



SLOVENSKÁ AKADEMIA VIED

PREDSEDNÍCTVO

Vážený pán
PhDr. Miroslav Pekník, CSc.
riaditeľ
Ústav politických vied SAV
Dúbravská cesta 9
Bratislava

Bratislava 10. februára 2017
Číslo: Ú SAV-0363/2017

Vážený pán riaditeľ,

na základe uznesenia Predsedníctva SAV č. 1212.C zo dňa 9. februára 2017 sa zaraďuje
Ústav politických vied SAV do kategórie s charakteristikou:

**Výskum nemá pevné základy alebo stagnuje, prípadne má nedostatky z vedeckého
alebo technického hľadiska.**

The research is not solid or is repetitive, or it is flawed in the scientific or technical
approaches.

S pozdravom

prof. RNDr. Pavol Šajgalík, DrSc.
predseda SAV

Poučenie o odvolaní: Podľa čl. IV ods. 6 Zásad pravidelného hodnotenia vedeckých organizácií SAV za
obdobie 2012 - 2015 sa proti rozhodnutiu Predsedníctva SAV môžete odvolať do
21 kalendárnych dní od doručenia tohto rozhodnutia na Predsedníctvo SAV
(sekretariát predsedu SAV).

Príloha: Hodnotiaci protokol
(META-PANEL ASSESSMENT REPORT OF SAS RESEARCH INSTITUTE)

META-PANEL ASSESSMENT REPORT OF SAS RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Period January 1, 2012 – December 31, 2015

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 22. 3. 2016, the member of Panel of evaluators/ Invited external remote expert issues the report with following evaluation and proposal for Institute rating.

Name and address of SAS Institute	Institute of Political Sciences Dúbravská cesta 9 841 04 Bratislava
Name of panellist, and affiliation or Name of external remote expert, and affiliation	October 13, 2016

Scientific quality and productivity

Comments, including strengths and weaknesses	Rating*
<p>The position of the Institute has been influenced by specific conditions that are taken into account in the assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is a relatively new institute and inevitably coping with the difficulties of establishing profile and finding its place domestically as well as internationally. - The Institute has been expected to disseminate knowledge on the political past of Slovakia and Slovaks in general and on Slovak politicians in particular. <p>The Institute as a scientific institution, therefore, has tasks to carry out in order to contribute to the domestic politic culture and education.</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The Institute is also a centre that organizes broad cooperation with several further institutions within and outside SAS in Slovakia and not only from political science but from other disciplines. Otherwise it would gravely fail to meet the requirements stipulated in the official mission statement.</p> <p>The researchers attended to conferences in remarkable number and of considerable breadth thematically abroad and in Slovakia.</p> <p>One of the projects was to rethink the legacy of Marx and historical materialism, which can be a timely endeavour under the circumstances of the past financial crisis and the growing inequalities.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>The mission statement defines not less than five extremely broad areas for the institute: international relations, political systems, history of political thought, research methods and political history. One or two would be more than enough for an institute of this size. The institute reduced them to four dropping methodology but that is still too much.</p> <p>The areas are not specific enough. The political history part covered Cyril and Methodius as well as Dubcek and Husák.</p> <p>It is certainly important to give portraits of the outstanding Slovak politicians to the public. It would be good to know what scientific approach has been used it the work on them. Neither the Questionnaire nor the site visit clarified that issue.</p> <p>The fellows of the institute participated in more than 80 international conferences, 76 of them abroad from Beijing to Utrecht, and, still, both the international projects and the publications abroad are below the level expected. As if the conferences and workshops had not been used for networking and consortium building.</p> <p>Only two smallish international projects, both funded by Visegrád Fund, and nothing else but a single participation in a Polish led Visegrád cooperation for the last two years.</p> <p>No European Union funding opportunities were applied for.</p> <p>One has the impression that mostly individual projects are carried out in the institute. If that is true, the staff misses the opportunity open uniquely for an institute vis-a-vie a university department to run large projects.</p> <p>Non research staff seems to be too big: 5 for an institute of 22.</p> <p>If Tables 2.8.1.1 – 2.8.1.2 are correct, the age distribution in the research staff is very uneven: 5 from the total 12 are above 65 while no one is below 35.</p> <p>Under 2.8.4 The report states that all the recommendations by the previous assessment have been fulfilled but there is hardly any publications in important foreign periodicals according to the list of publications and also to Table 2.1.8.</p> <p>No IPSA, APSA or ECPR workshops or conferences have been attended by the fellows, although the institute is member to IPSA.</p>	D

Societal, cultural, or economic impact

Comments, including strengths and weaknesses	Rating*
The amount of outreach activities seems to be acceptable.	B

Future prospects (development potential)

Comments	Rating*
<p>The strategic part of the report is too short; less than the recommended 3 pages. Unfortunately, it is also vague: does not tell the specific plans the institute wants to implement, nor the methods to be used, nor the time line to follow.</p> <p>That suggests the lack of strategic thinking, which is unfavourable regarding the future prospects.</p> <p>The Institute seems to spread too thin to come up with internationally remarkable achievements.</p>	D

**Rating in scale from A to D, where A is excellent, B is very good, C is good and D is weak.*

OVERALL ASSESSMENT

Comments on the past performance

The past performance of the Institute of Political Science is rather poor. It is not clear what kind of political science the institute has been cultivating. The topics are more or less current, but it is impossible to really assess them because they are very general and coming from a too broad realm. The report does not clarify, however, the approaches used in the research.

Comments and recommendations for further improvement of the institute

The portfolio may be reduced considerably. One or two flag ship projects would concentrate forces particularly because they would indicate the directions of networking, advancement in method, long-term interinstitutional collaborations, even library development.

Political tendencies in Slovakia and in Central Europe in general, as well as Visegrád cooperation would certainly be of interest for the wider international audience specially now, along and in the aftermath of the migration/refugee crisis and because of the remarkable role Slovakia and the region have played within the European Union.

One would suggest that the Institute might turn towards comparative political science, which seems to be the mainstream in the international landscape. Comparing Slo-

vakian developments with parallel tendencies abroad would be useful anyway. The institute may want to join ECPR; that would make international networking easier. Particularly the ECPR workshops held every spring would be very useful opportunities for the young and the senior scholars to connect to the international political science and get substantial advice on their work.

It is favourable that the Institute has published works in English; it is advisable to target international journals with much broader visibility than the one owned by the Institute.

Since writing in English seems to be an issue, the Institute may want to think over what help it may provide the researchers with. Some funding for proof reading, even translation, academic writing courses may alleviate difficulties. Writing together with more experienced authors is also a help but that needs funding too.

The age composition of the institute is worrying and to be taken care of.

Proposal of overall institute rating: D

The research is not solid or is repetitive, or it is flawed in the scientific or technical approaches.

January 20, 2017



On behalf of the Meta-Panel
Prof. Marja Makarow