The Centre has been involved in the teaching of a considerable number of doctoral students per year, while there is a significant number of researchers (some have PhD) that carry out research in ongoing projects directly associated and/or coordinated by the Centre. There is considerable interaction between senior and younger researchers, while the average age of researchers is relatively low.

The consequences of the integration of three Units from different universities achieved by the Centre in the past period generate important challenges related to social sustainability as a research organization. Perhaps institutional transformations related to the division between teaching, social impact related activities, project administration, basic and applied research could be conceived in close cooperation with the home universities of the researchers. One can detect a clearly negative incentive to participate in international projects caused by an institutional preference for extensive teaching. The circulation between teaching and research positions is not a common practice. Thus, to achieve further internationalization of research performance oriented to Horizon Europe collaborations, Marie Curie Actions, as well as to ERC grants, a more reflective institutional strategy building would be required.

The target of internationalization is not equally achieved by the majority of Integrated Researchers, while at the same time more effective mechanisms should be in place for motivating researchers to pursue the Centre research objectives and obtain comparable achievements. There is a challenge between the further expansion of the Centre research agenda and the consolidation of its achievements. A more reflexive approach should be developed by the Centre so that it will increase its coherence and focus on the theoretical and policy lessons (and input) deriving from their research, participation in policy making and interaction between research and teaching.

In view of parochialism, as persistent danger for regional research organizations, CEGOT is advised to develop a future policy agenda which would allow strategic thinking in connection to its strengths and opportunities, given the wider competitive environment. The consolidation of its research and policy achievements is important for creating a research framework which would allow further expansion and specialization. For the future strategy of CEGOT, the concept of interdisciplinarity needs to be critically discussed and reflected upon, while multidisciplinary approaches could be also discussed and accommodated within the wider research framework of the Centre.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Sociology, Anthropology, Demography e Geography

R&D Unit: Centro de Estudos Geográficos - Universidade de Lisboa (CEG)

Coordinator: Mário Adriano Ferreira do Vale

Integrated PhD Researchers: 75

Overall Quality Grade: VERY GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 4
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 4
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 4

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 899 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 4

Programmatic Funding: 388 K€, including for 1 (Junior) New PhD Researcher Contract.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

CEG's mission is to foster geographical research, promote and disseminate geographical knowledge, and contribute to social inclusion and development, sustainable use of environmental resources and territorial cohesion with the lens of spatial justice. CEG conducts research in Geography and Planning, while also it is promoting interdisciplinary research. It engages an impressive number of integrated researchers (many of whom with PhD) and staff specialising in Geography and in Planning and in related fields.

CEG is organised along seven Research Groups, while it contains a number of transdisciplinary thematic lines which are built on specific areas constituting disciplinary interfaces. It disseminates its research results by publishing in high impact international journals (290 papers were published in the period 2013-2017). Moreover, CEG edits (since 1966) the journal *Finisterra*, which is indexed in various bibliometric databases. Particularly important are recent initiatives that illustrate CEG's commitment to social responsibility and its sense of giving back to society. The initiatives aim at engaging secondary education in advanced geographical teaching and expand the reach of geography, as part of social sciences, to wider regions of the world.

Internationalisation has been a significant vehicle for CEG over the years and it has resulted towards the widening of the Centre research scope. Some Research Groups have done particular advancements towards internationalisation. They have worked, as partners or coordinators, on several international projects, most of which are EU funded, and national projects. Another group has carried our research in collaboration with ESPON, DGRegio, Iberian-South American Network for Territorial Analysis and RSA network. Particularly important is another activity of CEG researchers, which is namely the coordination of the Portuguese Polar Program – that promotes and manages access of national researchers to both Polar regions, with supporting a total of 60 projects, 121 researchers and 5 flights to Antarctica in 2013-17.

Moreover, CEG plays an active role in international networks, including IMISCOE, Metropolis and the IGU. Researchers have published in indexed journals such as *Mobilities*, *JEMS*, *IJURR*, *Identities*, *Citizenship Studies*. Still other researchers have published in interdisciplinary journals with high/significant impact factor. In total, CEG researchers published 290 papers in journals indexed in ISI/SCOPUS, representing a very significant in the period 2013-2017. This publication record strengthened CEG's visibility and research excellence over the years.

Moreover, it is important to mention that CEG has accomplished significant results in the areas of inter/transdisciplinarity and in critical research on the fast and deep changes evident in the Greater Lisbon Region. A number of FCT projects focus on innovation, technology, city transformation and regional transition resulting to valuable knowledge for place-based policy interventions and urban theorization.

Overall, CEG contributes to five (5) PhD programs at IGOT (that recently increased to seven), while it has a strong commitment to apprentice and graduate training and to integrate early careers on research projects.

CEG has acquired a relatively strong position in the area of Geography, Planning and in related fields over the years, which is very close to excellence. On the basis of CEG dynamics towards internationalization and its existing research and publication record, the Centre will be led to excellence.

The challenges that CEG faces need to be confronted and resolved in the near future so that the Centre will increase its coherence and capacity to face the wider transformations in the European and world context. An important aspect is the consolidation of research and publications so far and in view of the Centre's strengths, capabilities and dynamics. This will enable the Centre towards developing a more elaborate strategic planning for the next period. CEG organizational capacity needs to be strengthened in the context of IGOT.

There is a potential for CEG to play an even stronger role on the European funding arena. The cross-disciplinary profile of CEG matches very well with several Social Challenges of the H2020 programs. By connecting physical and human geography into innovative research applications both within the fields of bioeconomy, energy and climate – there should be several opportunities both as coordinators and partners in future research consortia.

All research groups of CEG should be equally engaged in the internationalization path that has been already pursued by certain research groups. It is important that internal mechanisms (i.e. incentives, assistance, etc.) are strengthened and enabled towards this objective.

Another challenge for CEG is to develop a better and more coherent picture of the social impact of its research through mechanisms of monitoring. This would allow CEG to make advancements towards more informed research objectives, reflexivity between research and scientific thinking and reorientation of future actions.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Sociology, Anthropology, Demography e Geography

R&D Unit: Centro de Estudos Sociais (CES)

Coordinator: Boaventura de Sousa Santos

Integrated PhD Researchers: 180

Overall Quality Grade: EXCELLENT

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 5
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 5
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 4

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 3003 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 8

Programmatic Funding: 613 K€, including for 2 (Junior) New PhD Researchers Contracts.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

This is a very large, productive and international Unit that has celebrated 40 years of existence. It is a truly interdisciplinary Centre that trends towards transdisciplinarity in terms research work characterised by epistemological commitment, methodological innovation in investigating the politics of knowledge creation and transfer. The Unit offers a vibrant and very well-organized research environment with excellent support facilities and support staff, facilitating the interrogation of existing social science and humanities epistemologies to open up new avenues of research that respond to urgent complex socioeconomic, political and cultural problems

There is an established, well-functioning, participative governance structure and culture focussed on consensus rather than voting. Most members – senior, junior and PhD students – feel represented. There is not only an External Advisory Board, but also an internal evaluation unit. The international Advisory Board offers yearly reports.

The Centre is unique in Portugal, and probably across the globe, in bringing together researchers from such different disciplines and domains including sociology, anthropology, literature, architecture and the natural sciences under a single organisation.

The staff is drawn from across the world, with a significant number of international post docs and PhD students. There is good evidence of participation in international networks, and the reception of visiting scholars. There is a lot of communication between members, both within and across research groups through meetings, discussion groups, summer schools and the annual away-day for strategic planning.

The Unit performs cutting edge research but also has concrete societal impact, for example through the activities on knowledge democratization and public science. The intense interest in links between research and progressive social change is evident across a large number of integrated researchers, from a range of disciplines.

The Unit has been successful in attracting research grants, including highly prestigious grants, from Portugal and from Europe; the latter includes an impressive 6 ERC grants.

The Unit is productive and the nominated publications provide important contributions to the international literature with high levels of theoretical and practical relevance. Publications produced by the R&D Unit scholars include full length authoritative monographs, peer-reviewed articles, book chapters and reports in Portuguese, English, Italian and French, among other languages. These analyses include the philosophical and highly abstract, empirical investigations analysing micro-level interpersonal interactions, historical documents, policies and laws. Among the nominated publications there is a preponderance of papers establishing theoretical frameworks for future analysis and setting out the Portuguese case for a particular topic such as disability, financialisation or austerity. These are suggestive of a social science programme where new agendas are being created with reference to the national setting. In addition to work setting out Portuguese cases, there is interesting work on former colonies in Africa and elsewhere, as well as comparative national analysis.

There is variation in the extent to which individual researchers have international experience and publications in languages other than Portuguese. Those individual researchers who are not developing publishing in English may want to consider the potential implications for attracting competitive European funding.

There is a commitment to establishing public and popular dialogue with researchers and their research findings, through workshops convened internationally and contacts with the proximate local society, as well as through media outlets.

An impressive 450 PhD students participate in 11 well established programmes with a good ratio between the number of completed PhDs and number of staff. PhD programs are truly international with over 50% international students and over 30% of the students having grants for their PhD work. PhD students and young researchers are well supported in library, travel, editing/translation, grant writing, availability of data etc. which they report as readily accessible.

Training and advice to support academic career development is in evidence: for example, encouraging and facilitating publishing and participation in conference and event organization. Opportunities for PhD students and young researchers to teach, as preparation for a future university career were said to be limited.

Outreach activities are integrated in the Centre activities in the form of events and partnerships. Limited monitoring of the social impact of the Centre research and other activities was reported.

There is a good analysis of the internal and external situation of the Centre and strategic aims have been very well thought through. An example is that it seems to be one of the few Centres where proactive thinking about funding possibilities under Horizon Europe was demonstrated. The six future challenges have been very well chosen. Being an old Centre, it was good to see that there is attention to the renewal of staff and innovation in theory and methods.

Ethical issues are dealt with by an ethical committee that is clearly aware of the relevant issues. Their first focus has been on evaluating research protocols. Although the issues around secure data storage are not yet a very developed research issue in Portugal, they had nonetheless arrived on the agenda in CES.

The CVs of the Integrated Researchers make for impressive reading, offering, as they do, evidence of national and international research merits, which speak to both scholarly excellence and social relevance in a range of settings. The nuclear CVs vary from Good to Excellent with an average of Very Good.

Amongst the nominated CVs there are individuals who are clearly highly regarded by national and international peers, as shown by honours and merits including visiting professorships, European research evaluation roles, honorary degrees awarded, conference participation and editorships. Furthermore, engagement with research training is indicated by extensive lists of doctoral, masters and undergraduate supervision, both ongoing and completed.

Since the nominated CVs are of researchers in their 40s or older, it is harder to judge how people are faring at more junior phases of their development as researchers, immediately after the doctoral award. The relative lack of integrated researchers under 40 years of age underlines the need for investment in doctoral and postdoc researcher positions.

Plans are set out seek to balance ongoing growth with consolidation of the Unit and its activities. These are well thought through and largely well specified. However, planning for the appointment of research assistants with a PhD qualification could be better specified.

There is a stated intention to invest in international large-scale projects and to enlarge the body of researchers. Given that CES is already a large R&D Unit, this scaling up carries potential risks in terms of reduced responsiveness to social questions, reduced coherence across the various activities, and in terms of the ongoing development of the research agenda. Given that CES has made its name as an innovative and critical Centre, retaining this character as the generation of researchers that established the Unit retire, is a key issue.

The question of the ideal size for this R&D Unit bears some consideration at a time when retirements are ongoing and when internationalisation and the attraction of European competitive funding are explicit aims.

The plan to appoint new doctoral students states that the student research will be connected to ongoing research projects. How the need to support both individual researchers development, as well as that of the Centre could be better specified, since these two aims are potentially contradictory.

The role of the two evaluation units – internal and external – could be better specified in terms of how they will complement one another.

While the new ethics commission has been explicitly established in order to validate larger international projects, there is scope to develop ethical thinking with regard to other research, including that which takes place beyond the European ethical governance requirements.

The Panel would like to draw attention to the following six issues for potential development.

1) Research groups seem too large to be much more than an umbrella under which different projects gather. The research groups do not seem to function in organizing, guiding, monitoring or developing the research. Members describe feeling more identified with CES as a whole than with particular research groups.

2) Open access has been on the agenda at CES for several years already, with a repository for (pre)publications a key mechanism for making research available. However, there were said to be no funds for authors to pay article processing costs which may become necessary in the future as a means of securing open access. CES staff report the need to wait for national policy on open access to develop, but the Panel suggests that a more proactive approach could be called for. In particular the Lusophone networks and publications could be balanced strategically with the need for anglophone open access publishing.

3) The substantial size of this Centre is an issue that could benefit from some strategic consideration. On the one hand the current size helps to finance CES activities, since project overheads contribute to the excellent support facilities that are available. On the other hand there is a risk that CES becomes a collection of researchers rather than a coherent program of research wherein common aims join forces for added impact. While CES has defined common objectives that could facilitate coherence, this seems to play a fairly limited role in decisions about new projects and the admission of new colleagues.

4) In orienting itself to the outside world CES could consider, not only on Centres that are similar elsewhere in the world, but also consider benchmarking itself with Centres that cover part of the work that CES undertakes.

5) Ensuring the availability of opportunities to teach for doctoral students.

6) Developing a means of keeping track of the social impact of the Centre activities.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Sociology, Anthropology, Demography e Geography

R&D Unit: Centro de Estudos Transdisciplinares para o Desenvolvimento (CETRAD)

Coordinator: Timothy Leonard Koehnen

Integrated PhD Researchers: 45

Overall Quality Grade: GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 3
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 3
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 2

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 546 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 3

Programmatic Funding: 153 K€.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The Centre contributions aim to integrate an international publication strategy with knowledge transfer to its field of research. This combination of social research with the application of analytically enriched knowledge to the local field of rural practices has the potential to generate a distinctive achievement. However, while the obtained results, related to practices of wine production, social effect of tourism, sustainable local entrepreneurship, HIV/AIDS infection, and local forest management, demonstrate that the Centre is strongly embedded in a regional society, the research work of the Centre as a whole is not oriented to international standards of scientific knowledge production and interdisciplinary cooperation.

All three research groups (focusing, in short, on tourism, innovation, and society) are involved in the research work resulting in the main contributions of the Centre. The research strategy of the Centre is fully oriented to themes relevant to the practical perspective of applied research responding to the interests of local stakeholders representing local business and municipalities. It would be beneficial to develop institutional settings to promote methodological diversity as well as a theoretical discussion, which would enable further reflections promoting the internationalisation of the Centre's research strategy. It would be similarly helpful to develop a way to balance the diverse interests of local stakeholders and their influence on the research agenda of the Centre.

The Centre was able to respond to specific problems of public interest both in respect to issues related to local economic development (the competitiveness of local wine industry, local entrepreneurship, and the management of local forests) as well as to wider social challenges (the HIV/AIDS infection and social effects of tourism). Nonetheless, policy recommendation and the application of research findings related to these research themes could be more guided by social and environmental sensitivity. That is, research themes and their theoretical and methodological framing in an international perspective could take more into consideration the social and ecological responsibility of institutions involved in local economic development as well as local governance. Thus a buildout of research strategy with an international perspective with full of potential could be identified in the combination of recently applied research themes with a reflection on the environmental sustainability and social responsibility of related social actors which could also inform the collaboration between the Centre and various local stakeholders.

The institutional performance of the Centre is primarily oriented to a knowledge transfer to its local stakeholders, it takes aim also at internationalisation. This is evident in its involvement in research projects based on international cooperation, in its effort to promote publication in internationally prestigious academic journals, and the involvement of its key researchers in the structures of international academic life. Unfortunately, there are institutional limits to achieve further advancement of internationalisation both of the research perspective and collaborative practices of the Centre through participation in high-quality international research projects. These limits can be found first, in the form of cooperation between the Centre and the University it belongs to, second in the mode of integration of researchers into the Centre. Increasing internationalisation would require a qualitative change in the Centre research project organisational capabilities, primarily in the application procedures and project management, which cannot be achieved without the strong institutional support from the University. Besides dealing with institutional procedures, the

systematic support of the international publication-related activities would be required, that would, for instance, be able to deal with issues related to open access publication, including training, translation as well as article processing charges.

While the deep personal motivation of researchers is forming a valuable asset of the research strategy it cannot serve as the only ground for further internationalisation of the research performance without initiating organisational changes related to the division between teaching and research. The institutionalised possibility of circulation between teaching duties and research positions, including the alternatives of full time and part-time researchers, would make the engagement of researchers in the field of internationalised research more viable.

It seems to be crucial to face the challenge to attract a critical mass of new PhD students who could be integrated into new research projects developed along the thematic lines outlined in the strategic plan of the Centre. Perhaps the possibilities of the Centre are influenced by the misfit between the organisation of the academic year and the funding opportunities provided by various institutions, nevertheless, there are signs of systematic dealing with this challenge on the side of the Centre or the University. The integrative function of research groups consist of collaboration between senior, junior and PhD researchers which plays an important role in motivating researchers, nevertheless the management of human capacities is not organised on the level of research groups. The planned change to replace research-group coordinators with local stakeholders and Ph.D. program directors in the governing body of the Centre manifest this secondary role of research groups in the strategic plans of the Centre. Thus, to build up an effective social environment for future PhD students also would require to provide these researchers with established modes of interdisciplinary research cooperation, to share knowledge as well as get feedback from her colleagues while broadening the disciplinary perspectives with broader social science methodologies and theoretical models. What more in recent working conditions various obligations and duties disallow Ph.D. students to concentrate on their doctoral research and dissertation.

As a final point, it should be stressed that the internationalisation path needs to be strengthened and expanded in the Centre. A more elaborate, theoretically-anchored and policy-informed research agenda should be developed so that the Centre will be better prepared for more competitive research projects and networking actions.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Sociology, Anthropology, Demography e Geography

R&D Unit: Centro de Investigação e Estudos de Sociologia (CIES-IUL)

Coordinator: João Manuel Grossinho Sebastião

Integrated PhD Researchers: 118

Overall Quality Grade: VERY GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 4
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 4
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 4

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 1710 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 4

Programmatic Funding: 388 K€, including for 1 (Junior) New PhD Researcher Contract.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The Unit is a large and diverse one. It has as a distinctive feature a clear policy-oriented research agenda, which is articulated especially through the different Observatories that are part of the Centre core structure. It is an outward-facing Unit, making significant contributions to policy-making and to national and international social science. The Unit has engaged in a wide range of research and training endeavours in the review period, ranging from good to very high quality. The overall profile is very good indeed, but not truly outstanding.

The morphology of staffing involves a wide array of specialists, drawn from multiple specialist fields and career stages. Some senior researchers are acknowledged international experts in their fields. The researchers with a PhD degree and nuclear CVs demonstrate at the very least adequate scientific profiles and publications, with many better than that baseline. Overall, they show good trajectories and outputs. The information provided in ORCID and available websites shows advances in various fields, like sociology of education, political science and migration, among others. For instance, healthcare services publications indicate the approach of the Unit in linking research activity with public services.

The strong policy focus of much of the Unit research production does mean, however, that theoretical and conceptual innovation is not as strong as one might wish in a large sociology R&D Unit. The focus also means that a fair amount of research is primarily of interest to Portuguese audiences, although the Panel recognises that international readers may still value findings and conclusions taken from the Portuguese context.

The diversity of research areas and methodologies is clearly a strength. This diversity requires careful management and calibration. This has been done overall fairly successfully throughout the review period.

The organisation of the Unit partly into Observatories is clearly a very good way of organising multiple different research streams. That these are permanent structures is a distinct advantage in ensuring consistency within the Unit research endeavours across time. The set of laboratories have been effective at balancing the demands that exist between doing high quality academic research and at the same time attaining societal impact. It is clear that the Observatories structure provides a secure foundation for informing policy-making and achieving societal impact.

The different Research Groups involve and encompass important and useful research activities, mainly through national FCT funding, but increasingly international and European funding too, especially in the last 5 years. The researchers of the Unit are leading various EU funded projects, and they have participated as partners in several EU projects under the Framework Programme of research, namely projects under FP7, Marie-Curie actions, and H2020. They have applied to ERC and are currently awaiting the outcome. This is all very promising in terms of international research activity. However, it is also the case that strategic planning could still be strengthened somewhat, in order to increase further the chances of success in future applications to very highly competitive funding sources. This is necessary in light of the current unevenness across the Unit in terms of large and international grant capture, with some groups and sub-groups being more successful than others in this regard.

Some of the Research Groups tend to be broad, and perhaps rather too broad in nature. Some more thought should be given as to possibly splitting the bigger and looser research groups up into more specific and distinct groupings. This is related to the fact that the larger and looser ones are markedly bigger in terms of personnel than the smaller ones, possibly creating an imbalance within the Unit.

There is a strong network of collaborations and participation in international conferences. International collaborations include cooperation with relevant institutions such as the Oxford Reuters Institute, the Fondation Maison des Science de l'Homme, and FAPESP, to name a few.

The nature and level of scientific production is appropriate considering the size of the team, with an increased number of publications in international peer-reviewed journals. The Unit publishes a journal, mainly in the Portuguese language, that is positioned in rankings such as Scopus, with a notable citation level (Q3).

With regards to social and political impact, it is important to highlight the role of the Public Policies Forum, which engages plural debate on public policies and relevant stakeholders in Portugal. They have a number of outreach activities through the Observatories, with direct impact on policy development, mass media coverage, and so on.

The internal peer review process for grant applications seems to have worked well. However, support mechanisms for helping early career researcher in grant writing could be further augmented.

Early career researchers generally feel supported by staff and through the Unit's procedures. There is evidence of community spirit, and mutual aid and assistance across the staff group, including from more experienced to less experienced people. Regular meetings for career planning are a distinct plus.

Relatedly, a particular strength of the Unit lies in staff retention. The Unit managers seem to have taken effective steps to move some early career researchers onto more long-term and sustainable contracts. Early career staff development and retention seems to have been stronger, or at least more successful, than in other comparable Units in Portugal.

The Unit has achieved a reasonable balance between allowing for the autonomy of researchers and research groupings on the one side, and integration of multiple differing people and groups on the other. Binding the different parts together occurs through such positive mechanisms as an annual forum and more regular cross-group seminars. Micro-level procedures seem to be working and are broadly agreeable to the staff. There seems to be a culture of open discussion among the staff, or at least key members of it, of both opportunities and challenges. The relatively horizontal structure affords possibilities for participatory decision making. More broadly, there are sound informal communication processes.

Integration in and of a large and diverse Unit will inevitably never be perfect, but it can be fostered still further than hitherto. Bottom up research initiatives are both allowed and fostered, which is positive. But a disadvantage of decentralised network organisation is relative lack of capacity to deal in issues such as disinvesting in unproductive or marginal research areas, and to have clear and robust mechanisms for deciding when not to develop a particular research idea or field. This point may also apply to more positive strategies to do with developing more capacity to lead on large grants.

Broadly speaking, more attention can be given to developing precise and robust procedures whereby the "big picture" strategic priorities of the Unit are formulated, disseminated, encouraged and enforced.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Sociology, Anthropology, Demography e Geography

R&D Unit: Centro de Investigação em Antropologia e Saúde (CIAS)

Coordinator: Cristina Maria Proença Padez

Integrated PhD Researchers: 20

Overall Quality Grade: GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 3
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 4
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 3

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 229 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

Programmatic Funding: 44 K€.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The Unit is undoubtedly an interesting and dynamic one. The Panel found evidence of intensive research activity. Its role as the only R&D Unit in Portugal explicitly dedicated to biological or physical anthropology and related areas renders it unique and valuable. The Panel also notes the presence of this discipline elsewhere in Portugal, but acknowledges that this Unit functions as critical mass for this area of expertise in the country.

While a natural sciences Panel, working with different discipline-based criteria, may possibly have rated the Unit higher, this Panel is of the view that the Unit contribution to international social sciences, especially of health, is very promising. But this also needs more systematic development and more strategic planning. Funding is being offered explicitly to assist in that endeavour.

The biological or physical anthropological approach to health-related matters is undoubtedly useful and potentially highly fruitful. The long-term historical approach to contemporary issues that is pursued by the Centre is unusual in relation to social scientific fields, and it has great potential to inform current debates with novel forms of evidence and the fresh thinking based on them. This promise is partly being fulfilled at the moment, and was so during the review period, but more remains to be achieved.

The main issue involved with this Panel assessing this Unit is the degree of fit between the Unit intellectual orientation and location, namely physical and biological anthropology, located within a natural sciences faculty. This institutional location could possibly be a good springboard for creating social scientific work of true national and international significance which reaches audiences in areas such as health studies, obesity studies, sociology and social anthropology of health, and so on. But the intellectual orientation and institutional location could also be unhelpful in this regard. The Panel found a mixed picture in this regard, which can be summarised in the following way – there is good, and possibly very good, potential for high scholarly and societal significance, but this is not yet systematically realised, and there are some challenges to deal with.

The interdisciplinary mix of the Unit is promising but has not yet fully been realised or put into full practice, such that the primary audiences that research reaches are circumscribed, either being more national in nature, or when international, being more specifically discipline-based rather than more broadly reaching multiple disciplines, especially social sciences ones, beyond the researcher's core disciplines.

The Panel found evidence of energetic and highly committed leadership. But the lack of funding seems to mean that a very large amount of responsibilities fall on the shoulders of the Centre director and possibly a few other senior staff.

There is a strong sense of community and sense of mission among all staff, ranging from early PhD students to senior researchers. The Unit is certainly a well-functioning and tightly-knit entity. There is a lot to admire in this regard.

PhD students in particular, as well as early career scholars, were engaged, knowledgeable and strongly committed to the Centre. There was evidence of the Unit changing early career people intellectual and career directions in novel, creative and interdisciplinary ways. Teaching opportunities were offered by the Unit and taken up with productive results.

The Unit suffers across the board from a lack of funds, most strikingly for physical infrastructure and storage of fragile research materials. There is however evidence of systematic and creative responses to often challenging circumstances.

Research funding is primarily from Portuguese sources. While this is fine in itself, a relative lack of non-Portuguese and European funding sources has partly inhibited the Unit from growing into a more internationally recognised research enterprise.

Although the research group is well qualified in the relevant fields, and has a well-respected publication record, the overall research agenda is in not quite innovative enough. The Unit has produced an impressive number of publications. Some of them are really good, but many are rather too mainstream, following established lines of research rather innovating systematically. It could be said that the field of historical health studies has been governed by strong – but not independently verified – assumptions. It would probably be more innovative to produce research where these assumptions are questioned more, and more new ideas and lines of inquiry opened up. Likewise, the deeper theoretical issues need to be addressed more explicitly in published work and elsewhere.

Some of the researchers are highly qualified and produce good publications. Yet their international visibility is not as high as one would want from particularly the leading members of the research team.

Levels of societal impact are strong in some respects, with links to various sorts of institutional actors. But while there are some connections to policymakers, the lack of systematic and dense contacts in this regard may undercut the Unit aims to have profound effects on health policies, including those concerning obesity, at both Portuguese and European levels. This raises a wider issue of the Unit needing to rethink and upgrade its branding and marketing.

In terms of the Unit central thematic of health, researchers and publications are producing useful work primarily in Portuguese national terms. But they are not as visible in international social science fields as one might want or have expected.

Ethical issues related with named and identifiable human remains need to be considered more, and brought more thoroughly into line with current international codes and expectations on such matters. Funding should be conditional on the Unit formally agreeing to reflect upon such matters, to build an action plan on these issues into their strategic planning, and to sign up and commit to best practice international protocols covering such matters.

Funding from this Panel is offered with the explicit expectation that it be used to support the development of the Unit contribution to the social sciences, as opposed to the natural sciences only, of health at the international level. Interdisciplinary work is of course to be welcomed. But more exposure of the Unit research in leading international social science of health journals should be aimed at markedly more than has been the case before. This will enhance the Unit contribution to, and emergent profile in, the international social science of health. This in turn should aid the Unit in attracting more European funding.

Funding has been awarded in relation to the requests of the Unit, for 40K Euros for repairs and upgrading of physical infrastructure where fragile bone research materials are housed, and 4K Euros for consultants who will stimulate internationalization.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Sociology, Anthropology, Demography e Geography

R&D Unit: Centro em Rede de Investigação em Antropologia (CRIA)

Coordinator: Maria Antonia Pereira de Resende Pedroso de Lima

Integrated PhD Researchers: 76

Overall Quality Grade: VERY GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 4
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 4
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 4

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 1058 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 5

Programmatic Funding: 388 K€, including for 1 (Junior) New PhD Researcher Contract.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The Unit is networked across four university sites, offering a range of research and outreach activities that respond to social challenges, locally, nationally and transnationally with extensive involvement of international scholars and a commitment to Portuguese and to Lusophone work also in evidence.

There is ample evidence of very good research work, including an ERC starting grant which is coordinated by CRIA, membership of journal editorial Boards at national and international Level.

The development of new research themes is in evidence, including activism in the Western Sahara, intangible cultural heritage, emancipatory potential of participatory film practices and multi-species ecosystems. Some of these innovative approaches have become international reference points.

An impressive range of academic research work is represented in the nominated CVs: in addition to research production in Portuguese and English, there is postgraduate supervision, popular scientific communication, academic translation work, conference organisation and research consortium participation. While there is variation in the extent to which individuals participate in specific aspects of work, taken as a whole, the scientific merits of the researchers look appropriate.

The inclusion of an article in the Annual Review of Anthropology indicates the establishment of academic authority in their chosen field, as recognised by the profession.

The four research groups that organise the Unit research activity are complemented by thematic lines and working groups that focus on specific interests, such as Arabic and Islamic contexts or methods such as visual methods.

The Unit has undertaken an array of outreach and communication work, including film-making, theatre, education and exhibitions. CRIA staff regularly feature describing their research in various media.

The Unit own journal Etnografica is committed to multi-lingual publication and is part of a range of open access outputs that the Unit supports, mainly in Portuguese, with a view to disseminating to the wider Lusophone world.

The governance structure is clearly defined and seemed largely acceptable to staff with the institutional communication described as good. Communication between the Unit members is generally good, but markedly stronger for the Lisbon poles than between these two and the two other poles. The latter two poles are of limited size.

The Unit has four laboratories, all located in Lisbon, which are responsive to teaching and research needs. The doctoral programme offers innovative advanced training in anthropology that was described in positive terms by doctoral students that the Panel met.

The plans for the 2018-2022 period are presented as a continuation of the previous period (2013-2017), building on existing achievements as a diverse, dispersed and creative anthropological network engaged in fundamental and applied research as well as various forms of education and training.

The PhD student body is very international and they feel well supported by easily accessible, knowledgeable and competent senior researchers. There is some support for attending conferences, for translation and editing services, applying for grants and for teaching opportunities as part of career preparation. However, the Panel learned that there is a shortage of good office space and career support.

Efforts towards internationalisation, an increase in funded research resulting in accessible publications rest in part on the appointment of a significant number of new doctoral students and postdoctoral fellowships. The extent to which existing University-employed staff can increase their individual research efforts is extremely limited. The high level of engagement with EASA (European Association of Social Anthropologists) is note-worthy, with the hosting of one important mid-size meeting in 2018 and the full biennial conference of EASA in 2020 as evidence of CRIA's role as a hub for cross-European dialogues and collaborations.

The commitment to increase the number of peer-reviewed publications per researcher and to encourage monographs as a main genre of anthropological writing, looks potentially contradictory.

The Panel raises the following issues for the Unit consideration in developing its work:

1. The representation of doctoral students on the executive board and perhaps the audit board, to ensure their interests are taken into account in decision-making processes.
2. Further consideration of how the relationship between the four university sites can be developed to support and enhance research across the network, including the sites.
3. The open access publishing strategy and how it plays out in Portuguese, English and other languages, honouring the disciplinary commitment to monograph-writing as well as career-needs of researchers to compete in an international academic labour market.
4. How internationalisation can enhance the research identity of the Unit, as well as supporting applications for funding.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Sociology, Anthropology, Demography e Geography

R&D Unit: Centro Interdisciplinar de Ciências Sociais (CICS.NOVA)

Coordinator: Luís António Vicente Baptista

Integrated PhD Researchers: 138

Overall Quality Grade: GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 3
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 3
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 3

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 1612 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 4

Programmatic Funding: 288 K€, including for 1 (Auxiliar) New PhD Researcher Contract.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

CISC-NOVA is an interdisciplinary Centre based at Universidade Nova de Lisboa but with a geographically dispersed network of researchers from four regional hubs, organised into six topic-based research groups across the territory. This complex organisational structure brings together what were disparate small groups of researchers, to encompass 140 researchers working under a single organisational umbrella to strengthen research groups with more developmental potential. This dispersed network structure provides challenges and also opportunities to do research linked to the different territories and realities, with a focus on public policy, but to discuss them from a more global perspective, making contributions to wider research focus and agendas.

Great emphasis is placed on the ability to derive social problems from a range of social settings and disciplinary backgrounds to inform the Unit's research agenda. Involvement of stakeholders at different levels is also emphasized and channelled particularly through observatories. However, the connection between the local, national and global research areas or scientific contributions is not sufficiently developed. There is a predominance of applied research over fundamental or theoretically-driven projects. Along these lines, there are some international projects funded by the European Commission through DG Employment or DG EAC, and one partnership in a H2020 research project, developed mainly by two of the six research groups. However, most of the research projects are predominantly nationally based.

There is a strong emphasis on internationalization as the mechanism for improving the quality of research undertaken at the Unit, through the reception of visiting scholars and an internal evaluation system that distributes funding to all those engaged in research according to their previous productivity.

The Unit has a well-defined governance structure, with different mechanisms in place in order to promote communication between researchers placed in the different hubs who belong to the same research group. A better digital platform for communication could improve collaboration and synergies across hubs.

There is a commitment to open access publishing, not only through the Unit's own journals, books and working papers, but also through disseminating more widely in society. Use of university repositories for pre-prints is practised. There is a commitment to scientific publishing in Portuguese as well as English in evidence in the nominated publications, with the Unit hosting a number of open access journal and book publications.

The main researchers have good publication records, including some publications in ranked journals, for example the Ocean and Coastal Management (JCR, Q2) and Public Health (JCR, Q3), among others. This activity demonstrates there is scientific excellence in publications and the international dissemination of results. However, there is limited academic production of international peer-review journal papers among integrated researchers, although there are exceptions to this generalisation. Some CVs show popular scientific communication rather than academic production. Again, efforts to disseminate to wider publics and to answer to local demands are important but need to be balanced with academic publishing.

International activity in the form of participating in conferences is promoted and supported in the R&D Unit, from PhD students to senior researchers, and this is in evidence across many CVs. Alongside, some Integrated Researchers are strongly involved in governance and representation in international scientific societies. It would be good to encourage researchers to channel this international presence to promote networks of research collaboration.

A lively doctoral education programme is ongoing, with young researchers who are well integrated in the research groups activities. There is a sense of belonging among young researchers, who felt that being part of the R&D Unit improved their opportunities for training and going to international conferences. However, more periodical seminars in which doctoral students could participate of spaces of intellectual exchange, learning from all the research and diversity of themes and approaches developed in the Centre, would improve their learning experience and become focus of emergence of new talents and ideas. Notwithstanding, there is freedom for innovation and development of new research avenues on the part of the mid-career researchers, which clearly offer strong potential for the R&D Unit's development. A stronger support strategy to promote applications to EU and other international research funding would be important to channel this potential towards internationalization of research activity.

Finally, further connections are still needed between empirical research at small scale, and practices of co-production of knowledge with stakeholders, with bigger research questions and international scientific publishing of these studies. Attending local community priorities while also increasing impact at international level is a challenge for the future. Alongside, creating a more structured system of providing visibility to the social and policy impact – both at local and national levels – of the R&D Unit activity would be an asset to the overall project, providing this is one of its distinctive features.

The future development of the Unit is described against a back-drop of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. Integration of such goals within and across research group activities is a good strategy, especially in light of the new FP9 EU programme Horizon Europe. Stronger strategy for teamwork, including optimization and share of expertise from those researchers who have been successful in obtaining EU funded projects, would help to enhance the potential which lays in some others. For instance, share of expertise from RG3 Cities, Environment and Regional Development – with more international background in terms of research funding – may help others. The inclusion of communicating management expertise explained in the future planning is an appropriate strategy to put forward in order to make research contributions and publications, as well as social and policy impact achievements more visible, shared and cited.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Sociology, Anthropology, Demography e Geography

R&D Unit: Centro Interdisciplinar de Estudos de Género (CIEG)

Coordinator: Analia Torres

Integrated PhD Researchers: 17

Overall Quality Grade: EXCELLENT

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 5
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 5
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 4

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 237 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 5

Programmatic Funding: 610 K€, including for 2 (1 Auxiliar, 1 Principal) New PhD Researchers Contracts.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The Unit focus on social inequalities and gender effectively and productively roots it within the discipline of sociology, while developing over time in a more richly interdisciplinary direction.

Given that CIEG was only established in 2012, this is a very impressive trajectory of research and development. It is an extremely productive and vibrant Centre, the only one in Portugal, providing exceptional value given the size of the team of integrated researchers and relative to the amount of funding received from the FCT. It is well organized and there is a clear strategy for future growth and management of the Centre. It is clear that with the appropriate resourcing and staffing of the Centre, there is real potential for further growth and success.

There is a strong track record of successful grant applications, with funding being sought across a range of different funding streams and more than half of its income is from international sources (including EU funding) with a high proportion of past and current projects being international. There is an extremely high level of productivity in quality contributions relative to the number of integrated researchers, evidenced in the publications and successful grant applications. For instance, there are an average number of 12 publications per member of staff; with the majority (just under two thirds) of journal articles published in English. The majority of integrated researchers have performed R&D of recognized quality and merit in their contribution to knowledge at both national and international levels. The lead Integrated Researchers are at the very least nationally recognised figures in their respective fields of expertise, with many having international stature. In addition, CIEG has international networking and collaborations with international learned societies and several research networks, as well as with R&D Units in Universities in a number of other countries including Cape Verde, Canada and in Europe.

There are significant numbers of lively and engaged young scholars. Since the last evaluation, CIEG has established the first PhD programme in gender studies in Portugal, which has attracted significant numbers including demand from international students. (The MA programme in Family and Gender also demonstrates a healthy recruitment, with 31 students already completing.) PhD students are very well integrated into the intellectual life of the Unit. A challenge rests in reproducing and altering the often informal nature of communication and modes of support within the Unit in a situation where the number of personnel has significantly expanded. The Centre is well placed to take advantage of the demand for gender studies courses in Portugal, which is resulting in a large number of PhD applications. The potential to grow PhD numbers includes demand from international students, especially from Brazil given the current situation of defunding this area of study. The Panel noted that there should be in house ethics procedures, particularly geared to the sensitivities of gender and sexualities matters, rather than reliance on more generic University level mechanisms.

Early career researchers at the post doctoral stage of their trajectories are rather few in number, indicating a challenge for reproducing the Centre with 'new blood' people who have at least reasonably stable contractual conditions. There is a danger that there is an insufficient pipeline of younger researchers who are on career paths such that they may be able to take over from existing senior staff as the latter step down from positions of managerial responsibility.

In terms of dissemination and public engagement CIEG has made an outstanding contribution. The International Congress is a case in point attracting 270 attendees, of whom 85% were from a wide range of other countries (to Portugal) across the globe also testifying to its international profile. The work of CIEG is clearly of public interest and wider social and economic impact beyond their contribution to the academy. The Centre has clearly had impact on the application of research in a number of important respects. In addition to academic conferences, there is an excellent programme of wider public engagement through training courses and workshops on the theme of gender inequality as well as social media, newsletters, etc. A specific example is the contribution to public consultation and national law reform regarding Sexual Harassment and Bullying in the Workplace. The provision of training courses on gender equality has resulted in very high demand, and has been rolled out to a large number of people across a range of professional backgrounds. This could be a potential source of income. However, it is recommended that this should be resourced appropriately by a person responsible for training in such a way that it is not a competing work demand for the R&D activities of the integrated researchers.

There is an extremely high level of productivity in quality contributions relative to the number of integrated researchers, evidenced in the cited publications and successful grant applications. While this is a real strength, it raises a number of issues for the future development and potential growth of CIEG. The level of productivity is extremely impressive. However levels of staffing are an issue if this is to continue after this excellent level of performance during the Centre's early consolidation period. The Unit faces two ways at once. It is poised between filling a gap in Portuguese social science provision of gender studies research and advanced teaching, and making a contribution to the international field of gender studies. This is both inevitable and desirable. Yet there is a problem that national level activities, such as core researchers themselves offering pragmatic training courses to non-academic paying customers, are pulling down the potential realization of international reach and significance of research that could be of international significance. The existence of the Unit allows Portugal to start to catch up in gender studies provision with other European countries. But this could potentially undercut efforts to develop cutting edge and more globally significant work aimed at international audiences. The strategic ambition to take advantage of Portugal strategic geographical and socio-political position in the world is a sound one, but more concrete procedures and devices should be put in place to realise this ambition as fully as possible within current and future constraints.

That said, plans for the future development of CIEG are strategic and highly appropriate, in particular in relation to the need for human resources to continue to maintain this astonishing level of vibrancy and quality in productivity. After a period of consolidation, plans for CIEG to expand its goals for knowledge production, transfer and dissemination, and its interdisciplinarity and internationalization, seem excellent. Future plans for knowledge production are clear and in terms of grant income three applications are already under review in addition to three projects that have already been successful in attracting funding. The International Congress in 2019, building on the success of the previous one, will help to embed and extend its international profile, as will the continued strategy of publishing in both English and Portuguese. The aim to increase international students will further internationalize the Centre, and it is well placed to make use of current and developing international links and networks in furthering this goal. Expansion of their successful training programme would make an excellent contribution to the continuation of their role in public engagement and professional development in relation to issues of gender inequality, which could provide a significant revenue stream. However, these ambitions need to be balanced with the other aspects of R&D, as well as teaching responsibilities, which will increase as the Centre grows in terms of student numbers.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Sociology, Anthropology, Demography e Geography

R&D Unit: Centro Lusfada de investigação em Serviço Social e Intervenção Social (CLISSIS)

Coordinator: Duarte Gonçalves Rei Vilar

Integrated PhD Researchers: 26

Overall Quality Grade: GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 3
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 3
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 2

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 254 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 3

Programmatic Funding: 40 K€.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

As the only R&D Unit on Social Work in Portugal CLISSIS is in a position to play an important role in research leadership within the subject area, both nationally and internationally. However, this potential is not yet fully realized.

With expansion and reorganization one would expect increased levels of productivity. There does appear to have been an increase in the number of presentations and publications, and steady growth in PhD numbers. The publication record of 93 publications relative to the size of the team of integrated researchers is steady and provides evidence of quality and merit at a primary national level. There is no information on international students, though it is noted that there are plans to expand PhD partnerships with Normandy University from 2019. The expansion in integrated researchers has not, as yet, resulted in any income generation from successful grant funding. That would seem to represent a significant weakness that needs to be addressed. CLISSIS has 4 Research Groups each encompassing a wide range of topics that given the number of integrated researchers may need to be reviewed to gain greater coherence and clear thematic strands of research that can aid funding applications and PhD student recruitment. The fields of ethnomethodology and conversational analysis and social work history would seem to be the stronger and more coherent. A related strength is that the Centre does not only do research 'on' social work, but research that can improve the development of social work theory and practice.

A key strategy for the future needs to include the strengthening of internationalization. There is some evidence of international activities, including hosting the International Congress on Social Work and other international conference events. CLISSIS has international networking and collaborations with international learned societies for example through the Congress as well as some international links with Universities in North America, Spain and Brazil. In terms of the aim to increase national and international recognition, a key issue is how will the Centre build on its international presence and research networks and links in other countries, including attracting international PhD students. However, it could make use of current and developing international links and networks in furthering this goal. Continuing to hold international conferences will also help to embed and extend its international profile, as will a strategy of publishing in international outlets and in both Portuguese and English.

The work of CLISSIS is clearly of public interest and wider social and economic impact. In terms of dissemination and public engagement CLISSIS has made an important contribution in certain aspects of its work. Specific examples include prize winning research, which reviewed organizational practices and public employment practices, and research that will be inform the training of professionals, and the production of a handbook of good practice for institutions working with elder people. LabIS (Laboratory for Socio-Territorial Innovation) aims to link the Centre research activities and findings to social and community projects. In terms of the Centre stated aim to strengthen involvement with social and community projects and organizations, there seems to be some potential to extend links. However, there is little to no detailing of how this will be achieved in practice and the possibilities for future engagement and dissemination.

Outlined plans for future developments are to continue with much of what is already happening in the Centre. Across the Unit as a whole, plans for the future include consolidating and strengthening public engagement, PhD recruitment

and visibility. Key objectives for expansion are to increase funding and knowledge production, and to expand national and international recognition and partnerships. It is vital that the Centre focuses strategically in the next phase on the mechanisms and practices by which these goals may be achieved.

In summary, the plans for the future are rather broad and somewhat 'steady state', with limited evidence of strategic vision. This is a key issue if the stated goals for the next phase of development are to be realized. Mechanisms to enable continued performance and expansion, in particular sustainability issues in relation to funding and grant applications; strengthening internationalization, increasing productivity at national and international levels. Although unique in a Portugal setting, CLISSIS is not exceptional in an international context. There are several institutes researching on social work in other European countries that perform very well in terms of a theoretical in-depth and methodology, not only Normandy University. As a part of their internationalization strategy, CLISSIS is recommended to bench-mark themselves against other institutes of similar size and profile to in order to increase their level of quality.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Sociology, Anthropology, Demography e Geography

R&D Unit: CSG - Investigação em Ciências Sociais e Gestão (CSG)

Coordinator: João Alfredo dos Reis Peixoto

Integrated PhD Researchers: 120

Overall Quality Grade: VERY GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 4
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 5
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 4

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 1664 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 5

Programmatic Funding: 523 K€, including for 2 (1 Junior, 1 Auxiliar) New PhD Researchers Contracts.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

CSG is a relatively new construct, consisting of four previously separate institutes that were merged into one consortium under the umbrella of Lisbon School of Economics and Management (ISEG) at the University of Lisboa in 2013. The five research groups at CSG are partly derived from these four institutes. Due to its institutional relationship with the University of Lisboa, CSG has a very strong disciplinary identity, such as in economic sociology, management, development studies and history, and their challenge would be to benefit more actively from a cross-fertilization between the various disciplines and research groups.

The list of publications exhibits publications in both highly rated disciplinary international journals (Economy and Society, European Journal of Information Systems, Journal of Business Research). Other studies have been published in high level inter/transdisciplinary international journals (e.g. European Journal of Ageing, Health & Place, Journal of Cleaner Production, Water Resources Management, Tourism Economics), books and book chapters. As a whole, during the period of 2013-2017, CSG has had a record of 204 books, 647 book chapters, 747 articles in scientific peer-reviewed journals (including 405 in WoS and/or SCOPUS-indexed journals) and 41 research projects.

There are several examples of excellence in their work, and there is an originality in the way various theoretical perspectives are combined, for example political economy and finance, digitalization and big data, gender representation in business firms, which signals an opening up for new and promising avenues of R&D. They have a strong international impact on certain disciplines at European level, such as the field of economic sociology, where they have hosted key international figures as visiting scholars. One of them is currently represented in the advisory board of CSG. There is a strong international orientation among their PhD students. A majority of them do their thesis in English composed as a compilation of articles in international journals. CSG has a good system for support in participation at international conferences.

CSG has so far demonstrated great success on the domestic funding arena with an increasing number of grants from FCT. There are several examples of alternative funding sources from international units, such as the UN and the World Bank. CSG demonstrates a success also for 2018, acquiring 8 new projects from FCT and 10 projects from other sources. When it comes to EU funding, their achievements are of a more modest character. CSG seems to have attracted H2020 funding, but not as coordinators.

The five research groups seem to be strongly embedded within the University disciplines. But this also can be a weakness. There are four Thematic Lines in the organizational structure intended to unite the research groups, but there is a question whether these initiatives are sufficient enough in terms of creating the intended dynamic between the groups. CSG is a new construct with a short history. Therefore, they will need to consider and reconsider whether the researchers at all levels of the consortium including the PhD students and the post docs identify themselves within these thematic lines. The research and publishing achievements of two particular RGs are important. Moreover, CSG could improve its future policy agenda by consolidating its main publication and research achievements and connecting

them to its strengths and opportunities. CSG is advised to further evolve its plural character towards a more integrated institutional identity that will enable it to excellence.

CSG's strategy for EU funding seems to be fragmented and driven by the individual researchers or the research groups. The arena of EU-funding is however very complex, and resources in terms of administrative support is crucial. CSG has a potential for a much higher success rate in several of the Social Challenges identified by H2020 and Horizon Europe. CSG has, during the period of 2013-2017, organized more than 35 international conferences, exhibiting a large international network. However, in order to succeed at the European level, a more concerted action at CSG will be required. This ambition has to be stated more specifically in their strategy plan. This should also include resource allocation and staff. Today, resources are available at ISEG, who also serves all the other faculties at the school. More administrative support will be needed at the CSG level in order to offer training and to give administrative support in application writing, networking etc.

In summary, one has to take account of that CSG still has a short history as a Unit within ISEG. CSG researchers already do excellent research, but the consortium has an even greater potential of becoming an international reference through a more coherent integration of their research groups and a concerted focus on international funding.

The Programmatic Funding awarded should be partially used to support strengthening academic staff at the middle level.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Sociology, Anthropology, Demography e Geography

R&D Unit: DINÂMIA'CET-IUL, Centro de Estudos Sobre a Mudança Socioeconómica e o Território

Coordinator: Pedro Miguel Alves Felício Seco da Costa

Integrated PhD Researchers: 78

Overall Quality Grade: VERY GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 4
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 4
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 4

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 1038 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 4

Programmatic Funding: 388 K€, including for 1 (Junior) New PhD Researcher Contract.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

DINÂMIA is a large institute with 133 integrated researchers and 78 Integrated Researchers with a PhD divided into three research groups: 1) Innovation and Labor, 2) Cities and Territories, 3) Governance, Economy and Citizenry. Including a diverse group of researchers, from architecture and humanities, to social science, the challenge of DINÂMIA is to exploit the synergies between the different research groups more strongly, and to achieve a stronger impact on the international arena.

DINÂMIA has several sources of alternative funding apart from FCT, including international (although few from Horizon 2020). Their list of publications 2013-2017 exhibit publications in high-ranked indexed international journals including disciplinary journals (Journal of Institutional Economics). At the organizational level, the research groups of DINÂMIA are involved in several international networks. One example is Sociology of law – where DINÂMIA participated in the organization committee of the 2018 conference of ISA. DINÂMIA is interconnected with several other Portuguese academic partners through capacity building and doctoral programs that has been developed in collaboration with other Portuguese institutions, such as CES/Coimbra and Lisbon Universities on the topic of political economy. DINÂMIA participates in several exchange programs, they have PhDs from 11 countries, most of these come from the Lusophone area. On the dissemination side, DINÂMIA publishes an own online journal, CICADES, which is peer-reviewed

The research groups of DINÂMIA address international research questions issues of high societal relevance, such as digitalization and big data (i.e. the article in Information and Communications Technology Law) and financialization. The issue of financial crisis in Southern Europe is very well addressed in several papers and articles. Some of their research is creative and original in its approach. DINÂMIA contributes to an international theoretical discourse of post-colonialism through a critical and comparative analysis of architecture and urbanism in former Portuguese colonies. As such, the Centre is in line with a more international research agenda.

With such a diverse group of research groups and topics, there are challenges of advancing a collaborative environment between the various groups. DINÂMIA reports that there are three so-called Integrating Thematic Lines (ITL) intended to unite the research groups that were defined in 2013. The impression is, however, that the organizational structure of these thematic lines is weak, and that few of the researchers referred to these lines as a source of identification.

DINÂMIA is a large institute with a wide research network, and with an access to institutional resources in support of international applications. Furthermore, the research profile of DINÂMIA matches very well with the focus of Social Challenges within the H2020 program, such as on the topics of bioeconomy, digital lives, sharing economy, smart cities and circular economy. DINÂMIA is involved in a COST consortium with several European partners. On this background, there is a strong potential research funding from the EU. The impression is that DINÂMIA is in an initial phase when it comes to acquiring EU funding. Although their strategy plan is quite coherent in addressing domestic issues (employment, democracy, financial crisis), the EU strategy could be more forward-leaning by specifying concrete goals, and identifying how resources could be allocated in order to realize these objectives. Employing thematic lines as strands of research could be helpful in addressing the relevant social challenges of H2020.

DINAMIA consists of three research groups including a thematically focus on diverse issues such as political economy, citizenry, labor market and urban studies. There are certainly challenges on how to integrate this research agenda into a coherent strategy. The site visit indicated that there were few horizontal cross-cutting research agendas aimed at creating a stronger dynamic between the groups, apart from the fact that all researchers were cross-disciplinary from the outset.

The consequences of growth achieved by the DINAMIA in the past period challenge its sustainability as a research organization. DINAMIA's answer to this challenge is a further mobilization of resources without any considerations to reorganise its institutional structure and its relationship to the University. This has specific relevance as far as one takes into account that the research strategy of the DINAMIA is framed by the discourse of social and environmental sustainability. Perhaps any transformations related to the division between teaching, social impact related activities, project administration, basic and applied research could be conceived in close cooperation with the University. One can detect disincentives to participate in international projects caused by an institutional preference for extensive teaching and publication. Thus, to achieve further internationalization of research performance oriented to Horizon Europe collaborations, Marie Curie Actions as well as ERC grants, a more reflective institutional strategy building would be required.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Sociology, Anthropology, Demography e Geography

R&D Unit: Instituto de Ciências Sociais da Universidade de Lisboa (ICS-ULisboa)

Coordinator: José Luís Cardoso

Integrated PhD Researchers: 112

Overall Quality Grade: ExCELLENT

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 5
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 5
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 4

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 2038 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 8

Programmatic Funding: 613 K€, including for 2 (Junior) New PhD Researchers Contracts.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The Institute of Social Sciences is an excellent and successful R&D Unit with relevant research achievements and broad international scientific dissemination, becoming a reference in their area of activity, both nationally and internationally. It is integrated by seven research groups in fields of study such as environment, political institutions, social policy, identities and cultures, inequalities, vulnerable groups, empires and postcolonial societies. All of them are strategically coordinated through three thematic axes of citizenship, sustainability and social inclusion, while at the same time promoting academic freedom and innovative and creative proposals among researchers.

All research groups have their distinct research activities and periodical seminars to create in each of them true hubs of intellectual exchange, where all researchers from PhD to senior members participate. Each of the seven research groups have been successful in achieving international funding, mostly EU, in prestigious R&D programmes such as FP7 and H2020 collaborative schemes, ERC grants, MSC actions, HERA and ERAnet. Competitive R&D funding has also been awarded at the national level by FCT, and some groups have attracted resources from private foundations as well. The fact that all research groups have been successful in internationalizing their research activity talks about the excellent overall coordination and support to talent in each or the different areas. The level of research and international activity makes the institute an attractive place for visiting scholars, who come from different parts of the world, contributing at the same time to the periodical intellectual exchange within groups and also to the institute as a whole.

The Unit is also a leader in the creation and coordination of PASSDA infrastructure for national survey data, which involves also the coordination of Portuguese participation in ESS, ESV and other international surveys. This is another important contribution and also one of the strong potentials that lay within this Unit.

The Institute counts on a strong organization structure, with a School Board and other more operational Boards: Management, Scientific, Pedagogical, Ethics, and Outreach boards. They are composed by representatives from the different research levels in the Unit, namely PhD students, post-doc and non-permanent researchers and full-time permanent researchers. While this is very well structured, there seems to be a strong level of formalization. Accordingly, more space for team work which would motivate emergence and flow of ideas about new research avenues and strategies would strengthen and project further the potential encapsulated within this R&D Unit.

The researchers with a PhD degree and nuclear CV demonstrate a relevant scientific profile, both at national and international level. The information provided in their ORCID and available websites shows clear advancements in different fields in the social sciences, with a high number of publications in peer reviewed international journals well positioned in Scopus or JCR WoS (some of them Q1, like 'New Media and Society' or 'Journal of Politics'). Furthermore, there are publications of books and book chapters with renowned publishers such as Springer, Routledge or Cambridge University Press. There is a good balance between publications in Portuguese language and other international publication forums. In addition, while co-authorship with colleagues from other countries is emphasised, collaboration and co-authorship among researchers from different research groups within the Institute can be also found, which mirrors the synergies that the Institute tries to promote among research groups. Open access publishing is discussed in

the Unit, and there is full awareness among researchers about the challenges of Plan S. However, funding for Golden Open access is still a big issue, not only for the Institute but for researchers in Portugal in general. Researchers with EU funding have budgets for covering author processing charges, but this is not the case for all research happening within the Unit. Anyhow, the use of the institutional repository for Green open access is in place. Furthermore, the journal and book series published from the Unit both have an open access strategy in place.

The Institute includes 9 PhD programmes, some of which are transdisciplinary and coordinated with other faculties or universities. This provides the opportunity for PhD students to work in a highly stimulating environment, with weekly seminars and ongoing research activities, while at the same time know and collaborate with scholars outside the institute. Advanced training programmes and summer schools for both PhD students and postdoc researchers is successfully provided and strong encouragement to participation in them is in place. There is strong sense of belonging among students and in general a feeling of closeness and good collaboration with supervisors; however, it seemed that there are many formal seminars for academic exchange and less opportunities for informal meetings and collaborations among them. In this sense, there is some room for improvement at the level of doctoral training research possibilities. Furthermore, while most of the PhD students are encouraged to go to international conferences and publish articles in international journals, almost all of them write their dissertations as a monograph and in Portuguese language. Promoting the possibility of doing doctoral dissertations as a compendium of articles would open more possibilities for young scholars to continue research careers when they finish their PhDs.

The Institute counts on technical staff which is specialized and crucial in supporting researchers grant applications. Furthermore, there are informal strategies from the senior researchers to support younger research scholars in their research proposals. For instance, an ERC coaching promoted by a senior who obtained an advanced ERC grant is a valuable internal human resource. Similar strategies of teamwork and optimization of expertise can strengthen strategic planning for the future.

While this Institute has a strong contribution in terms of cutting-edge fundamental research, there is also some indication of outreach and impact on society. However, evidence of the societal and political impact of the research activity of the Unit has not been provided in sufficient detail. It is advisable to think further in including a new strategy for developing outreach activities, promoting co-production of knowledge with the diversity of stakeholders related to some of the research projects and creating a systematic way of monitoring and gathering societal and political impact in qualitative and/or quantitative forms.

The objectives for 2018-2022 and future strategy are well planned, but not always well specified. The objectives include emergent research in the three axes of inclusion, citizenship and sustainability. The plan addresses properly the need to continue promoting international and national data infrastructures, the presence of the Institute in contributing to the SSH research agenda internationally and the promotion of postgraduate and young researchers careers. In this line, it is important to mention the creation of an international research-led master's course in advance quantitative and qualitative methods, which is coherent with the lines of research of the Institute and its transdisciplinary approach, and covers a gap in early career training. Strengthening the future strategy with elements of teamwork and optimization of expertise among researchers would be important for the future, as well as a more clear plan for transferring scientific research outcomes into benefits for society and public policy.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Sociology, Anthropology, Demography e Geography

R&D Unit: Instituto de Sociologia da Universidade do Porto (IS-UP)

Coordinator: Alexandra Cristina Ramos da Silva Lopes Gunes

Integrated PhD Researchers: 37

Overall Quality Grade: VERY GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 4
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 4
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 4

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 518 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 6

Programmatic Funding: 523 K€, including for 2 (1 Junior, 1 Auxiliar) New PhD Researchers Contracts.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The Unit is a small- to medium-sized research entity, with an established profile within Portugal and abroad. It has strong national presence, and good international presence, within the field of sociology and cognate areas. It provides a valuable resource for sociology research and advanced training in northern Portugal, while contributing in various ways to international social science.

There has been intellectual expansion over time, with a move from a core staff group with relatively similar intellectual profiles, to a more diverse staffing profile, encompassing a broader range of disciplinary and practitioner forms of expertise.

The Unit has a distinctive mix of sociological topics and forms of expertise. As a relatively long-standing Unit, it has a core identity which is shared by all members, from senior research leaders to beginner PhD students. There is much potential in the Unit for reaching wider audiences and for undertaking larger projects. The sense of community and common purpose has been boosted by the relocation of the Unit to one building where most or all researchers and students are located.

Ethical issues are dealt with in appropriate ways. The movement towards Open Access publishing is also being effectively handled.

There is a good range of, and balance between, different methodological orientations, and the diversity is impressive in a Unit of this relatively small size. There is also a sound and productive interplay between research, teaching and societal impact.

There are various areas of research which have international significance and recognition, including, for example, the analysis of social class and the sociology of arts and culture. Publications in these and other areas are quite strong, with a good range of internationally relevant publications in good outlets.

The funding base for research has been reasonable, with funding from FCT and one Horizon 2020 project.

The research groups have emerged in sensible ways from existing staff interests. They have a concrete existence, having been used to put together large grant applications. However, they are still rather too loose to function as directive mechanisms for making future strategic decisions about which topic areas to concentrate on and, possibly, which areas to reduce or pull out of.

The Unit is currently too modestly-sized really to benefit from the development of Thematic Lines at this stage in its history. But some thought should be given to exploring these, at least to help recalibrate the currently rather loose research grouping headings and thematics.

The Unit has a fairly wide range of experts in their fields, especially given the relatively modest size of the Unit, ranging from highly applied researchers to sociological theorists, with most personnel inhabiting a middle ground between these poles, as one would expect in a Unit of this sort. This mixture of abilities and interests is a good basis for future endeavours and for realising ambitions.

The staff are for the most part outward-looking and contributing to international as well as national research agendas. Some research programmes are particularly internationally-facing. Staff linkages to colleagues in other countries, including key contacts in France, are useful and productive, and more can be made of them in the future.

The modes of communication within the Unit are primarily of an informal nature. This makes sense given the relatively modest size of the Unit. However, care should be taken that important issues are communicated formally too.

The Unit leadership display a very sound understanding of what expansion of the Unit should entail. More generally, the level of leadership is of high quality, displaying acute awareness of both the limitations, strengths and future possible trajectories of the Unit. Leadership also has involved very high levels of commitment, and very effective forms of community building and solidarity enhancement. This also provides a very sound basis for future activities.

The relatively small number of PhD students is a disadvantage in terms of creating, maintaining and expanding a graduate school. The Panel recognises the reasons behind the relatively small numbers, namely limited funding opportunities and high levels of competition.

The interviewed PhD students lacked resources which would enable them to more fully internationalize their research activities and intellectual outlooks, such as by attending international conferences or having more systematic support to allow them to publish in English. Relatively modest inputs such as better language translation software would make a significant positive difference to the abilities of PhD students to build internationally viable careers. Nonetheless, there is evidence that PhD students are actively encouraged to organise their own career building events, and they indeed do so. Post PhD careers training is underpowered, probably due to a lack of sufficient time for senior researchers to carry out these activities as much as would be desirable.

The Unit is intellectually and pragmatically more than viable. But it is seriously undercut by lack of support funding in almost all key areas of endeavour. There is a strong sense amongst Unit members of living "hand to mouth". This in turn undermines levels of energy, both individual and collective. Strategic funding is very much needed to address these matters and to put the Unit on a markedly more secure and forward-facing footing.

The Unit physical location in the city of Oporto has already been drawn upon effectively in various ways, using the city as an exploratory field-site for exploring broader social issues which affect other parts of Europe and the world. This approach to using the local to study the global should be built upon more in the future. A guiding principle here could be to model the Unit partly on that of the Chicago School of sociology, which used diverse research methods to study the city around them and then draw broader sociological conclusions of relevance to international social science.

In the interests of furthering internationalization, the Unit should also expand and strengthen its International Advisory Board, considering communication with them through electronic methods as well as face-to-face meetings. Mentoring of PhD students could be markedly enhanced through such a mechanism.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Sociology, Anthropology, Demography e Geography

R&D Unit: Unidade de Investigação em Educação e Intervenção Comunitária (RECI)

Coordinator: Zaida de Aguiar Sá Azeredo

Integrated PhD Researchers: 28

Overall Quality Grade: WEAK

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 2
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 2
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 2

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

This Unit wanted to be evaluated under a thematic area “Inclusion, Multiculturalism and Social Integration”, but as this area did not receive a sufficient number of applications to function it was assigned to the Social Sciences - Sociology, Anthropology, Demography e Geography Panel. RECI felt this to be the second-best option. FCT provided the Panel with an evaluation by an expert in the field.

RECI’s activities cover a broad range of topics with two lines: “Inclusion and life-long learning” and “Social practices and community well-being”. Under these lines there is a very broad variety of topics varying from (e-)learning to drug and alcohol consumption, to ageing. The combination of the Instituto Piaget and APDES in RECI is a promising synergetic enterprise. Networks in the (local) community (APDES) and scholarly experience (Instituto Piaget) are brought together. The two research lines seem to have developed from each of the two constitutive institutions. The interaction between the two lines should be strengthened in order to better realise the potential synergy between the two institutions. In fact, having these two lines might hinder synergy rather than facilitate it. The Panel feels that reflection on the theoretical and methodological approaches adopted by the Centre is needed in order to strengthen the capacity for broader societal impact, for example in a critical analysis of local and national policies.

The Centre is distinct in its focus on the transfer of scholarly knowledge for the benefit of local communities, and, for example, through peer research on empowering communities. Including the voice of the participants is well-developed and all projects seem to be anchored in the community. The Unit describes itself as structured around three vectors: research, intervention and advocacy and it seeks to pursue the integration of these three vectors. It wants to influence policies, be a resource of knowledge, and stimulate use of action research. Scientific production *strictu sensu* is not the first priority but is seen as one outcome of action research in intervention studies. Evidently the intervention vector is the strongest developed element from which advocacy and research are fed. Research in this case functions to make interventions and policy advice evidence-based rather than knowledge on interventions contributing to theoretical progress. Contributions to theoretical developments have not been convincingly conveyed to the Panel. Part of RECI’s research focuses on lifelong learning and there are several European networks on adult education, some of which focus on scientific research while others are aimed at policy-makers and practitioners. Involvement in such networks would give the R&D Unit a higher profile. It would also widen RECI’s contacts for possible future research partners.

The outcomes of multidisciplinary approached activities clearly benefit society and specifically the local community, and perhaps in some cases may have international relevance. Research outcomes until recently have primarily been published in Portuguese with far more conference than journal publications. Researchers have adequate background and expertise, but the international activity and scholarly publications are very limited. Moreover, publications of members are mostly in journals which are not included in the WoS or Scopus. Internationalization is a strategic aim, but the activities in order to facilitate this internationalization have not been shown to the Panel. Some incentives for publishing internationally are in place (e.g., travel grants), but the Panel felt that the effects of these incentives were not (yet) visible. More strategic support for international research applications and for the submission of papers to international journals would improve the reach of their scientific activity.

Most of the international activity that is funded through the European Commission is from applied programmes including DG Justice, DG Home, and the UNDP, but there is no participation in the Framework Programme of Research. Few integrated PhD researchers have led or have been involved in competitive R&D funding, nationally or internationally. There is a fundraising department in RECI for supporting grant acquisition. Also, technical and financial

support is available. RECI does have some international links with particular countries such as Africa, Brazil and southern European countries through some of its research projects but in proportion to the number of integrated researchers, and, therefore the size of the research team, the international links are very limited. On their website and in their report RECI states that one of their main goals is 'to establish itself as an unavoidable resource for scientists, professionals and decision-makers in the national context'. In such statements there is no reference to an international context.

Compared to university R&D Units, RECI writes, it has adopted a less 'traditional' and scientific approach to research by using action research methodologies to facilitate intervention strategies and make resources and findings available to professionals, policy-makers and community agents as well as to the scientific community. RECI's research, therefore, aims to have an impact on policy-making and practice. The Panel understands this focus, but feels that the Centre underestimates the diversity of research approaches that can be found in academia. There are no mechanisms in place to monitor the societal impact.

The organizational structure is clear. It provides researchers with formal and informal ways to participate in the Centre governance. Several procedures for communication such as meetings, seminars and Go-To meetings and Skype are in place, but the dispersed geographical locations sometimes hinder the collaboration. Interpersonal relations are good and young/new researchers easily can benefit from the experience of longer established colleagues through formal and informal communication and interaction. Integrated researchers mentioned that there is very close relationship among them and intense informal interaction at the project level. However, more structured meetings would strengthen the strategy of RECI to promote scientific research.

RECI has no PhD programme but encourages researchers without a PhD to acquire that degree for the benefit of the candidates themselves and for the quality of the RECI projects. The PhD students the Panel met felt supported by the Centre in their projects and to some degree in going to conferences, and publishing. Funds however are limited and some improvement seemed to be possible in terms, for instance of funding travel for international conferences. The Panel suggests that always connecting the topic of the PhD project to one of RECI's projects would benefit both RECI and the PhD students research environment. Also, facilitating PhD students as a collective might help to allow RECI to benefit more from the PhD projects.

Open access is not yet a priority and budgets for article processing cost are limited. The Centre is very well aware of ethical issues involved in their projects and is underway in establishing an ethical committee.

Overall, the foreseen objectives for 2018-2022 lack details about the research agenda to ensure the development of competitive research projects and scientific publications.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Sociology, Anthropology, Demography e Geography

R&D Unit: Unidade de Investigação em Governança, Competitividade e Políticas Públicas (GOVCOPP)

Coordinator: Eduardo Anselmo Moreira Fernandes Castro

Integrated PhD Researchers: 84

Overall Quality Grade: VERY GOOD

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 4
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 4
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 4

Base Funding for (2020-2023): 1160 K€

Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 4

Programmatic Funding: 388 K€, including for 1 (Junior) New PhD Researcher Contract.

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The Unit describes itself as a R&D Unit for applied more than fundamental research. Nevertheless, the Panel observed that several contributions in publications are really at the front of scientific developments achieving very interesting and significant results. Specifically, this is the case for rigorous methodological developments and innovations such as using Bayesian statistics, work in the Systems for Decisions Support group and in the Behavioural and Experimental lab. The Unit touches on a wide variety of topics, and is very productive with impressive internationally published articles. There are some international staff members. Researchers have adequate background and expertise, covering the disciplines needed for GOVCOPP's projects and showing international activity. Moreover, publications of members are well spread over different types of outlets, including journals which are indexed in the WoS or Scopus.

The wide variety of topics makes one wonder what the coherence is and if there is synergy between the different groups in even within groups. During the visit this coherence was not well-articulated. There are international networks and contacts, but here improvement is possible. Several topics studied have mainly a local significance, but some members are able to publish internationally about it anyway. The role of the Centre as lead partner in Horizon 2020 projects is limited and no ERC grants have been won, nor applied for. Funding for projects clearly has grown over the evaluation period as has the number of integrated researchers.

The Centre builds bridges between science and society, specifically, but not exclusively, the local communities. The Centre did not show the Panel mechanisms to monitor their societal impact. That doesn't mean there is no impact, on the contrary the Panel saw several projects with local communities where problems were solved. The researchers try not to be mere consultants who solve practical problems but want to contribute to theoretical developments. However, the Panel felt the way these developments were described not always convincing. What theoretical contributions GOVCOPP has provided was not well articulated.

As so many other Centres the Panel visited, GOVCOPP feels that their distinct quality is the transdisciplinary approach for the solution of problems and the Panel has seen such transdisciplinarity in several projects. When questioned about issues of inter- multi- and transdisciplinary approaches a clear vision was not conveyed to the Panel. Other characteristics that the Centre felt distinguished GOVCOPP from other Centres were the balance between scientific and societal impact, contact with local authorities, the availability of knowledge and methods from several disciplines at campus, specifically the integration of engineering and biology in the social sciences. The Panel recognizes these characteristics, but feels these are not unique for GOVCOPP.

The governance of the Centre on the one hand follows the legal requirements and on the other brings principles of good governance in practice by organising frequent formal and informal interactions and good dialogue about both organizational and academic topics. The scientific council and research group meetings play an important role and seem to help everyone feel to be connected. Strong in this Centre are the research groups; these function in the governance of the Centre and in the activities to pursue the Centre academic mission, among others by organizing governance meetings, research meetings and seminars and by budget policies and administering these budgets. Researchers feel

associated both to the Centre GOVCOPP and their research group. Also, communication to facilitate synergy between groups is well-organised without hierarchical barriers.

The Centre strives to be international and at the PhD programme level it indeed is a truly international Centre with students from a wide variety of countries ranging from Brazil to Germany and Pakistan. The 9 PhD programs GOVCOPP participates in have a good ratio between defended PhDs and staff and are very well organised. Students know who and when to approach, be it supervisors or other experienced or young colleagues. They feel very well supported by their supervisors and the wider academic environment. Budgets for travel, editing and translation are available, although not very extensive in case a PhD project is not connected to a funded research project. There is a lot of exchange within and across PhD programmes as is the case for the research groups. PhD students would like to have teaching opportunities among others for career building, but such opportunities are not provided. Other help for career building is available either in the Centre or the university. The PhD students the Panel met, to their knowledge, are not included in the Centre's governance.

The awareness of open access policies is in a rather early stage and procedures for making publications freely available seem not very well developed.

Ethical questions have not been documented in the application, because it was felt to be not so important. In answering questions of the Panel, it appeared that there is an ethical committee in the university and that researchers are expected to follow the appropriate ethical guidelines.

The Unit seems to be aware of what can be improved and has some specified plans for that. Strategic aims are engaging, appropriate, timely and fitted to the stage of development of the Centre. However also when asked for by the Panel, little operationalization in concrete actions was found. For example, for internationalization sending emails about the importance of internationalization obviously will not be sufficient action. There is no elaborate system for rewarding international production in place. The Centre wants to produce knowledge that is accepted by society, instead of being considered just another opinion. No concrete mechanisms or procedures to reach this aim were mentioned. The latter doesn't mean that knowledge the Centre produces is not accepted in society, but that reflection on how to do that is not sufficiently developed. In fact, building bridges between science and local society might be a key achievement of the Centre. Finally, the Panel got insufficient insight in the way the Centre wants to achieve sustainable growth.

Generally, the Panel felt that too often the Centre focusses on what the outside world does or doesn't do instead of considering what the Centre could do.

Evaluation Panel: SOCIAL SCIENCES - Sociology, Anthropology, Demography e Geography

R&D Unit: Unidade de Investigação Interdisciplinar - Comunidades Envelhecidas Funcionais (Age.Comm)

Coordinator: Maria João da Silva Guardado Moreira

Integrated PhD Researchers: 14

Overall Quality Grade: INSUFFICIENT

Evaluation Criteria Ratings

- (A) Quality, merit, relevance and internationalization of the R&D activities of the Integrated Researchers in the R&D Unit Application: 1
- (B) Merit of the team of Integrated Researchers: 1
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 1

Justification, Comments and Recommendations

Given the absence of research activity from the preceding 5-year period, it is not possible for the Panel to offer scores for this Unit, although some description of the limited evidence is offered below.

However, since the web-based form insists on the insertion of numbers for the three criteria, we have put in '1', even though we think that the Unit cannot be evaluated in the terms of this review.

This Unit wanted to be evaluated under a thematic area: "Aging; Work and Social and Cultural Activities in the Life-cycle, Health and Well-being", but because of lack of other applications in this area it had to choose the Social Sciences Panel for its evaluation. FCT provided the Panel with an evaluation by an expert in the field of aging.

This R&D Unit offers an interesting vision of how to bring together inter-disciplinary groups – notably in relation to health, IT, planning and some of the social sciences – to consider key issues around ageing populations in interior regions. It is clear from the proposal that the Centre is in an early stage of development, for instance, much of the planning is written in the future tense, describing aspirations that are not yet rooted in practice.

The Unit has achieved some notable successes in its short lifetime, despite the absence of significant research funding. These include the development of a Masters course in Gerontology, the identification of a range of local stakeholders in the sparsely populated interior region, including higher education institutions, Municipal Councils, institutional care and non-government organisations and the establishment of international links, both with similar territories in Spain and with some major European research programmes. Furthermore, work around palliative care has been initiated.

While the Centre describes itself as an applied R&D Unit, the Panel's impression was that the activities are primarily aimed at (developing and improving) the provision of services. The amount of time available for research is very limited since most members are teachers in a Polytechnic with a notional 20% of their time allocated for research; others are working in institutions such as hospitals that provide clinical services and which do not allow staff any research time.

Grants that have been awarded to support research activity seem to be very limited in size.

Out of the five nominated publications, two are in English. One is a conference proceeding with limited value as a research output. The other is an interesting historical study in a book chapter that sets out the background rationale for this Unit. This amounts to extremely low productivity for the Centre, if assessed over a five year period.

The governance of the Centre is sound with a scientific council, a distinguished strategic board and an external advisory committee. There is an appropriate level of involvement for integrated members and communication seems to be both smooth and sufficiently frequent.

The Centre has no PhD programme as it is associated with a Polytechnic Institute, and the PhD students the Panel met were Integrated Researchers whose doctoral studies were registered elsewhere. The students PhD projects were not all closely related to the mission of the Centre. The Centre involvement in and support of the projects seemed limited and the candidates saw their projects primarily as being pursued at their own initiative and sometimes primarily for their personal career perspective.

Because the Unit started only a year ago there is very little that could make this Unit a national point of reference at this point in time.

The Nuclear CVs show highly limited international scholarly production in the field that the Unit covers, beyond a number of conference presentations.

The strategy described in the application and the somewhat different strategy presented during the site visit, are lacking in focus; the strategy is not well operationalized and it is not realistic in the light of the limited resources available, even if FCT funding were acquired. The connection between the Centre mission and two of the four strategic axes is not well justified.

The strategy for the future is more a collection of the ideas and aspirations that have been gathered in the consultation process regarding developing services than a coherent research program. It lacks both a clear theoretical basis and a vision of what could be contributed to the scholarly literature. The aim of facilitating participatory and inclusive communities, characterised by mobility and autonomy at advanced ages, is perhaps progressive but without a theoretical anchoring, risks looking like a plan to impose a policy. The proposal and the site visit presentations were characterised by an imperative to improve the well-being of the aging population in ways that are already defined by the staff, rather than an intention to (co)produce knowledge about how to improve matters.

While the idea of working with older people as 'participants' is emphasized, it was not clear how much they might be truly involved as 'co-producers' or 'co-researchers' in the development of the research agenda and in the research itself. While participative approaches have become a significant area of development work with older people and they may well be a strong feature of the work of the Unit, but it was nonetheless unclear from the information provided the extent to which they are used in practice.

At the international level, participation in some key programmes was presented (e.g. EuroAge; programmes with colleagues in Spain and London; European Innovation Network on Active and Healthy Ageing). At the regional level collaboration with Municipal Councils and cultural associations that led to the development of a social survey is noted. However in terms of international network participation and regional collaboration, the extent to which such activity leads to scientific outputs was not clear.

Several elements of the strategy seem overambitious. For example, publishing in international journals necessitates a more developed theoretical basis. Applying robotics in elderly care is certainly an interesting option for providing service, but the Panel did not get a sense of it being a realistic strategy for developing international publications in the field of robotics.

The Masters students are nominated as key players in the Unit, but this does not seem a realistic strategy, particularly in terms of scholar production.

The focus of the Unit seems local (Portuguese interior regions especially Beira) and the Panel did not find a clear strategy to turn the experiences in this region into more widely applicable outcomes.