

GLOBAL REPORT ON THE EVALUATION OF THE RESEARCH UNITS ON ART AND ARCHITECTURE AREA

At the end of the evaluation the Panel did not produce a Global Report for the area. As an alternative, the present text offers an analysis of the global data emerging from the exercise, as well of the information contained in the reports corresponding to the individual Research Units.

Twelve Research Units of the Art and Architecture area were evaluated in the period 8 to 12 April 2003 by a scientific Panel coordinated by José Ressano Garcia Lamas. The other Panel members were Luis Moya Gonzalez, Antonio Pizzo, Delfin Rodriguez Ruiz, and Francesco Zurlo. Their respective affiliations can be found in Annex 2 of the Overall Report.

Of the twelve research units, 6 had already been evaluated in the previous cycle, and 6 were new applications. This situation, as well as the name, coordinator, host institution and the final classification of all the units, is presented in TABLE 1. The evaluation focussed on the research activities carried out in the period 1999-2001, taking into consideration the reports presented, the discussions that took place during the visits to the units, and the general impression gathered therein. Individual reports were produced for each unit, containing a general appreciation and several suggestions aimed at improving its future performance. Integration of all the above factors led to the classifications presented in the Table.

From the results in therein it can be concluded that, in general terms, the research units of the Art and Architecture area were well rated. In fact, five (41.7%) were rated as “Very Good” or “Excellent”, four (33.3%) as “Good” and four (25.0%) as “Poor” or “Fair”. Reading the individual units’ reports reinforces this feeling: in general terms, the Panel was well impressed with the research being done in the Art and Architecture area and with the units themselves. In addition, and similarly to other areas, it can be concluded that the new research units had worst performances than the old ones. In fact, two of the three worst ratings – one “Poor”, one “Fair” – were ascribed to this group. As a consequence, one of the new applicants did not become a Research Unit recognised by the Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) for the period 2003 – 2005. The classifications in this group – two “Very Good”, two “Good” and two “Poor” or “Fair” – were, on average, also inferior to those of the other group. This possibly reflects the positive effect of a learning curve for the units with regular activity and financing before the evaluation.

TABLE 1. Evaluation of the Art and Architecture Research Units (1999-2001) - General information

| Unit situation | Unit n. | Name | Coordinator | Host Institution | Final classification |
|-----------------------|----------------|--|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Old | 112 | Centro de História da Arte | José Alberto Simões Gomes Machado | Universidade de Évora | Excellent |
| Old | 145 | Centro de Estudos de Arquitectura e Urbanismo | Nuno Rodrigo Martins Portas | Faculdade de Arquitectura da Universidade do Porto | Very Good |
| Old | 279 | Centro de Estudos de Teatro | Maria Helena Zaira Diniz de Ayala Serodio Pereira | Fundação da Universidade de Lisbon | Excellent |
| Old | Old 417 | Instituto de História da Arte | Margarida Maria Acciaiuoli H. C. Tavares Brito | Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas da Universidade Nova de Lisbon | Good |
| Old | 472 | Instituto de Etnomusicologia | Salwa El-Shawan Castelo-Branco | Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas da Universidade Nova de Lisbon | Good |
| Old | 523 | CEARQ - Centro de Estudos de Arquitectura | Mário Júlio Teixeira Kruger | Faculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia da Universidade de Coimbra | Fair |
| New | 622 | Centro de Investigação em Ciências e Tecnologias das Artes | Francisco José Amorim de Carvalho Guerra | Universidade Católica Portuguesa - Centro Regional do Porto | Good |
| New | 648 | Centro de Estudos de Arquitectura Paisagista - Professor Caldeira Cabral | Maria Manuela Cordes Cabêdo Sanches Raposo Magalhães | Instituto Superior de Agronomia da Universidade Técnica de Lisbon | Good |
| New | 693 | Centro de Estudos de Sociologia e Estética Musical | Mário António Pinto Vieira de Carvalho | Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas da Universidade Nova de Lisbon | Very Good |
| New | 711 | Unidade de Investigação em Design e Comunicação - UNIDCOM/IADE | Fernando António de Oliveira Carvalho Rodrigues | IADE, Instituto de Artes Visuais Design e Marketing | Fair |
| New | 729 | Vidro e Cerâmica para as Artes | José Carlos Fernandes de Carvalho e Melo | Faculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia da Universidade Nova de Lisbon | Very Good |
| New | 751 | CIEIA - Centro Interdisciplinar de Estudos e Intervenção Artísticos | Lucília Maria de Oliveira Rodrigues da Costa Valente | MPIAEP | Poor |

TABLE 2. Evaluation of the Art and Architecture Research Units - Comparative chronological and territorial analysis

| Unit n. | Name | Town | Region | Classification 1999 - 2001 | Classification 2003 | FTEs 2000 | FTEs 2003 | Financing 2000-2002 (€) | Financing 2003-2005 (€) |
|---|--|---------|----------|----------------------------|---------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 279 | Centro de Estudos de Teatro | Lisbon | LVT | Excellent | Excellent | 5 | 7.0 | 108,721.3 | 111,500.0 |
| 417 | Instituto de História da Arte | Lisbon | | Good | Good | 4 | 7.0 | 31,812.2 | 56,700.0 |
| 472 | Instituto de Etnomusicologia | Lisbon | | Very Good | Good | 1 | 10.0 | 16,360.6 | 81,000.0 |
| 648 | Centro de Estudos de Arquitectura Paisagista - Professor Caldeira Cabral | Lisbon | | | Good | | 4.0 | | 32,400.0 |
| 693 | Centro de Estudos de Sociologia e Estética Musical | Lisbon | | | Very Good | | 10.0 | | 81,000.0 |
| 711 | Unidade de Investigação em Design e Comunicação - UNIDCOM/IADE | Lisbon | | | Fair | | 14.0 | | 31,500.0 |
| 729 | Vidro e Cerâmica para as Artes | Lisbon | | | Very Good | | 3.5 | | 28,350.0 |
| Data for the Lisbon and Tagus Valley Region [FTEs; Financing (Euros)]: | | | | | | 10 | 55.5 | 156,894.1 | 422,450.0 |
| 145 | Centro de Estudos de Arquitectura e Urbanismo | Porto | North | Excellent | Very Good | 8 | 15.0 | 83.166,24 | 202,500.0* |
| 622 | Centro de Investigação em Ciências e Tecnologias das Artes | Porto | | | | | 6.0 | | 32.400,00 |
| Data for the North Region [FTEs; Financing (Euros)]: | | | | | | 8 | 21 | 83,166.2 | 234,900.0 |
| 523 | Centro de Estudos de Arquitectura | Coimbra | Centre | Fair | Fair | 4 | 7 | 47,547.9 | 23,625.0 |
| Data for the Centro Region [FTEs; Financing (Euros)]: | | | | | | 4 | 7 | 47,547.9 | 23,625.0 |
| 112 | Centro de História da Arte | Évora | Alentejo | Excellent | Excellent | 9 | 11 | 160,757.0 | 172,500.0 |
| 751 | CIEIA - Centro Interdisciplinar de Estudos e Intervenção Artísticos | Évora | | | | | | | 0.0 |
| Data for the Alentejo Region [FTEs; Financing (Euros)]: | | | | | | 9 | 11 | 160,757.0 | 172,500.0 |
| Global data for Portugal [FTEs; Financing (Euros)]: | | | | | | 31 | 94 | 448,365.3 | 853,475.0 |

* No funding was yet received in this period

A more profound analysis cannot be made without the information gathered by the Panel itself, as part of it is of a subjective nature. Henceforth, to complement the data in this report, it is probably informative to make a comparative analysis between the results of the present evaluation and those of the previous one. It is also interesting to cross that analysis with a territorial one, to assess whether the present good global performance is determined by specific regions or corresponds to the country in general. That analysis is shown in TABLE 2, together with the global amount of financing (from both the “Pluriannual” and “Programmatic” Programmes) received by each unit. As mentioned elsewhere, the financing for the period 2003 - 2005 was calculated taking as a basis the number of FTE PhDs in December 2003, and the following annual values per PhD (in Euros): Excellent – 4,500; Very Good – 4,050; Good – 2,700; Fair – 1,125; Poor – 0. The analysis of the “Programmatic” funding will be done in a specific section, together with that of other areas.

Comparison of Tables 1 and 2 evidences a number of interesting conclusions. The first is that from 2000 to 2003 the number of financed FCT Research Units in the Art and Architecture area increased from 6 to 11 and the corresponding number of FTEs augmented from 31 to 94, 83.3% and 204.8%, respectively. The second is that the units are relatively well distributed throughout the country, being localised in the North, Centro, Lisbon and Tagus Valley (LVT) and Alentejo regions. However the LVT region is by far the predominant one, followed by the North region. This is a new situation, because the results of the 1999 - 2001 evaluation were much more homogeneous nationally, both in number of Units, FTEs and financing. Another conclusion is that the best ratings (“Very Good” and “Excellent”) are also prevalent in the LVT region. The situation is summarized in Table 3 for the two evaluation cycles.

TABLE 3. National distribution of the classifications of the RUs in the two cycles

| Regions | Situation in 2000 | | | | Situation in 2003 | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------|-------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------|-------------|------------------|
| | Very Good + Excellent | Good | Fair + Poor | Units per Region | Very Good + Excellent | Good | Fair + Poor | Units per Region |
| LVT | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 7 |
| | 50.0% | 100.0% | 0.0% | 50.0% | 60.0% | 75.0% | 33.3% | 58.3% |
| NORTH | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| | 25.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 16.7% | 20.0% | 25.0% | 0.0% | 16.7% |
| CENTR | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100.0% | 16.7% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 33.3% | 8.3% |
| ALENTEJO | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| | 25.0% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 16.7% | 20.0% | 0.0% | 33.3% | 16.7% |
| National - n.: (%) | 4 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 12 |
| | 66.6% | 16.7% | 16.7% | 100.0% | 41.7% | 33.3% | 25.0% | 100.0% |

In global terms, the quality of the ratings decreased from one evaluation to the other as the proportion of “Very Good” and “Excellent” went from 66.6% to 41.7%, and the number of Units in the lower end of the ratings (“Fair” and “Poor”) increased from 16.7% to 25%, essentially due to the performance of the Centro region. This in spite of the good performance of the LVT region that improved from 50 to 60% the proportion of Units classified in the upper end of the ratings.

The increase in the number of Research Units was also not homogeneous across the four Regions. It was clearly greater in the LVT region. This is also reflected in the number of FTEs and the financing received, as can be concluded by inspection of TABLE 2. In fact, the number of FTEs increased 455.0%, 162.5%, 75.0% and 22.2% to 55.5, 21, 7 and 11, respectively, in the LVT, North, Centro, and Alentejo regions. Also, the global financing for the 3 years period augmented 90.4% from 448,365.3 to 853,475.0 Euros (from 4,821.1 to 3,010.5 *Euros/ researcher.year*). The variation is reflected in the four regions by changes in financing of 169.3%, 182.4%, (-) 50.3% and 7.3%, respectively, to 422,450.0, 234,900.0, 23,625.0 and 172,500.0 Euros. This corresponds to 5,229.8, 3,465.3, 3,962.3 and 5,954.0 *Euros/researcher.year*, respectively, in 2000 - 2002 and 2,537.2, 3,728.6, 1,125.0 and 5,227.3 *Euros/ researcher.year*, in 2003 - 2005.

In conclusion, the last cycle of evaluations of the Art and Architecture area led to a concentration of Research Units and FTEs in the LVT region, thus ending the near national homogeneity that had resulted from the previous cycle. LVT Units also obtained the highest global financing in the 2003 - 2005 period. The North region occupies the second place in the number of Units, FTEs, average ratings and global financing and the third in financing per FTE researcher. The Centre Region has the lowest number of Research Units, FTEs, global financing and average ratings. The Alentejo region, after exclusion of the Unit rated as “Poor”, occupies the first place in financing per FTE researcher and average ratings and the third in global financing and FTEs. It is also of note the negative performance of the Unit located in the Centre region, which did not improve the bad ratings it received in the previous evaluation.