

Minutes No. 3

Ata da reunião de seleção e seriação de candidatos ao concurso para atribuição de Bolsa de Investigação para Doutoramento de tipologia “bolsa no país” ou “bolsa mista”, no âmbito da OpenEU.

On the twenty-first day of July 2026, at sixteen hours, the Jury met, via videoconference, composed of a total of 23 (twenty-three) members, including the President and the Vice-President, to award 7 (seven) Doctoral Research Grants within the scope of the OpenEU Project, with the following composition:

President: Sandra Caeiro (Universidade Aberta - UAb)

Vice-President: Paulo Osório (Universidade Aberta - UAb)

Members:

Angeles Sanchez-Elvira Paniagua (Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia - UNED, Espanha)

António Carrizo Moreira (Universidade Aberta - UAb)

Carmen Pagès Serra (Universitat Oberta de Catalunya - UOC, Espanha)

Cristina Vieira (Universidade Aberta - UAb)

Diogo Casa Nova (Universidade Aberta - UAb)

Fátima Alves (Universidade Aberta - UAb)

Frederico Branco (Universidade de Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro - UTAD)

Inés Gil Jaurena (Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia - UNED, Espanha)

Isabel Barros Dias (Universidade Aberta - UAb)

Isabel Huet e Silva (Universidade Aberta - UAb)

João Simão (Universidade Aberta - UAb)

José Cravino (Universidade de Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro - UTAD)

José Eduardo Franco (Universidade Aberta - UAb)

Marcus Specht (FernUniversität in Hagen, Alemanha)

Maria Adelina Castelo (Universidade Aberta - UAb)

Mario Bessa (Universidade Aberta - UAb)

Paulo Nunes da Silva (Universidade Aberta - UAb)

Petra C. de Weerd-Nederhof (Open Universiteit – OU, Países Baixos)

Petru Curseu (Open Universiteit - OU, Países Baixos)

Susana Henriques (Universidade Aberta - UAb)

Vítor Rocio (Universidade Aberta - UAb)

The meeting was convened with the following agenda:

- **Single item:** Consideration of the statements presented by the candidates Cristiane Lopes Miguel Neto dos Santos, Diogo Miguel Santos Rocha, S. M. Abul Kalam Azad and Susana Maria dos Santos Rocha Fouto da Silva, during the hearing of interested parties, for the purposes set out in Article 121 et seq. of the Code of Administrative Procedure (CPA).

Moving on to the single item on the agenda, the Jury Chair informed that, during the hearing of interested parties regarding the curriculum evaluation list, the candidate **Cristiane Lopes Miguel Neto dos Santos** submitted a statement requesting "the reappraisal of a specific point of the curriculum evaluation, in the justification contained in Minute No. 2, in the observation identified as A2, it is mentioned that the candidate does not have scientific articles in indexed journals,

patents, projects or communications in conference proceedings, only reflecting extensive experience in institutional management, including at the international level".

The candidate presents new elements, which cannot be considered by the jury members, as they were not presented at the time of application. However, the new elements presented also do not allow us to verify that the oral communications are recorded in the proceedings of scientific events.

Thus, the jury reaffirms that the candidate did not show evidence of possessing:

- scientific articles published in indexed journals;
- oral presentations in the proceedings of scientific conference events, in the application process.

Regarding participation in projects, the Call for Applications explicitly requested "participation as a team member in competitively funded research projects (with project reference), scholarships obtained (outside the project), authorship of patents". However, the candidate does not show evidence that the projects listed in the statement (which were not included in the curriculum vitae at the time of application) were of a competitive nature, and with the respective reference.

Subsequently, the President of the jury also informed that the candidate **Diogo Miguel Santos Rocha**, during the hearing of interested parties, submitted a statement regarding his non-admission, requesting the jury to:

- 1- Reconsider the decision not to admit his application;
- 2- Consider the associative nature of the doctoral program he attends and his effective academic connection to the Universidade Aberta;
- 3- His admission to the competition, should it be concluded that administrative enrollment in one of the institutions that are part of the association should not prevail over the effective attendance of a doctorate developed jointly by the Universidade Aberta.

Having analyzed the candidate's statement, and as decided in the previous meeting, as recorded in minutes no. 2, the candidate does not comply with the provisions of the opening notice, Notice Ref. 01/BD-OpenEU, which is expressly and unequivocally reflected in point 1 - Candidate Admission Requirements, Admissibility Requirements for the Application, it is essential, under penalty of non-admission to the Competition, to indicate the UAb doctoral program in which the candidate intends to enroll or is already enrolled. If the candidate is already attending a doctoral program at UAb, only students enrolled at UAb are eligible.

Continuing, the Jury Chair informed that candidate **S. M. Abul Kalam Azad** submitted a statement regarding the curriculum evaluation score in criteria A and B, and therefore requests a review of the scores assigned to his bachelor's and master's degree certificates obtained abroad. Regarding criterion B, he also requests that the jury reconsider and increase the score assigned in sub-criterion B3.

The jury understands that the Notice explicitly states that "in the case of students who present a recognized foreign diploma without a grade converted to the Portuguese classification, they will be evaluated with the minimum grade" (Note from Annex I Evaluation Criteria), and this was the procedure carried out, so the score assigned complies with the notice. Additional training (MBA and postgraduate studies) was also quantified in item A2. This item also mentions involvement in

some projects within the scope of Caritas Bangladesh, however, there is no evidence that these are research projects with competitive funding, as requested in the notice. Regarding item B3, the candidate presents additional information regarding the internationalization and risk analysis of the work plan, but the jury cannot consider elements that were not included in the work plan submitted with the application.

Regarding the application of **Susana Maria dos Santos Rocha Fouto da Silva**, the candidate requested the following points from the jury members, also attaching the documentary evidence considered relevant for a better assessment of the points raised:

1. The correction of the possible material or interpretative error in the justification A2 - Personal Curriculum, replacing the reference to "speech and language therapy" with the correct assessment of my specialized training in Family Mediation, School Mediation, Logotherapy and Existential Analysis and family intervention and Restorative and Reparative Justice;

2. The re-evaluation of sub-criterion A2 - Personal Curriculum, expressly considering the tutoring at the Universidade Aberta, the Microcredential "Orientalization Module for Tutors - UAb", the Executive Secretariat and the organizational participation in UAB/CEG/DEG scientific events, the representation of students in the Doctoral Program, the integration into the Center for Global Studies of the Universidade Aberta and the professional experience directly related to the objective of the research;

3. Consideration of the forthcoming article "Cultivating Peace: The Transformative Power of Dialogue Circles with DARCo", at least as a clarifying element of the written production and the coherence of the trajectory in the field of mediation, conflict, restorative/reparative justice and dialogue circles;

4. An explanation of the partial classification assigned to A1, A2, B1, B2, and B3, as well as the formula applied to obtain the final classification of 3.113 points;

5. A clarification of the correspondence between the positive qualitative justification attributed to my activity plan and the specific score assigned to criterion B - Merit of the activity plan;

6. A reweighting of the final classification, should it be confirmed that any of the curricular elements identified above were not expressly considered, or that the partial score does not proportionally reflect the justification contained in the evaluation;

7. Consequently, if the reweighting results in a change to the final classification, the corresponding correction of the single ranking list.

After analyzing the pronunciation and the documents submitted, the jury found that the candidate was correct regarding the error in designating her area of training and professional experience. However, this error was not evaluated. Regarding item A2, the candidate presents new elements that cannot be considered by the jury members, as they were not submitted at the time of application. However, the jury reiterates that all of the candidate's experience and training were meticulously evaluated in the section "Other relevant elements of the curriculum, such as: additional academic diplomas, internships, awards, training programs, event organization," also taking into account their relevance to the objectives of OpenEU. The aspects now reported by the candidate were not properly explained in the application instructions (for example, there is no evidence of the various activities at CEG). The calculation formulas for evaluating the points and

sub-points of items A and B are in accordance with the call for applications. Even so, the jury re-evaluated her entire application and considers that there were no errors in her classification.

Based on the analysis of all the pronouncements presented and their respective justifications, the jury decided to maintain the evaluation previously assigned to the candidates who expressed their opinions during the preliminary hearing, thus maintaining the list of curricular evaluation and final classification (Annex I) and the single list of final ranking, which is part of this record (Annex II).

There being nothing further to discuss, the Jury meeting was closed at 5:30 PM. The meeting was held via videoconference, with the participation of all its members.

This record, after being read, was unanimously approved by all members of the jury.

Given that some members are abroad and/or unable to physically sign the document, this record is signed by the Jury Chair, who declares, under her responsibility, that its content faithfully corresponds to what was decided and that it has been agreed upon by all members, with proof of approval of this record by the remaining jury members, via electronic communication, being filed in the process.

July 21, 2026

The Jury President: Sandra Caeiro (Universidade Aberta - UAb)