



## SLOVENSKÁ AKADEMIA VIED

PRESEDNÍCTVO

Vážený pán

Mgr. Juraj Marušiak, PhD.  
riaditeľ

Ústav politických vied SAV, v. v. i.  
Dúbravská cesta 5973/9  
84104 Bratislava

Bratislava 19. december 2022  
Číslo: Ú SAV –06511/2022

Vážený pán riaditeľ,

na základe uznesenia Predsedníctva SAV č. 501.C zo dňa 15. decembra 2022  
sa zaraďuje Ústav politických vied SAV, v. v. i. do kategórie s charakteristikou:

**Výskum má pevné základy a prispieva k pochopeniu vednej oblasti na európskej úrovni.**

The research is solid and has contributed to the understanding in the field at the European level.

prof. RNDr. Pavol Šajgalík, DrSc.  
predseda SAV

Poučenie o odvolaní: Podľa čl. IV ods. 6 Zásad pravidelného hodnotenia vedeckých organizácií SAV za obdobie 2016 - 2021 sa proti rozhodnutiu Predsedníctva SAV môžete odvolať do 21 kalendárnych dní od doručenia tohto rozhodnutia na Predsedníctvo SAV (sekretariát predsedu SAV).

Príloha: Hodnotiaci protokol  
(METAPANEL FINAL EVALUATION REPORT ON SAS RESEARCH INSTITUTE)

## METAPANEL FINAL EVALUATION REPORT ON SAS RESEARCH INSTITUTE

**Period January 1, 2016 – December 31, 2021**

According to § I, section 15 and 16 of Principles of periodic assessment of SAS research institutes adopted under the regulation of § 10, section 5, letter d) Act No. 133/2002 Coll. on Slovak Academy of Sciences and approved by the SAS Assembly on November 21, 2021, Metapanel issued the report with following evaluation and proposal for Institute rating.

<b>Name and address of SAS Institute</b>	<b>Ústav politických vied SAV, v. v. i. Dúbravska cesta 9 841 04 Bratislava Slovenská republika</b>
<b>On-site visit date</b>	<b>November 8, 2022</b>

### Scientific quality and productivity

<b>Comments, including strengths and weaknesses</b> (recommended number of characters with spaces: up to 4000)	<b>Rating*</b>
<p>Much to be appreciated has improved since the previous evaluation and as follow-up to the recommendations of 2016.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The foreign language performance has grown remarkably.</li> <li>- The first seeds of quantitative research have been planted.</li> <li>- The Institute has increased its international networking, e.g., IPS joined ECPR as recommended six years ago.</li> <li>- IPS recruited fellows who publish in foreign language and that increases the visibility.</li> </ul> <p>Several problems have not been solved for the past six years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The disciplinary profile is still diffuse. One of the departments is labelled Political Theory but what it frequently and most visibly focusses on is the thinking of past Slovak politicians instead of theoretical problems. In that sense, a great part of the activities are still on the historical and not on the theoretical problems of politics.</li> <li>- The publication performance, particularly in foreign languages, is very uneven among the research staff.</li> <li>- Although some papers mention methods used during the research, in most of the cases, those methods do not seem to be solid and strong. For example, challenge-and-response method does not seem to be an elaborate one, particularly in political theory.</li> <li>- Six years have proved insufficient to produce papers based on quantitative methods.</li> <li>- It is still unclear whether participation in international events has been used for networking, whether that was one of the original purposes.</li> </ul>	<b>C</b>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A great part of the international conferences was organized with participants practically from Slovakia and Czech Republic only. That does not help internationalisation.</li> <li>- No participation in ECPR events (General Conferences or Joint Sessions of Workshops) or in initiating sessions, panels and workshops took place.</li> <li>- Although the staff is successful in obtaining domestic funds, the success rate regarding foreign support is low. It is particularly low if one does not count the H2020 projects the IPS's participation in is mentioned in the self-evaluation but not indicated on CORDIS. The latter is the more unfortunate because thereby IPS loses visibility and potential future partners and invitations to consortia buildings.</li> </ul>	
---	--

### Societal, cultural, or economic impact

<b>Comments</b> , including strengths and weaknesses (recommended number of characters with spaces: up to 4000)	<b>Rating*</b>
<p>IPS had a wide and diverse outreach activity during the evaluation period. Good relationship with media and schools is a valuable asset. Some doubts pop up though:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The main objective of the outreach activities seems to be a general education of the public and not the dissemination of the research results achieved at IPS.</li> <li>- Political activism seems to be present in the outreach. The self-evaluation defines a direct link between parliamentary election results and the intensity of work among the primary and secondary school teachers. Such responses may drift IPS into the political arena, which threatens independent research and openness towards its scholarly contribution.</li> <li>- Independent research may also be threatened by a very close cooperation with ministries. It is questionable whether political scientists can give impartial evaluation on political processes in drafting of which they participated previously.</li> </ul>	<b>C</b>

### Strategy and potential for development

<b>Comments</b> (recommended number of characters with spaces: up to 4000)	<b>Rating*</b>
<p>Part 4. "Research strategy and future development of the Institute for the next five years" is rather short and does not meet the S.M.A.R.T. requirements. It does not Specify exactly what IPS wants to achieve by the end of the next evaluation period. It does not define Measureable objectives either. The smallish goals (a couple of publications) are not Ambitious at all and do not take into account the various specific components of the general objectives: "Research strategy," "International cooperation" and "Personal and institutional development of the institute". No Timeline, no professional and financial incentives to encourage the staff are put forward.</p>	<b>C</b>

*\*Rating on a scale from A to D, where A is internationally leading; A/B part is internationally leading, overall is visible at the European level; B is visible at European level; B/C part is visible at the European level, overall is solid; C is solid; C/D is partly solid; D is not solid;*

## OVERALL ASSESSMENT

### **General comments on the Institute performance (2016-2021)**

Without doubt, noticeable improvement has gone through since the previous evaluation, particularly in foreign language publication and in trying to obtain European funding. Still, surprisingly little has happened in those areas as well as in the establishment of quantitative methods, in the development of the methodological reflection and in encouraging the core staff towards applying for foreign funding or participating in important international professional associations like ECPR.

### **Comments and recommendations for further improvement and development of the institute**

Several recommendations from the previous evaluation are still pertinent:

- The portfolio may be reduced further. One or two flag ship projects would concentrate the capacities of IPS and direct the specific steps of development in staff development and international networking.
- A political theory topic relevant for Slovak politics and a topic with much quantitative input may be the two flag ships. The latter may follow a comparative approach, whereby the specific achievements of Slovakian political life could be made visible in Europe.
- IPS may want to take advantage of the opportunities COST, ECPR and CEPSA offer the staff in general and for the young researchers in particular. Since IPS has domestic funds, COST is a very opportune way for internationalisation. CEPSA is definitely for the political scientists from the region and ECPR is a great forum for meeting the best quality papers and having discussions of one's own works.
- It is advisable to strengthen the international character of the scientific events the Institute organizes by inviting scholars from outside Slovakia and Czech Republic up to at least the fifty percent of the participants.
- Internationalisation by preparing both funding applications and scholarly papers needs strong staff that can help science management, proofreading, financial planning etc.
- Regarding publishing in top-tier journals, a possible way forward is to join networks based on, e.g., ECPR workshops, which publish thematic issues.
- In outreach activities more emphasis should be put on dissemination of IPS's own research results. That is the specific contribution no other actors can provide the public with.
- Regular SWOT analyses and SMART action planning are recommended in order to clarify the gaps and needs and to find the ways to improve professionally.
- IPS seems to be too small to leap forward considerably. A merger may alleviate some shortages.
- The Institute may see potential in a yearly volume on the development of Slovak politics in Slovak, as the Institute of Economic Research does on the economic development. That would serve the Slovak public well.

**Proposal of overall institute rating:**

**C**

Date, December 12, 2022

On behalf of the Metapanel  
Prof. Marja Makarow