



UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE PELOTAS
FAT - Faculty of Administration and Tourism FAEM -
Faculty of Agronomy Eliseu Maciel
**PPGD TSA - Graduate Program in Territorial Development
and Agrobusiness Systems**



**Internal Evaluation Seminar of PPGDTSA
2013-2016 Quadrennium**

Pelotas, December 2017.

Introduction

This succinct report seeks to present the main discussions held based on the results of CAPES 'evaluation of our PPG. It is intended to be a preliminary version to serve as a basis for the actions proposition and for the strategic guidance aiming the growth and evolution of the PPGDTSA.

It is preliminary because not all professors were able to attend the meetings we had to present and appreciate the evaluation made by CAPES on our program. It is also preliminary because it is understood that the student body also needs to be heard, and the suggestions that come from them also need to be analyzed. Thus, this document will be sent to all PPGDTSA members for evaluation and incorporation of new suggestions. And then it will be introduced to the students to hear their opinions.

The information presented here was obtained through the Area Document, the Quadrennial Area Evaluation, the Individual Program Evaluation Form, and the analyzes and opinions of the present professors at the internal seminars held on the 1st and 6th of November 2017.

A special thanks to the professors Marcelo Dias, Mário Canever, Alisson Maheler, Rosana Tondolo, and Vilmar Tondolo for their willingness to present and detail the CAPES assessment sheets for the other professors.

I am grateful to all other professors that were present and actively participated with their analyses, opinions, and suggestions that I tried to incorporate in this preliminary report.

I expect that this record will be the initial step for the program to progress to concept 4 in the next four-year CAPES evaluation.

*Prof. Mário Conill Gomes
Coordinator*

EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM PROPOSAL (W= 0%)

Overall rating of the item: **Very Good**

ITEM: Coherence, consistency, comprehensiveness, and updating of the areas of concentration, lines of research, ongoing projects, and curriculum proposal. (w = 50%)

EVALUATION/CONCEPT: Good

DIAGNOSIS: “...*The bibliography in many program’s courses does not represent the state of the art of several themes and there is an imbalance between old and recent references ...*”

ACTIONS:

- To review teaching plans and update courses.
- Provide interdisciplinary practices that involve different professors and students; invite external lecturers who are specialists in interdisciplinarity.
- Review the structure of research projects; work with one or two umbrella projects per research line.
- Propose a discussion to arrive at a curricular reorganization that considers the epistemological needs of the program.
- Evaluate the need to implement a leveling phase for new classes.

ITEM: Program planning with a view to its future development, considering the international challenges of the area in the production of knowledge, its purposes in better training of its students, its goals regarding the richer social insertion of its alumnus, according to the parameters of the area. (w = 30%)

EVALUATION/CONCEPT: Good

DIAGNOSIS: “...*There is no information on the criteria for the accreditation or disqualification of professors. This topic is informed as an aspect to be improved in the item self-assessment of the document informed in Sucupira.*”

ACTIONS:

- Make clear, in the next report, and more visible, on the program website, the accreditation/disqualification system for permanent professors.
- Develop and implement criteria for accreditation/disqualification of collaborating professors.

ITEM: Infrastructure for teaching, research, and if applicable, extension. (w = 20%)

EVALUATION/CONCEPT: Good

DIAGNOSIS: There is no mention in the opinion on deficiencies to be remedied. However, this does not mean settling for improvements.

ACTIONS:

- Evaluate the possibility of setting up a specific structure for video conferencing to qualifying exams/defense of thesis, lectures, and short courses.

ASSESSMENT OF THE FACULTY (W= 20%)

Overall rating of the item: **Very Good**

ITEM: Profile of the faculty, considered as degree, diversification in the origin of training, improvement and experience, and its compatibility and adequacy to the Program Proposal. (w = 15%)

EVALUATION/CONCEPT: Good

DIAGNOSIS: *"The training profile of the professors is compatible with the program's courses. The proportion of NDP with aligned production to the program's proposal is particularly good, according to the parameters of the area for item 2.1 (at least 85% of professors are aligned)."*

Although CAPES' evaluation was "Very Good", different interpretations of the expressed theme by the Area of Concentration and Lines of Research are perceived. Therefore, it is necessary to work better on the group's identity.

ACTIONS:

- Extended meeting (Academic and Administrative Committee + other professors) to discuss and consolidate the identity of the PPG.
- Meeting with new entrants to work and reinforce the thematic identity of the program.
- Reassess the participation and contribution of collaborating professors in the program and implement rules of accreditation/disqualification, similarly to the rules of the NDP.

ITEM: Adequacy and dedication of permanent professors in relation to the program research and training activities. (w = 30%)

EVALUATION/CONCEPT: Good

DIAGNOSIS: *"The Program does not depend on collaborating or visiting professors, according to the parameters of the area..."; "... The stability of the permanent faculty makes it possible to attribute the particularly good concept..."*

Even though there is no dependence on collaborating professors, we understand that they are of fundamental importance, both for co-supervision and for the implementation of a truly interdisciplinary policy.

ACTIONS:

- Develop and implement criteria for accreditation/disqualification of collaborating professors.

ITEM: Distribution of research and training activities among program professors. (w = 30%)

EVALUATION/CONCEPT: **Good**

DIAGNOSIS: *"The proportion of permanent professors with research projects with external funding is regular..."; "The proportion of permanent professors who had at least 60 hours class in the program during the quadrennium is particularly good..."*

ACTIONS:

- Elaborate a prospective alert system for public notices to promote research.

- Send projects to development agencies, even without a prospect of success.
- Encourage the most productive professors to apply for CNPq productivity grants.

ITEM: Contribution of professors to teaching and/or research activities in undergraduate programs, paying attention to the repercussion that this item may have on the training of future PG entrants, and (according to the area) in the training of more qualified professionals in the scope of undergraduate program. (w = 10%)

EVALUATION/CONCEPT: Good

DIAGNOSIS: *"The proportion of permanent professors with undergraduate program participation and with a workload less than or equal to 300 hours per year is very good for the parameters of the area"; "No permanent professor taught more than 300h in undergraduate program per year..."*

ACTIONS:

ITEM: The professor participation in events aligned with his area of expertise. (w = 10%)

EVALUATION/CONCEPT: Good

DIAGNOSIS: *"The participation of permanent professors in scientific events in the area, with publication or presentation of lectures is very good due to the parameters of the area".*

This item will most likely be excluded from the next quadrennial review.

ACTIONS:

- Reassess the policy of incentives (financing) for participation and publication in conferences.

EVALUATION OF THE STUDENT BODY, DISSERTATIONS, AND THESES(W= 35%)

Overall rating of the item: **Not Applicable (Not Evaluated)**

ITEM: Number of dissertations, and theses defended in the evaluation period, in relation to the permanent faculty and the size of the student body. (w = 10%)

EVALUATION/CONCEPT: N/A

DIAGNOSIS: N/A

ACTIONS:

ITEM: Distribution of the guidelines of the dissertations, and theses defended in the evaluation period in relation to the professors of the program. (w = 20%)

EVALUATION/CONCEPT: N/A

DIAGNOSIS: N/A

ACTIONS:

ITEM: Quality of dissertations, and theses, and the production of graduate and undergraduate students (in the case of HEIs with an undergraduate program in the area) in the scientific production of the program, as measured by publications and other relevant indicators to the area. (w = 50%)

EVALUATION/CONCEPT: N/A

DIAGNOSIS: **Although CAPES has not issued an opinion on the quality**

of the theses, it seems important to highlight 02 aspects: a) that the theses must adhere to the identity of the program; b) that it is very important to publish together with the alumni after the theses defense.

ACTIONS:

- Bring professors and students together to present and consolidate the PPG identity.
- Develop strategies to keep in touch with graduates and encourage the publication of articles together with professors after defending the theses.
- Keep the delivery deadline of the theses at 24 months and use the time between 24 and 30 months for the preparation and submission of a theses' article to be published in an B2 magazine or higher.
- Survey and assess adherence to the program's identity of theses already defended.

ITEM: Efficiency of the Program in training masters and doctors with grants: Time of training for masters and doctors and percentage of qualified grant recipient. (w = 10%)

EVALUATION/CONCEPT: N/A

DIAGNOSIS: **CAPES penalizes only programs that exceed the 30 months** set as a limit.

ACTIONS:

- Reinforce communication to the student body about the deadlines for dissertation deliver.

ITEM: Presentation by students and alumni in events aligned with the Program Proposal. (w = 10%)

EVALUATION/CONCEPT: N/A

DIAGNOSIS: *This item will most likely be excluded from the assessment for the next quadrennium.*

ACTIONS:

- Reassess the policy of incentives (financing) for participation and publication in conferences.

EVALUATION OF INTELLECTUAL PRODUCTION (W= 35%)

Overall rating of the item: **Good**

ITEM: Qualified publications of the Program by permanent professor. (W = 50%)

EVALUATION/CONCEPT: **Good**

DIAGNOSIS: *"The average total bibliographic production per permanent professor has reached a level...Particularly good.; "The average qualified bibliographic production per permanent professor of the Program was evaluated as 'Good'..."*

ACTIONS:

- Create conditions to increase our average score from 124 to 224 points.

ITEM: Distribution of qualified publications in relation to the permanent faculty of the Program. (W = 35%)

EVALUATION/CONCEPT: **Regular**

DIAGNOSIS: *" The distribution of the qualified production of the Program among permanent professors is regular..."*

ACTIONS:

- Reassess the policy of incentives (financing) for publication in qualified magazines.
- Create conditions to reach a goal of an average of 60 points per year in A1, A2 or B1 magazines.

ITEM: Technical production, patents, and other productions considered relevant. (W = 15%)

EVALUATION/CONCEPT: **Good**

DIAGNOSIS: *"The proportion of permanent professors with average of three or more products/activities per year is Good".*

ACTIONS:

- Study the classification criteria of technological journals and evaluate the possibility of producing works and publishing them in this type of vehicle.
- Encourage professors to participate as reviewers of scientific journals.

EVALUATION OF SOCIAL INSERTION (W= 10%)

Overall rating of the item: **Good**

ITEM: Insertion and regional and (or) national impact of the program. (W = 50%)

EVALUATION/CONCEPT: **Regular**

DIAGNOSIS: *"The impact of the Program is still small..."*.

Although the program is young, we report the insertion in some productive arrangements, as well as events in the program area. However, we do not have a formalized monitoring of graduates, because the number of these defended so far is small.

ACTIONS:

- Study and implement a way to monitor the program alumni.
- Be present in government agencies such as COREDE SUL.

ITEM: Integration and cooperation with other programs and centers of research and professional development related to the area of knowledge of the program, with a view to the development of research and of the graduate program. (W = 30%)

EVALUATION/CONCEPT: Very Good

DIAGNOSIS: **Despite the youth of the program, CAPES 'evaluation detected our** efforts to cooperate with other universities and research institutions, such as Embrapa, as well as to qualify and internationalize our academic production.

ACTIONS:

- Create efforts to facilitate that professors can participate in postdoctoral programs abroad.

ITEM: Visibility or transparency given by the program to its performance. (W = 20%)

EVALUATION/CONCEPT: Very Good

DIAGNOSIS: CAPES evaluated our site well. However, this does not mean that it cannot be improved. Some measures have already been taken, such as changing the visual identity to adapt to the UFPel standard. In addition, the translation of the website into English and Spanish has begun. We also started the enrollment of special and regular students via electronic form. Regarding the availability of information, we started a base of more frequent questions and answers to make them more transparent.

ACTIONS:

- Finish the translation of the website into English and Spanish.
- Broaden the question and answer base.
- Make the minutes of the collegiate meetings available for online consultation.