

## Evaluation Panel: ARTS AND HUMANITIES – Philosophy

### Panel Members

Michael Esfeld (Chair)	University of Lausanne, Switzerland
Alberto Voltolini	University of Torino, Italy
Anna Marmodoro	University of Durham and University of Oxford, United Kingdom
Georg Bertram	Free University of Berlin, Germany
Véronique Zanetti	University of Bielefeld, Germany

### R&D Units

Centro de Estudos de Filosofia (CEFi)	Universidade Católica Portuguesa (UCP)
Centro de Estudos Filosóficos e Humanísticos (CEFH)	Universidade Católica Portuguesa (UCP)
Centro de Ética, Política e Sociedade (CEPS)	Universidade do Minho (UM)
Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa (CFUL)	Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa (FL/ULisboa)
Centro de Filosofia das Ciências da Universidade de Lisboa (CFCUL)	FCiências.ID - Associação para a Investigação e Desenvolvimento de Ciências (Fciências.ID)
Centro de Investigação em Teologia e Estudos de Religião (CITER)	Universidade Católica Portuguesa (UCP)
Instituto de Estudos Filosóficos (IEF)	Universidade de Coimbra (UC)
Instituto de Filosofia (IF)	Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto (FL/UP)
Instituto de Filosofia da Nova (IFILNOVA)	Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas (FCSH/UNL)
PRAXIS - Centro de Filosofia, Política e Cultura (PRAXIS)	Universidade da Beira Interior (UBI)



## Evaluation Panel: ARTS AND HUMANITIES – Philosophy

---

**R&D Unit:** Centro de Estudos de Filosofia (CEFi)

**Coordinator:** Carlos Aurélio Ventura Morujão

**Integrated PhD Researchers:** 31

---

**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: 2
- (C) Appropriateness of objectives, strategy, plan of activities and organization: 1

### Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The R&D Unit is mainly devoted to Christian phenomenological philosophy. Even though this could serve as providing a focus for research, the Unit seems to lack an internal coherence. Three thematic lines of research have been present in the 2013-2017 period and are still going to be pursued in the 2018-2022 timeslot, one concerning the interconnections between phenomenology and psychoanalysis, another one on religious spirituality and the meaning of life based on a Franciscan perspective, and a third one on ethical issues about man, particularly focused on the philosophical figure of Bernard Lonergan.

More research lines, actually eight, have been sketched in the presentation, but they seem to unnecessarily multiply the diversity of the studies. In the presentation, moreover, a difference has been drawn between research lines and research activities, but it was not totally clear the point of distinction (possibly the research activities are basically reading groups). Yet, the appeal to interdisciplinarity notwithstanding, such lines are not particularly integrated. On the one hand, this depends on the fact that such lines are mostly addressed to investigate the thought of single philosophers (originally Lonergan himself and Morujao, nowadays also Henry) without a clear explanation of the reasons why such philosophers deserve to be studied. This fact raises some queries. On the one hand, first of all, more should be said about whether Henry is relevant because of his focusing on issues such as pain and death, which may be relevant as far as issues about the meaning of life are concerned. On the other hand, moreover, it is not clear, nor it emerged clearly in the debate, whether the study of Morujao is relevant because he has been a leading figure in Portuguese phenomenological thought, or because of his connection with other phenomenological themes more popularly investigated in the overall worldly phenomenological research. If the latter, one should plan not only a critical edition of his works, which are expectedly mostly in Portuguese, but also a thorough scrutiny of the connections between his thought and the thought of international leading figures in the phenomenological movement. (This emerged as a general problem concerning the study of all the Portuguese philosophers involved in the research lines). Finally, it appears that the research themes are rather heterogeneous (for instance, it would be better to understand how religious experience and aesthetic experience, which are both studied in one of the research lines, can be theoretically connected, and whether, or up to what extent, a phenomenological approach to the mind is the ground for all such attitudes). For instance, while one may understand how religious studies about eschatology and the meaning of life can have an impact on the research on ethics, as regards the human life addressed in various dimensions, it is less clear how this may have to do with researches in phenomenology centered on the problem of the relationship between perception and hallucinations.

In this respect, there appears to be no convincing strategy for making the Unit research more palatable from an international point of view. For instance, the appeal to the translation of Lonergan works in Portuguese definitely deserves attention, but it is not clear how this can increase the international impact of the Unit research. Even if partnerships with Portuguese and other international organizations are mentioned, there appears to be no articulated plan for establishing and consolidating international partnerships and networks. Just one mention occurs for an application in 2015 to a Horizon 2020 call, yet the application has to do with a theme, social responsibility, which seems to be a further one, not entirely connected with the other research lines. The Unit publications seem to have basically a local focus and impact, as it also appears in the general survey of the editorial activity. By contrast, the idea of founding a new international peer-reviewed journal, the International Journal of Philosophy and Social Values, seems attractive, especially because up to now the publications seem to have had just a local impact, for they are mainly in Portuguese. Yet it is not clear up to what extent the new journal is intended to be an academic one, with an aim at international high

standards, or if it will be also addressed to dissemination purposes. Since just two issues of the journal have hitherto come out, a proper assessment of this point has to be postponed.

As regards the planned budget, an important attention is devoted both to recruiting technical staff and to attracting visiting researchers. Yet it is less clear how the post-doc researcher that is required will be supposed to work. Even though s/he is expected to have a preparation in phenomenology and to work on phenomenological thought, s/he is requested to collaborate with all the research lines, notably to cooperate with the seminar on Phenomenology and Psychoanalysis, and with studies both on Morujao and on Ortega. S/he is planned to also work in scientific boards and commissions belonging to the Center. All this kind of work may substract her/hem the relevant energies to pursue her/his own research career, especially if one considers that the position required is not permanent. Perhaps different figures would have better served these desiderata; alternatively, it would have been more recommendable to have PhD students working in such different directions respectively. It is problematic for the Unit not to have a PhD program (and not even a MA program in philosophy) to which it corresponds. This explains why the Unit has had nearly no PhD students within it during the last years. And, as we have learned during the site visit, this is as well the reason for why the Unit has not applied for PhD fellowships (because PhD students cannot be enrolled in a PhD program in philosophy at the Portuguese Catholic University at Lisbon). But it is at the same time a clear symptom of the fact that the Unit lacks the necessary grounding in teaching and PhD education. Thus, it seems highly advisable for the Portuguese Catholic University to establish a PhD program in philosophy if it wants to further run this research Unit.

## Evaluation Panel: ARTS AND HUMANITIES – Philosophy

---

**R&D Unit:** Centro de Estudos Filosóficos e Humanísticos (CEFH)

**Coordinator:** Augusto Soares da Silva

**Integrated PhD Researchers:** 39

---

**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):** 484 K€

### Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 2

Programmatic Funding: 120 K€.

### Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The strength of the Unit is the interdisciplinary approach to the topic of the relationship between nature, person and society, involving researchers mainly from philosophy, linguistics, psychology and literature studies, but also from economics. On the one hand, there is a fruitful interdisciplinary cooperation in the Unit from which also the PhD students profit. On the other hand, this broad approach also has the consequence that the Unit lacks a clear research focus. There are very good achievements in particular areas, for instance in linguistics with an excellent reputation throughout the Portuguese language community including notably Brazil.

Overall, the Unit profits from many valuable international connections. Its internal structure and governance is convincing. However, the Unit as such is not perceived as a major player for the relationship between nature, person and society in the philosophy community. Its composition and the very diverse research topics are explained rather by the circumstances in the Catholic University of Portugal in Braga than by a precise common research interest. Nonetheless, the Unit succeeded in turning these circumstances into a successful interdisciplinary cooperation of research into the relationship between man and nature, broadly conceived. We indeed consider it to be an important mission of philosophy to build bridges towards other disciplines and acknowledge the achievements of the Unit in that respect. We also appreciate that the Unit acquired not only Portuguese funding from the FCT, but that the research group on cognition, intersubjectivity and human development also won European funding. The Unit has 4 PhD programmes running with regular seminars for the PhD students, both within each research topic and in an interdisciplinary manner. This is very good and we encourage the Unit to continue in this way. The number of PhD theses completed in the period 2013-17 is satisfactory.

There is a huge number of publications, both books/edited books and journal articles, among them an impressive number of publications in journals that are listed in Scopus and/or the Web of Science. However, as regards philosophy proper, there are no publications in internationally recognized philosophy journals in the period 2013-17. As things stand, the publication output in philosophy with international visibility is therefore weak (although we appreciate the visibility in philosophy journals in the Portuguese language community including Brazil). The Unit edits the Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia. It succeeded to bring this journal up to international standards, since it will be listed in Scopus. This is a very good achievement.

The Unit has a strategy of sharpening its research focus by further developing the existing four research topics. We appreciate the SWOT analysis and the Unit being conscious about the fields where it has weaknesses (such as the lack of international publications in philosophy) and the development of a strategy for improvement, e.g. achieve more international publications through reduction of teaching load. We see a potential for further development for the group working on topic 1, namely emergent properties and top-down causation. There is a precise research topic here together with a clear choice of methodology to pursue this topic (i.e. emergentism by contrast to reductionism, top-down causation by contrast to causal closure of the physical). There is an expertise in philosophy of science with a physics background of some of the involved researchers and there is a clear competence in metaphysics. What the group working on this topic should achieve in the period 2019-22 is international visibility by publishing in English in

philosophy journals in the field and by intensifying research contacts and cooperations beyond the Portuguese language community. We appreciate the measures envisaged to achieve this goal such as reductions in the teaching load. We are also convinced by the group working on topic 4 of cognition, intersubjectivity and human development and its strategy of confirming its position of an international player in this field also beyond the Portuguese language community. Again, we see the clear choice of a methodology based on embodiment. We also appreciate the research done on topic 2 on ethical implications of science and technology as well as on topic 3 on symbolic interactions. However, our concern is that the profile of the Unit becomes too vague by extending research to topics such as health, tourism and migration. If such topics are pursued together with research in core areas of philosophy such as metaphysics, philosophy of language and philosophy of science, the link with these core areas has to become clearly visible, that is, how they profit from the core competences in philosophy for their research and what they give back to philosophy. We would therefore like to suggest to the Unit to consider linking the research subjects of topics 2 and 3 more close to the research in the core philosophy subjects in topics 1 and 4, that is, philosophy of science, metaphysics and philosophy of language. In sum, we encourage the Unit to concentrate its research in a better way and thereby to obtain a clear focus that will be associated with the Unit and make it visible as a Unit on the international level while at the same time preserving the extremely valuable interdisciplinary cooperation.

Given the rating of the Unit and the limited number of PhD fellowships and research positions awarded within this FCT Program, the requests of the Unit cannot be met.

## Evaluation Panel: ARTS AND HUMANITIES – Philosophy

---

**R&D Unit:** Centro de Ética, Política e Sociedade (CEPS)

**Coordinator:** João Carlos Ribeiro Cardoso Mendes

**Integrated PhD Researchers:** 14

---

**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):** 180 K€

### Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 5

Programmatic Funding: 570 K€, including for 2 (Junior) New PhD Researcher Contract.

### Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The distinctive feature of this Center resides in the fact that it is the only Center in Portugal dedicated only to the fields of Political Theory and Philosophy and Applied Ethics. This specialization is its flagship. The particular strength of the Center lies indeed in its remarkable cohesion and the coherence of the program. While each research group benefits from the indispensable freedom to define the focus of the project and the desirable means to optimize it, the thematic homogeneity of the Unit makes possible an intensive interaction and cooperation among the researchers.

The Unit hosts research of high quality on very social relevant topics in political philosophy which are extremely actual and widely discussed internationally (theories of justice, basic income, democracy theory and populism) and in applied ethics (animal and environmental Ethics and artificial consciousness). The two fields of research interact closely. It is a good example of a Center which takes profit from its small size by opting for a distinct and convincing focus in philosophical research. The combination of the two topics has enabled the Unit to establish an effective networking with valuable partner universities specialized on similar topics (like the Chair Hoover at the Université Catholique de Louvain as well as with Technische Universität Braunschweig or the University of Paris I Sorbonne and the University of Montreal). The COST Action, a project on Liquid Technoethics with the DAAD is also worthwhile to be mentioned. The Unit organizes valuable international scientific events like the Braga Meetings on Ethics and Political Philosophy (with highly recognized guests), the Summer School and the Braga Meetings.

Despite the fact that the Center is still young, it has already a good reputation in Portugal as well as beyond the borders and it manages to attract many research students, especially from the Galician region; indeed, the Center has many connections with the University of Santiago in Spain.

The Unit has a good record of publication with a number of publications in very good international journals. Although it is remarkable that all the main publications listed in the report are in English, most of the other publications are however in Portuguese and it is doubtful whether they reach the sort of international visibility that such topics deserve. For topics that are actually intensively discussed on the international scene, the publication output that lets the Unit attain a substantive form of international visibility should be higher in order for the researchers to contribute to the ongoing international philosophical discussion. The Unit should reflect better on whether there is a viable strategy for enhancing the number of publications in peer reviewed journals in order to increase the visibility of the research activities abroad. In that sense, the foundation of a peer reviewed journal Ethics, Politics & Society, however, constitutes an excellent first step and it is a valuable commitment to strengthen the international profile of the Unit.

Considering that most of the PhD students have no grant and are working for their living, the average of 4 years to finish the doctoral thesis is a very satisfying result and speaks in favor of the good quality of supervision. PhD students benefit from the advise of two or three supervisors; external advisors can be associated as well. PhD students are encouraged to write their doctorate in English. They have organized a research seminar and a reading group in which they present their work in progress. There is also a Summer School which is addressed to them. The climate of research seems to be very beneficial.

The Unit intends to become more involved in the Doctorate program. Given its good structure and its excellent research program, it should pursue a more offensive politics of financing young researchers and we would advise them to apply for more PhD positions.

At the moment a gender imbalance is to be noticed. The research members are aware of it and have already put in place concrete some measures to encourage women to apply for PhD positions.

The Unit pursues a sound strategy of stabilization. It plans to consolidate its focus and gives full priority to developing the projects already launched without being tempted to proliferate the number of projects in an unsustainable way. That makes entirely sense. The Unit expects to grow its impact but its strategy of growth with only 2 PhD fellowships and 2 new researchers to be hired from 2020 until 2022 seems to be too modest. Given the strong coherence, the thematic unity of the Center and the very good scientific record of the integrated researchers, we think that the Unit can afford growing in size without running the risk of losing its cohesion. Since all the topics of research of the groups research are highly debated on the international scene, one would expect the Center to be concerned with seeking other external funding, for example at the European level. The Unit hasn't benefitted from external funding until now. We encourage the Unit to intensify its funding strategy.

## Evaluation Panel: ARTS AND HUMANITIES – Philosophy

---

**R&D Unit:** Centro de Filosofia da Universidade de Lisboa (CFUL)

**Coordinator:** António Pedro Sangreman Proença de Marcelino Mesquita

**Integrated PhD Researchers:** 52

---

**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):** 615 K€

### Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 6

Programmatic Funding: 335 K€, including for 1 (Junior) New PhD Researcher Contract.

### Justification, Comments and Recommendations

Even if it is made up by different, possibly heterogenous, lines of research, the Center for Philosophy in Lisbon is definitely a strong Research Unit, organized along three different research groups: History of Philosophy; Language, Mind and Cognition (LanCog); Practical Philosophy. This said, we encourage the Practical Philosophy group to find more unitary research plans, for it now seems to cover too different research activities (even if this can be explained in terms of the fact that those activities were already present in the Unit before the institution of the new FCT regulations). By contrast, the studies on different individual philosophers in History of Philosophy are justified by the fact that they are leading philosophers in the history of philosophy with all-encompassing views.

The three research groups have been very active in the 2013-2017 period and have planned to so remain for the 2018-2022 timeslot. The Unit has integrated foreigners among its members thus enhancing in various ways its internationalization. In accordance with the available funds, the groups have invited visiting professors for short periods of time to give international lecture courses (see in particular the Petrus Hispanus Lectures below). Partnerships with other Portuguese institutions and especially international networking are very relevant: first of all, an interesting MA program in Contemporary Philosophy has been planned for 2018-2022 in cooperation with the University of Lille; moreover, a network for the study of Neoplatonism has been founded with other international societies; finally, LanCog is a member of the prestigious European network on Philosophy of Language and Mind (PLM). LanCog has also organized a series of international lectures, the Petrus Hispanus lectures, which has hosted distinguished international philosophers (among them Tyler Burge, David Chalmers, Hilary Putnam, Timothy Williamson, Crispin Wright). LanCog has also launched for many years an important tool for analytic philosophy, the Online Companion on Analytic Philosophy, whose entries can be a device of public utility for the entire community in the analytically-oriented philosophical world. The members publications are often of the utmost relevance (Manuel Garcia-Carpintero publishes in top journals such as *Journal of Philosophy*, *Mind*, and *Nous*) and they have taken place in top international journals. In this respect, the research groups could aim at the publication of more papers that are co-authored by two or three members of a group and may include also PhD students. Although there has clearly been a considerable improvement in the number of international publications in the 2013-2017 timeslot, we find that a more systematic plan should be put forward in order to ensure that such an improvement will stabilize. The worthy idea of having the papers corrected by an English native speaker paid by the Unit is not enough.

Although it is not the only journal that the R&D Unit takes care of, the review *Disputatio* is one of the leading European reviews for analytic philosophy, it is well indexed (Q2) by the Scimago Journal Rank, and it hosts an important amount of publications by distinguished contemporary philosophers, along with special issues on some of the main debated topics (e.g., ontological commitment, a symposium on mental files, a special edition on the philosophy of Robert Brandom and John McDowell, with a direct debates between such philosophers). We nevertheless wonder why there is no collaboration between *Disputatio* and another similar journal, basically in philosophy of science, that is edited by the Centre for the Philosophy of Science, i.e. *Kairos*. There is an important work of translation in Portuguese of many classics in philosophy, basically but not exclusively ancient philosophy (the annotated translation of Aristotle) and an ongoing program in the research, transcription, translation, commentary and publication of Early Portuguese Political Thought.

This activity is very important for letting such philosophers be accurately known in the whole Portuguese-speaking world (Brazil first of all). The project on Tolerance and Instability, started in 2014, will be continued. Its topics are central in a contemporary debate that started from logic but was extended to epistemology and metaphysics. Given such interests, it would be natural to search for coplanned activities with other R&D Units in Lisbon, notably the Center for the Philosophy of Science. Some research projects are indeed going in this direction (e.g. the project on emergence directed by David Yates.)

The three PhD programs (Philosophy, Ethics and Societal Challenges, Climate Change and Sustainable Development) are very well established, and their line of expansion makes perfect sense. PhD students are invited to spend some time of their PhD abroad, although unfortunately they can rely for his only on a limited financial support. We however wonder why, on the one hand, the first project is not subdivided into different curricula, and on the other hand, why the second and the third program are not fused, given their evident interconnections. By contrast, given the importance of the Center, a major line of expansion in post-doc positions might have been planned. Possibly, this is due to the fact that a sensible amount of money has been already planned in the budget for contract of researchers with PhD (1078K€). Rightly enough, such positions are open to an international competition, and they have been often been won by non-Portuguese scholars. Yet no structural strategy has been planned yet in order to attract international applications for such positions. In any case, both in the funding for 2013-2017 and in that for 2018-2022, the Unit has also exploited and is expected to exploit some international sources, partly based on EU funding. More financial means could be however devoted to request for such positions if less means were required for Disputatio, once the review found another international publisher that does not request payment.

As we said before, it is highly recommendable to have the 16 PhD positions that the Unit has required. Yet more post-doc positions should be asked in order to increase the internationalization level of the Unit. This would be possible if the funds required for editing Disputatio were reduced. As suggested before, we think that it would be wise to look for another international publisher that does not request payment.

## Evaluation Panel: ARTS AND HUMANITIES – Philosophy

---

**R&D Unit:** Centro de Filosofia das Ciências da Universidade de Lisboa (CFCUL)

**Coordinator:** Rui António Nobre Moreira

**Integrated PhD Researchers:** 47

---

**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):** 570 K€

### Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 6

Programmatic Funding: 335 K€, including for 1 (Junior) New PhD Researcher Contract.

### Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The Unit is unique in at least two aspects: it is the only Centre for philosophy of science in Portugal, and it is located within the faculty of science. The performance of the Unit is very good: corresponding to its mission, it covers the whole area of philosophy of science, that is, (a) its main fields (philosophy of logic and mathematics, formal epistemology, philosophy of physics, philosophy of biology, metaphysics of science, philosophy of technology, etc.), (b) the history as well as the current systematic issues. The Unit pursues a plurality of methods (formal as well as conceptual) and it considers also the relationship between science and arts as well as the one between science and ethics. It runs a PhD programme in philosophy. The number of defended PhD theses (19 in 2013-17) and master diploma (62 in 2013-17) is very good.

The Centre also pursues an internationalization strategy that has many very good aspects: it is internationally well connected, hosts a recognized journal (Kairos, published open access with de Gruyter) and obtained international funding, including a Templeton grant in the past. Nearly half of the researchers in the Centre who hold a PhD did their PhD abroad, which is evidence of the attractiveness of the Centre on an international level. There is an excellent publication output of individual researchers in the Centre: there are papers published in leading international journals such as *Synthese*, *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, *Foundations of Science*, *Axiomathes*, *Topoi*, *Philosophia Mathematica*, *History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences*. There are also books, edited books and contributions to books published by leading international publishing houses such as Springer and Brill.

To maintain its level of very good performance or even improve it in the next funding period, we think that the Centre can undertake measures to further increase its international visibility. We are convinced that the researchers in the Centre have the potential to continue to produce very good or even excellent publications in leading journals and that the Centre provides the necessary environment for that. However, these research outputs are often not perceived as outputs of the Centre as such in distinction to outputs of the individual researchers only. The Centre clearly is visible at the national level as the Unit for research in philosophy of science in Portugal. It also profits from a number of very valuable international contacts. To increase its visibility as a Centre outside Portugal, one suggestion is to establish institutional links with the leading Centres for philosophy of science in Europe as the Munich Center for Mathematical Philosophy, the Center for Philosophy of Science at the London School of Economics, or the Institut d'histoire et philosophie des sciences et technologies in Paris. In that respect, researchers from these institutions could be invited to join in the external advisory board of CFCUL.

We think that the division of the Centre into three research groups – philosophy of formal sciences, philosophy of natural sciences and philosophy of technology – is convincing. We also see the point of the transversal research pole of interdisciplinarity in order to bring these research groups together, for instance in a common weekly seminar of the Centre. We strongly encourage the Centre to continue to pursue the idea of the unity of science, both in its philosophical research as well as in its organization. In that respect, it is important that the philosophy of all the natural sciences, from the formal ones via physics and chemistry to biology and environmental sciences is pursued by the Centre and that the link between these sciences is kept in view, for instance by the project on an overarching theme

such as emergentism, by creating new interdisciplinary links such as the link between the formal science of game theory and evolutionary biology, etc. We also think that the Centre can in that respect profit more from its unique position as being hosted by the faculty of science (instead of the faculty of humanities, where philosophy is located), for instance by trying to bring in more active, working scientists as co-supervisors of PhD theses and the like. In that sense, we consider the strategy to pursue the research as structured in the three groups with the transversal research pole of interdisciplinarity to link them up as providing a very good organizational framework.

However, we are less convinced of extending research group 3 to science and art. On the one hand, outreach to society up to linking science with artistic performances is important. On the other hand, however, if the Centre is to strengthen its internationalization and to become visible in Europe as a Centre for philosophy of science like the Centres existing in Britain, France, Germany, etc., it has to concentrate on sharpening its profile as a Centre for research in philosophy of science as the field is conceived today in Europe and worldwide. In that respect, pursuing the link with science and art on the same level as research in philosophy of science gives the impression of too much of a diversification that hinders in the end the Centre from gaining a clear profile. It is obvious that the Centre cannot and should not pursue a strategy of focusing only on a specific field and a specific methodology. Its unique position in the faculty of science and its mission in favour of the unity of science require it to pursue research in the whole field of the philosophy of natural science including the link with philosophy of technology. However, the profile should then be centred on this mission and also be implemented in a PhD programme that is focused on this mission. Also for the PhD programme, further strengthening the international links of the Centre by establishing for instance institutional links with similar Centres in Europe is very important, so that an exchange is established, e.g. by PhD students going abroad for a stage in other such Centres in Europe, distinguished researchers of the Centres coming in as co-supervisors for PhD theses, etc.

As regards the funding, we recommend to attribute to this Unit 6 grants for PhD students and 1 new Junior Researcher as well some additional Programmatic Funding.

## Evaluation Panel: ARTS AND HUMANITIES – Philosophy

---

**R&D Unit:** Centro de Investigação em Teologia e Estudos de Religião (CITER)

**Coordinator:** Luisa Maria Almendra

**Integrated PhD Researchers:** 23

---

**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 is the first and only Research Centre of this type in Portugal. It is being assessed for the first time this year. In terms of aspirations, it wants to become a flagship Unit within the University, and has been benefitted by institutional support so far for its creation and establishment. It was created in its current format only in 2017, with 23 researchers and 7 PhD students supervised by members of the Unit in 2017.

Given the history and culture of Portugal, the rationale for such a Research Unit to exist is evident.

The Unit assumes that religion is a “constitutive element of the human condition and within society”, and sees as its own aims: 1) to promote multi- and inter- disciplinary research in theology and religious studies 2) to create a bridge with society, linking Christian faith and current social issues and debates. To achieve these goals the Unit has organized itself around two thematic lines: a) values and social dynamics; b) aesthetics of Religion. Each axe aims at promoting interdisciplinary research (theology, religious studies, ethics, sociology, anthropology).

The Unit’s approach in its formation has been very sensible; bottom-up from people to goals (quoting from their self-description: formed through clusters in scientific areas in which the researchers had already achieved recognized maturity, also demonstrating the capacity to advance to higher levels).

The Unit is geographically spread over three locations (Braga, Lisbon and Porto). This was positively presented as a strength rather than a disadvantage. The Unit presents it as a strength, because, by being geographically spread, they claim to be able to reach more researchers and engage more locally. On the other hand, it is clear to us that the geographical distribution comes with challenges too. The Unit has set two strategies to deal with the difficulty of being divided over a number of places: there are two general meetings per year, to which everybody is supposed to participate; and video conferences are also set up in the midterm; also, all the members come together on the occasions of conferences. It is unsure, however, if these measures suffice to enhance the cooperation between the two locations.

The Unit has a Board of Directors and an Advisory Board. The latter has international membership: 4 members from different countries, who have all visited CITER. This is commendable, but we think that this is not yet sufficient for the type of feedback and international support the Unit needs to gather to be able to achieve its goals. It would be beneficial to further expand the Board membership with more attention to mid-career experts.

The Unit conceives itself from the start as part of an international dialogue within religious studies, and has clear ambition to reach international standing. There is some evidence of such international collaborations e.g. with Italy and Germany, e.g. invited lecture lectures held by foreign researchers from these countries; the Portugal-Brazil interfaces and the participation in the European Academy of Religion. An international study group of Religion and Literature (with Freie Universität Berlin and Harvard) is said to have been launched 2018 but could gather concrete evidence of it. It is unclear what are the actual substance and impact of the collaborations.

The Unit has academic potential (so far mainly demonstrated by the research activities of its current members) and also potential for societal impact. Its existing strengths are the quality and the commitment of the individual members (and notably the leadership qualities of its Director Prof Luisa Almendra) and the dissemination/impact already achieved in society.

There are however several areas where the Unit could grow and should improve in order to reach a “good” position:

Concerning research outputs and activities: an important question the Unit needs to reflect on is this: what is their priority, a social or academic mission? If both, how do they achieve a sustainable balance? The Panel felt that there was unclarity in the Unit regarding their self-assessment of their own research achievements; impact on society and scientific outputs are distinct types of results and the one cannot replace or predominate over the other, if the Unit wants to be considered a Centre for academic research. As things are at present, the overall assessment of their research outputs and activities are “weak”.

2017 was a year of intense research activities (e.g. conferences and other public outreach activities), which are all well documented. Some projects have already been completed showing the Unit capacity to deliver with respect to engagement with the media and impact on society.

Worthwhile mentioning is the portal “Religion and Society”, which offers a quantitative database and qualitative studies interpreting social transformations in the religious field, to be made available for e.g. informing public decision processes.

However, the academic publication track record of the Unit members is overall “weak”. Most of the publications are in Portuguese and not peer-reviewed. Many of the main publications appear to have only modest academic impact and some societal impact. (For example, even though the ongoing Dictionary in Religious Studies seems to be a very useful tool for researchers in the area, there is no evidence of its actual use or scientific impact).

There was some discussion at the on-site meeting of what kind of academic journals the Unit members can realistically target for international peer reviewed publication, but a robust strategy needs to be developed and implemented and it is still missing.

More generally, while we felt that the Unit members have some awareness of the fact that they need to raise the bar with respect to their academic achievements, there was no strategy concerning how to make this possible, and no clarity with respect to goals and ambition. Further exploration of the issue revealed that the Unit members have a very high work load and would much benefit from more support to enable them to make time to pursue more competitively significant academic goals, and above all high-profile publications. (The teaching load and lack of research leave are difficulties that were raised at the meeting at on-site visit.)

Concerning funding: the Unit has so far depended almost entirely from the faculty of theology for funding and support. The Unit has succeeded to get some external grants but in small amounts (the largest grant was 30K€; and the first external funds have been achieved in 2018). The Unit is now trying to reach out to public funds, and also to European funding, but there isn’t yet a concrete application strategy. (When asked, they could only list a number of foundations they could in principle apply to, rather than outlining feasible application strategies.) It clear that recognition by FCT will position them in a stronger position to apply for external funds.

Concerning graduate training: during the on-site visit the Panel learned that the PhD students are granted a high degree of freedom for their projects, and they can be located in the campus they chose; the Unit and the PhD community are not “divorced”; yet it would be good if there were more strategically integrated; the Panel thinks a clearer strategy is needed here.

Concerning future plans: The Unit aims at consolidating its structure, which is quite reasonable at this stage. The research planned for the years 2018-2022 is structured in two thematic lines, namely, firstly, the Theology, Values and Social Dynamics line of research, and, secondly, the Performatives and Aesthetics of Religion line of research. The plans listed in the report include many events and activities, but the Panel did not see evidence of sufficiently robust planning for research projects in the strict academic sense. It would be good to see more sharply defined plans for the advancement of scientific research goals that go beyond what is academically simply “the state of the art” in religious studies. Also, it remains unexplained (and potentially problematic) how the two research lines will interact, and how can they be fruitful for each other.

Overall, there could be more ambition reflected in the Unit plans, particularly for reaching out with strong research publications, and publications that reach out to an international readership.

## Evaluation Panel: ARTS AND HUMANITIES – Philosophy

---

**R&D Unit:** Instituto de Estudos Filosóficos (IEF)

**Coordinator:** Mário Avelino Santiago de Carvalho

**Integrated PhD Researchers:** 14

---

**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):** 131 K€

### Recommended Programmatic Support

Programmatic Funding: 50 K€.

### Justification, Comments and Recommendations

In its current shape, the Unit has been established in 2016. It has two main lines of research: the ethics of care on the one hand, and a large historical field on the other, from the Antique philosophy to the philosophy of the 20th, with an accent on the 16th and 17th history of Portuguese philosophy, the German Idealism (Hegel and Fichte), Kierkegaard and Cassirer. Being located in Coimbra, it hosts members from two other campuses: from Lisbon (New University of Lisbon) and from the University of Applied Sciences in Coimbra.

The Unit appears to follow a two-fold mission: on the one side, mainly around the ethics of care thematic, it wants to have a social impact with a Therapy Lecture Cycle, a Cinema Cycle or a presence in secondary schools. On the other side, it underlines the need to develop a Portuguese philosophical reflection by translating important authors of the 16th Portuguese school (like Manuel de Góis and F. Suárez) or recent classical authors (Wittgenstein or Kierkegaard). This dedication to the history of philosophy, with the clear concern for the promotion of philosophy in Portuguese is without doubt a strength of the Unit and should be encouraged, because of the wideness of the Portuguese speaking community around the world. Moreover, this line of research has a clear pedagogical value as well. The Unit has the excellent idea to organize seminars on translation and editorial projects. The challenging work of translation and commentary is an excellent way to acquire a deep acquaintance with the texts and their context and to engage in hermeneutical work. The refinement of these skills can without doubt create a clear incentive for young scholars to join the Unit. Unfortunately, there is no clear strategy as to how the historical work of the Unit should be developed in the future. We would appreciate if there were a more substantial vision as to how and in which direction the Unit wants to develop.

We would also like to know how the rich history of philosophy in Coimbra could be better brought into focus for contemporary research. On that point of view, there is a certain tension between the two objectives of enhancing the Portuguese philosophical tradition and being perceived internationally. Interpreting major authors (also of the past) requires engaging in an international dialogue, which is not completely compatible with publishing in Portuguese. Publishing all the proceedings of the organized conference is not necessarily an adequate strategy. The Unit has two own journals, *Revista Filosófica de Coimbra*, and the journal *Dedica*. However, they have not yet reached the desirable international visibility to promote the patrimony in a sufficient way. It would be interesting to read, how the Unit plans to get the wishful visibility in the future.

There is no indication of record of publications for the whole Unit. To be sure, some researchers are very productive and have published in relevant international journals or publishing houses. The main publications however are still in Portuguese, which makes it unlikely for the time being that they will have a high visibility.

The Unit appears quite heterogeneous and the research lines seem to be basically individual.

According to the description and the presentation, the ethics of care is meant to serve as thematic link between the different topics of research. This common ground is not understood as an ideological constraint. Researchers publish, translate and teach in their own field of research. They are however encouraged to contribute to the common topic in a very loose way. To that end, an international colloquium with the title *Roads to Care* was organized in October 2018. For

2021 a second international colloquium of the road of care is planned. The ethics of care is undoubtedly one extremely important topic, which has to be pursued in the future, also because of its political actuality and repercussion. Apart from these both colloquia, however, there is no evidence of other research output coming from this line of study. There is definitively an attempt in the group to find a thematical unity, but this attempt doesn't appear to be very convincing. In many ways, the ethics of care looks like an institutional constraint that doesn't emanate from the projects themselves and doesn't reflect their thematic priority. The Unit contribution to the ethics of care is not enough clearly visible in the publication output. The program of common research among the groups, even if appealing, should be more structured. If the Unit wishes ethics of care to be identified as one of its recognizable lines of research, we recommend the Center to give it a clearer thematical focusing and to embed it in a more encompassing research strategy.

Graduate training: The Unit has no PhD program. Ongoing seminars take place on a monthly basis in each section. There is no planned common seminar in which PhD students could present and discuss their own work. Reading groups issue from own initiatives. The average time for finishing the doctoral thesis is quite high, lying between 5 and 6 years. There is no clear policy to encourage PhD students to finish earlier. The gender balance doesn't seem very satisfying. This aspect is not considered as desiderata within the Unit.

Future plans and funding: On the whole, the Unit seems to lack enough vision for its future. The description emphasizes the fact that the Center offers an innovative approach to philosophy but we wonder if there is really any substantial aspect through which this innovation is palpable. For the years 2018-2022, 4 PhD fellowships are planned, even though the expected value in terms of research is expressed in a rather unspecific way. The approach guiding the research program might be described in more detailed terms. In the present state of description, the objectives do not seem to really push the Unit forward to further achievements.

The Unit has wide international contacts. There is a common project with a Chinese university on the reception of Aristoteles in China and other contacts mainly oriented toward Italy and Brazil. It would be good to know more about the internationalization policy of the Unit.

## Evaluation Panel: ARTS AND HUMANITIES – Philosophy

---

**R&D Unit:** Instituto de Filosofia (IF)

**Coordinator:** Paula Isabel do Vale Oliveira e Silva

**Integrated PhD Researchers:** 57

---

**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):** 690 K€

### Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 6

Programmatic Funding: 570 K€, including for 2 (Junior) New PhD Researcher Contract.

### Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The Unit is organized around two axes: the history of ancient and medieval philosophy (in particular the reception of Aristotle in Portugal) and early modern philosophy; and in addition, contemporary philosophy of mind and language.

In terms of academic merit, generally speaking, the research sub-groups in the history of philosophy are particularly strong and have contributed new knowledge to the field. The Mind, Language and Action group too is very strong with significant research outputs. It is less clear what is the thematic focus and operational unity of the group working on Aesthetics, Politics and Knowledge, and how the interdisciplinary dialogue is established within the group and its external collaborator; but the group is clearly active and has international connections. The other two groups Roots and Horizons of Philosophy & Culture in Portugal and Philosophy & Public Space also appear less cohesive, but nevertheless successful in what they do.

In terms of cohesion within the Unit, during the on-site visit, the Panel gathered further evidence that there are significant interactions within each sub-group as well as across groups, and further interdisciplinary interactions (with the cognitive sciences, also supported by a research grant). The Unit is aware of some existing overlaps among its sub-groups but makes it a point of strength. For instance, the groups collaborate in graduate supervision across groups and they have joint activities such as seminars.

The Unit has important international collaborations (e.g. France, Spain, Italy; notable is also the inclusion of Charles Travis in contemporary philosophy of language and perception in the research group). The Unit has also an international advisory board, comprising three members, who visit and provide oral written feedback on the Unit operation, on the occasion of a workshop or a similar research activity. This is evidence of internationalization.

The subgroups in the history of philosophy have been exceptionally successful in attracting research funding; the other subgroups have also attracted funding but of considerably smaller amounts (but notable is the BIAL project “Estranged from Oneself”). This disparity was plausibly accounted for partly by the productivity of the groups and partly to the nature of the research grants calls, which has cultural heritage as a priority.

The research funding achieved so far have been very beneficial to the Unit and put to good use; for example, they have attracted students and researchers from abroad, coming to pursue an academic career in Portugal. During the visit there was some discussion around the issue of how the Unit could aim at receiving more funding from outside Portugal – from Europe, given that research funding has proven so useful. The Unit demonstrated awareness that looking outwards would be beneficial, and gave us evidence of having made it one of their future strategic priorities. The Unit tries to submit a funding application per year, and is trying to apply to the European Research Council as well; it was good to learn that there is also institutional support for preparing such funding applications.

Concerning research outputs and the merits and activities of the Unit members, this is an area where the Unit is overall strong but could grow further. The Unit appears heterogenous and not all its subgroups and members contribute in

cutting edge ways to the field of philosophy, although some certainly do, and some of the outputs are of international standing (in the history of philosophy and philosophy of mind). Some of the work carried out by some of the subgroups is not academically impactful but reaches out beyond academic philosophy, and this merit has to be recognized, even if it is not a contribution of the advancement of philosophy as such.

Generally speaking, it appears that the Unit members publish mostly books and edited books, and only rarely in peer reviewed journals; only few publications are in well recognized international journals; although we do recognize that the publications listed for the years 2013-2017 encompass work with some international visibility. Among the important contributions made by the sub-groups of the Unit in terms of publications we want to commend e.g. the critical edition of Petrus Hispanus, and an edited book on "Pre-Reflective Consciousness – Sartre and Contemporary Philosophy of Mind" (Routledge).

The two main directions the Panel recommends the Unit can further improve is, starting from an already very good position: a) quality of publications; and b) more/all researchers delivering high level publications.

These issues were discussed at the on-site visit, with special focus on how the Unit is developing strategies for improving the publication track record of its members. It is very commendable that the Unit does have the ambition to improve, and is taking some steps towards making it possible (e.g. creating a culture that encourages researchers to submit their work to peer-reviewed international journals; trying to make funds available for translation/copyediting; providing each other feedback on the work; supporting students to present their work in progress at international conferences). A fair point that was made by the Unit Director is that publications in Portuguese support research-led teaching because students at an early stage might not yet be able to work with material in foreign languages; and further they support some internationalization by reaching out to a large community of Portuguese-speaking people such as in Brazil. Our reflection is that the issue is not language but peer review; so a certain number of publications in Portuguese are fine but as long as they are subject to peer-review, and in any case increasing number of publication in international venues is advisable.

In terms of impact outside academia, some members of the Unit have theatres collaborations and have ways to reach out to schools and lay people.

It is also fair to note that the research outputs have to be assessed in relation to the teaching load, which appears to the Panel higher than in some other Units.

Concerning the research community, it appeared above all interconnected and with an excellent esprit de corps. The Unit has succeeded in attracting researchers from abroad (e.g. a junior one from Italy; and two senior ones, appointed via open competition). The early career researchers are integrated in the teaching, at least as far as this is possible; and teach at MA level and also contribute to PhD teaching via graduate seminars. This is a positive, because it means that research can feed into teaching and (hopefully) vice versa; and can increase their chances of future academic employment.

Concerning the future plans for 2018-2022, the Unit aims to develop further along the existing lines, sharpening its focus, with two main research areas and subgroups, namely Medieval and Early Modern Philosophy and Contemporary Philosophy. This is strategy. On the one hand, there is a plan in place to pursue further internationalization through a number of co-operations including also visiting fellowships as well as open competition for the PhD and post-doc positions that would be made available with FCT funding; on the other hand, improving publications in internationally recognized journals will be further pursued.

## Evaluation Panel: ARTS AND HUMANITIES – Philosophy

---

**R&D Unit:** Instituto de Filosofia da Nova (IFILNOVA)

**Coordinator:** António José Duque Silva Marques

**Integrated PhD Researchers:** 56

---

**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: 5

**Base Funding for (2020-2023):** 952 K€

### Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 9

Programmatic Funding: 920 K€, including for 3 (Junior) New PhD Researchers Contracts.

### Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The Research Unit does excellent work in different fields of philosophy. It very convincingly manages to balance, on the one hand, a clear thematic focus (on questions related to the concept of value) and, on the other hand, work in different philosophical fields in which this focus is pursued. The Unit has restructured its dissemination facility into a separate lab which has the same autonomy as the other four labs have but serves as an overarching lab which interacts with all of the other Units. With this measure the Unit will succeed in both securing encompassing interactions within it and fostering the societal impact of the Unit's work. By its work during the last five years, the Unit has completely confirmed the rating as "excellent" which it got in further earlier FCT applications.

In comparison with other philosophical Research Units in Portugal the Unit is clearly leading with regard to its publication record and its international visibility. Two of its groups have realized highly recognized philosophical work on an international level (ArgLab and the Nietzsche Group within the CultureLab) and the Unit as a whole has excellent international collaborations and connections. The CineLab runs an internationally visible online journal in film philosophy. The Unit has realized a decent amount of international hires and has attracted good international PhD students. This is a clear sign of a successful strategy of internationalization. It is of particular importance that the Unit has constantly increased its funding during the last years. In 2018, the Unit has received significant European funding for two projects. This is outstanding within philosophy in Portugal. In addition, the Unit has acquired significant project funding for 11 research projects which are situated in the different groups of the Unit. The Unit has a very convincing governance which includes a good representation of all groups in the Unit Directory. Finally, the Unit has a very strong hold in different MA programs and in PhD education which are run within the faculty the Unit corresponds to. It should be underlined that this holds for all of the Unit groups, which makes the Unit particularly strong. To sum up, this is to say that the Unit has gone through another excellent development during the last five years.

The Unit has an excellent publication record and it follows a convincing professional publication strategy. From 2013 to 2017 an impressive number of journal articles, book chapters and books have been published by members of the Unit, among them a very good amount of journal articles in SCOPUS listed journals. The Unit pursues a clear strategy of realizing more and more international visibility with its publications. At the same time, it takes care of safeguarding Portuguese as a language in which philosophy is done. This double orientation with regard to the language politics of publishing is very convincing and should be maintained.

The Unit strategy for the future is, in general, very convincing and should be realized as it is designed. The Unit has identified four strategic goals related to the acquisition of external funding, to realizing publications in highly visible international journals, to advanced training within Doctoral programs, and, finally, to the employment of researchers doing a PhD. With the funding the Unit already attained and with the funding it will without doubt attain in the future these goals. In correlation with these goals, the Unit follows, in general, a strategy of growth. This is completely justified, given the excellent record of the Unit during the last years. Nevertheless, it will be important to prioritize growth in quality over growth in quantity. With regard to the goals concerning PhD education and employment of researchers holding a PhD this could mean two things: Firstly, it is important for the further success and development of the Unit to

strengthen the Unit connection to the Doctoral programs in philosophy, in aesthetics, and in communication studies. This can be done by linking the programs in question closer to the work done in the Unit and by integrating more of the program's PhD students to the research done within the different groups of the Unit. In this regard, a kind of reunification of PhD education in Doctoral programs and research is highly recommended. Secondly, the structure of employment of researchers holding a PhD should be refined in the direction of not only generating more and more PostDoc researchers who, after having finished (several) PostDoc contracts, do not find places in academia. The Unit should use all its institutional power to establish structures in the direction of tenure track positions or of structures similar to tenure track. Correspondingly, it is advisable to follow a very ambitious hiring strategy. It should be prevented that members who already belong to the Unit are set on a permanent track. International hires would be very desirable in this regard. This could mean that the Unit opens PostDoc positions without restricting them to one of its specific fields (different from how this is described in the application). It could allow for applications for all of its different fields and select the most excellent applicants to offer them a permanent perspective. The PhD fellowships should also be advertised internationally, and the Unit should look for international applicants. As to philosophical publications in Portuguese it would, in general and all over Portugal, be good to introduce a more peer review oriented structure. Since the Unit is very strong in international publications it could contribute significantly to this process (for instance, by founding a peer reviewed journal in Portuguese or by supporting a foundation in this direction). This would be an important measure in order to both safeguard and strengthen Portuguese as a philosophical language.

## Evaluation Panel: ARTS AND HUMANITIES – Philosophy

---

**R&D Unit:** PRAXIS - Centro de Filosofia, Política e Cultura (PRAXIS)

**Coordinator:** José Manuel Boavida Santos

**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: 3

**Base Funding for (2020-2023):** 279 K€

### Recommended Programmatic Support

PhD Fellowships: 2

Programmatic Funding: 100 K€.

### Justification, Comments and Recommendations

The strength of the Unit is its focus on the practical dimension of philosophical work in both practical and theoretical philosophy. In this sense, the Unit combines work on political philosophy, ethics, phenomenology, cultural theory and religious studies. Most members of the Unit work in more than one of these groups which means that even though the Unit is rather a small one they have a good amount of people collaborating on the different subjects which are worked on within the Unit groups. The Unit combines two universities, namely the University of Beira Interior at Covilhã and the University of Évora which are quite far apart from each other. Given this specific situation, there is significant exchange and collaboration within the Unit. Among others, this is due to the fact that most members of the Unit have a basis in phenomenology. Nevertheless, during the on-site visit we have got the impression that the work of the Unit is generally separated in two major fields, namely political theory, and phenomenology (in relation to aspects of psychoanalysis and psychotherapy), one of them situated in Covilhã, the other one situated in Évora. In the course of the Unit (re-)foundation in 2016, two new groups have been established, namely one on “Philosophy of Culture” and one on “Religion and Violence” (mainly due to developments within the faculty). Therewith, the Unit work in political theory, ethics, and phenomenology is broadened, but not in a entirely convincing way. It would be better if the Unit would realize a clearer focus in how it contributes to the investigation of its core subject, namely the practical dimensions of the philosophical theories it is concerned with. To do this would be helpful for the internationalization of the Unit as well. The Unit as a whole has good connections to Brazil and has realized some collaboration with Porto Verde and with France (Paris I). But, in general, its international visibility and connectedness could be better. Among the Unit achievements during the last years a Portuguese translation of Aristotle “Eudemian Ethics” stands out. Obviously, the work the Centre does is important for representing the phenomenological discussion in Portugal. As to the Unit record, it is important to note that 21 philosophy PhDs have been completed at UBI and UE during the years between 2013 and 2017.

The Unit has realized a decent number of publications (books, book chapters and journal articles). There have been good publications realized in the fields of political philosophy, ethics, and phenomenology, but since these publications are mostly in Portuguese, most of them do not contribute to the international philosophical discussion in a broader sense. With its publications the Unit contributes significantly to the reception of phenomenological philosophy in the Portuguese speaking world. Within the Unit, a project on government communication has been completed which clearly had some impact on discussions in society.

It is convincing that the Unit has been rebuilt around questions of practical dimensions of philosophy. The general goals which the Unit sets for its work during the next four years are adequate. But the refinement which has been realized during the last years does not establish a completely convincing structure for philosophical research on an international level. Given the specific local situation of the Unit with its two places at Covilhã and Évora, it would be desirable to build a unique focus which could attract international researchers and which could foster collaboration with different parts of the world. The phenomenological focus could serve as basis for this by helping the Unit to get a more unified idea of what should be achieved through the philosophical reflection of practical dimensions of philosophical work. On a phenomenological basis, even questions of culture and religion (raised by the two projects planned) could be integrated

in a more convincing way, rendering therewith unnecessary an increase of the number of projects. In order to do this, we would recommend including dimensions of culture and religion into the political theory group work and/or into the ethics group work. It seems recommendable to focus on the work in political theory and in phenomenology (in relation to psychotherapy). With regard to phenomenology, the Unit could aim for becoming the most important place for phenomenology in Portugal (by inviting philosophers from both the University of Lisbon and the Catholic University of Portugal to participate in the work done in Évora). With regard to the political theory group, it seems to be advisable to profile the work more in relationship to the political philosophy group at the University of Minho at Braga (for instance by realizing a profile in political philosophy which relies more on a phenomenological basis). With these measures, the Unit could follow a clearer strategy of internationalization and of acquiring more national and international funding. As to a strategy for internationalization, it would be good to realize more publications in international high ranked journals and to connect more to international discussion (as, for instance, the international discussion on Heidegger philosophy). As to research funding, a clearer and (with regard to political theory) more unique focus could help the Unit to apply successfully for project funding, both from FCT and from international (European) funds. The Unit has been successful in supporting PhD students and a PostDoc researcher with their applications for FCT fundings; and it is comparably strong in PhD education (with a good PhD program that includes a two-year phase of course work). But during the on-site visit, the impression was that they could aim more for international doctoral students and PostDoc researcher. The Unit future strategy could be refined in a way as to realize more internationalization in this regard, too. The universities in which the Unit is located should give adequate support for national and international applications for project funding. In its application, the Unit asks for a PostDoc researcher to get support for this. But it is not a good idea to engage a PostDoc researcher for this. Support for applications should be provided by the university.

The two PhD fellowships awarded should be distributed between Covilhã and Évora.

It seems advisable to use the Programmatic Funding not (only) to fill positions which have the task of working on the website, on the co-organization of conferences, and on editing publications (both in print and online). Rather, the positions should be used to hire researchers in order to sharpen the Unit profile (in political theory and phenomenology) and to contribute to its international visibility (see general comments).