

Report
Assessment of higher education institutions and their
faculties
(2010)

“This work was supported by the Research and Development Support Agency under contract No APVV-0384-07”



AGENTÚRA
NA PODPORU
VÝSKUMU A VÝVOJA

The work of ARRA is supported by:



The partner of ARRA is



The authors of this report would like to thank the members of the Board of Advisors of ARRA, in particular the chairperson RNDr. Štefan Olejník, DrSc., prof. Ing. Július Horváth, PhD., and Prof. RNDr. Pavol Brunovský, DrSc., and also the members of the Board of Trustees (in particular the chairperson Ing. Jozef Kollár) for their comments, discussions, analyses and reviews.

The selection of criteria and the set up of the methodology used have been taken, with necessary modifications, from previous ARRA reports¹. The selection of criteria and classification of faculties in characteristic groups is based on the results of the development in the area of the assessment of higher education institutions in Slovakia as well as on international trends. The opinions presented in this report have been discussed with and approved by ARRA bodies, several of them being presented also at ARRA expert seminars dealing with the issues of higher education institution assessment and quality assurance in the course of this year.

ARRA uses data from the reports of the Ministry of Education of the Slovak Republic, from the Institute of Information and Prognoses in Education, and from the Web of Knowledge database. For humanities and social science faculties, this data was also combined with data on their publications not included in international databases that were obtained from these higher education institutions' annual reports.

1

http://www.arra.sk/index.php?module=pagemaster&PAGE_user_op=view_page&PAGE_id=15&MMN_position=11:5

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED	5
1. ARRA AND AUTHORS OF THE REPORT	11
2. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY AND QUALITY INDICATORS.....	12
3. SUMMARY	15
4. RESULTS OF THE ASSESSMENT	18
4.1 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the FILOZOF group	18
4.2 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the TEOLOG group.....	20
4.3 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the PRAV group	22
4.4 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the PEDAGOG group.....	24
4.5 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the EKONOM group.....	26
4.6 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the UMEL group	29
4.7 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the OTHER SPOL group.....	31
4.8 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the PRIR group.....	34
4.9 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the MED group	37
4.10 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the TECH group	40
4.11 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the AGRO group	44

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED

APVV – Research and Development Support Agency

ARRA – Academic Ranking and Rating Agency

MoEdu SR – Ministry of Education of the Slovak Republic

SAV – Slovak Academy of Sciences

IPE – Institute of Information and Prognoses in Education

WoK – Web of Knowledge

List of the groups of universities, higher education institutions and faculties and their abbreviations used in the report:

FILozOF – universities, higher education institutions, and faculties of philosophical sciences

TEOLOG – universities, higher education institutions, and faculties of theological sciences

PRAV – universities, higher education institutions, and faculties of law sciences

PEDAGOG – universities, higher education institutions, and faculties of education sciences

EKONOM – universities, higher education institutions, and faculties of economic sciences

UMEL – universities, higher education institutions, and faculties of arts

OTHER SPOL – universities, higher education institutions, and faculties of social sciences not classified in other groups

PRIR – universities, higher education institutions, and faculties of natural sciences

MED – universities, higher education institutions, and faculties of medical and health sciences

TECH – faculties of technical sciences

AGRO – universities, higher education institutions, and faculties of agricultural sciences

Table 1. List of the groups of universities, higher education institutions and faculties and their abbreviations used in the report

Institution	Faculty	Group	Acronym
Academy of Arts in Banská Bystrica			AU
Academy of Arts	Faculty of Dramatic Arts	UMEL	FDU AU
Academy of Arts	Faculty of Music	UMEL	FMU AU
Academy of Arts	Faculty of Fine Arts	UMEL	FVU AU

Institution	Faculty	Group	Acronym
University of Economics in Bratislava			EU BA
University of Economics	Faculty of Economic Informatics	EKONOM	FHI EU
University of Economics	Faculty of International Relations	OTHER SPOL	FMEV EU
University of Economics	Faculty of Business Management	EKONOM	FPM EU
University of Economics	Faculty of National Economy	EKONOM	NHF EU
University of Economics	Faculty of Business	EKONOM	OF EU
University of Economics	Faculty of Business Economics	EKONOM	PHF EU
Catholic University in Ružomberok			KU
Catholic University	Faculty of Philosophy	FILOZOF	FIF KU
Catholic University	Faculty of Education	PEDAGOG	PedF KU
Catholic University	Faculty of Healthcare	MED	FZ KU
Catholic University	Faculty of Theology	TEOLOG	TF KU
Prešov University in Prešov			PU
University of Prešov	Faculty of Humanities and Natural Sciences	FILOZOF	FHPriV PU
University of Prešov	Faculty of Management	EKONOM	FM PU
University of Prešov	Faculty of Sports	PEDAGOG	FŠ PU
University of Prešov	Faculty of Healthcare	MED	FZ PU
University of Prešov	Faculty of Philosophy	FILOZOF	FIF PU
University of Prešov	Greek Catholic Faculty of Theology	TEOLOG	GKTF PU
University of Prešov	Faculty of Education	PEDAGOG	PedF PU
University of Prešov	Faculty of Orthodox Theology	TEOLOG	PBF PU
Slovak University of Agriculture in Nitra			SPU
Slovak University of Agriculture	Faculty of Agrobiology and Food Resources	AGRO	FAPZ SPU
Slovak University of Agriculture	Faculty of Biotechnology and Food Sciences	AGRO	FBP SPU
Slovak University of Agriculture	Faculty of Economics and Management	EKONOM	FEM SPU
Slovak University of Agriculture	Faculty of European Studies and Regional Development	OTHER SPOL	FEŠRR SPU
Slovak University of Agriculture	Faculty of Horticulture and Landscape Engineering	AGRO	FZKI SPU
Slovak University of Agriculture	Faculty of Engineering	TECH	TF SPU

Institution	Faculty	Group	Acronym
Slovak University of Technology in Bratislava			STUBA
Slovak University of Technology	Faculty of Architecture	TECH	FA STU
Slovak University of Technology	Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Informatics	TECH	FEI STU
Slovak University of Technology	Faculty of Chemical and Food Technology	TECH	FCHPT STU
Slovak University of Technology	Faculty of Informatics and Information Technologies	TECH	FIIT STU
Slovak University of Technology	Faculty of Material Sciences and Technology	TECH	MTF STU
Slovak University of Technology	Faculty of Civil Engineering	TECH	SvF STU
Slovak University of Technology	Faculty of Mechanical Engineering	TECH	SjF STU
Technical University in Košice			TUKE
Technical University of Košice	Faculty of Economics	EKONOM	EF TUKE
Technical University of Košice	Faculty of Mining, Ecology, Process Control and Geotechnology	TECH	FBERG TUKE
Technical University of Košice	Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Informatics	TECH	FEI TUKE
Technical University of Košice	Faculty of Arts	UMEL	FU TUKE
Technical University of Košice	Faculty of Manufacturing Technologies	TECH	FVT TUKE
Technical University of Košice	Faculty of Metallurgy	TECH	HF TUKE
Technical University of Košice	Faculty of Civil Engineering	TECH	SvF TUKE
Technical University of Košice	Faculty of Aeronautics	TECH	LF TUKE
Technical University of Košice	Faculty of Mechanical Engineering	TECH	SjF TUKE
Technical University, Zvolen			TUZVO
Technical University in Zvolen	Faculty of Wood Sciences and Technology	AGRO	DF TUZVO
Technical University in Zvolen	Faculty of Ecology and Environmental Sciences	PRIR	FEE TUZVO
Technical University in Zvolen	Faculty of Environmental and Manufacturing Technology	TECH	FEVT TUZVO
Technical University in Zvolen	Faculty of Forestry	AGRO	LF TUZVO
Trenčín University of A. Dubček in Trenčín			TUAD
Alexander Dubček University in Trenčín	Faculty of Mechatronics	TECH	FM TUAD
Alexander Dubček University in Trenčín	Faculty of Industrial Technologies	TECH	FPT TUAD
Alexander Dubček University in Trenčín	Faculty of Social and Economic Relations	OTHER SPOL	FSEV TUAD
Alexander Dubček University in Trenčín	Faculty of Special Technology	TECH	FŠT TUAD

--	--	--	--

Institution	Faculty	Group	Acronym
Trnava University in Trnava			TU
Trnava University	Faculty of Healthcare and Social Work	MED	FZSP TU
Trnava University	Faculty of Philosophy	FILOZOF	FIF TU
Trnava University	Faculty of Education	PEDAGOG	PedF TU
Trnava University	Faculty of Law	PRAV	PraF TU
Trnava University	Faculty of Theology	TEOLOG	TF TU
Comenius University in Bratislava			UK
Comenius University	Evangelical Theological Faculty	TEOLOG	EBF UK
Comenius University	Faculty of Management	EKONOM	FM UK
Comenius University	Faculty of Mathematics, Physics, and Informatics	PRIR	FMFI UK
Comenius University	Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences	OTHER SPOL	FSEV UK
Comenius University	Faculty of Physical Education and Sports	PEDAGOG	FTVŠ UK
Comenius University	Faculty of Pharmacy	MED	FaF UK
Comenius University	Faculty of Philosophy	FILOZOF	FIF UK
Comenius University	Jessenius Faculty of Medicine	MED	JLF UK
Comenius University	Faculty of Medicine	MED	LF UK
Comenius University	Faculty of Education	PEDAGOG	PedF UK
Comenius University	Faculty of Law	PRAV	PraF UK
Comenius University	Faculty of Natural Sciences	PRIR	PriF UK
Comenius University	Roman Catholic Faculty of Theology	TEOLOG	RKCMBF UK
Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra			UKF
Constantine the Philosopher University	Faculty of Natural Sciences	PRIR	FPriV UKF
Constantine the Philosopher University	Faculty of Social Sciences and Healthcare	MED	FSVZ UKF
Constantine the Philosopher University	Faculty of Central European Studies	OTHER SPOL	FSŠ UKF
Constantine the Philosopher University	Faculty of Philosophy	FILOZOF	FIF UKF
Constantine the Philosopher University	Faculty of Education	PEDAGOG	PedF UKF
Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica			UMB
Matej Bel University	Faculty of Economics	EKONOM	EF UMB
Matej Bel University	Faculty of Humanities	FILOZOF	FHV UMB
Matej Bel University	Faculty of Political Sciences and International Relations	OTHER SPOL	FPV UMB
Matej Bel University	Faculty of Natural Sciences	PRIR	FPriV UMB

Matej Bel University	Faculty of Education	PEDAGOG	PedF UMB
Matej Bel University	Faculty of Law	PRAV	PraF UMB

Institution	Faculty	Group	Acronym
Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice			UPJŠ
Pavol Jozef Šafárik University	Faculty of Public Administration	OTHER SPOL	FVS UPJŠ
Pavol Jozef Šafárik University	Faculty of Medicine	MED	LF UPJŠ
Pavol Jozef Šafárik University	Faculty of Law	PRAV	PraF UPJŠ
Pavol Jozef Šafárik University	Faculty of Natural Sciences	PRIR	PriF UPJŠ
University of SS. Cyril and Methodius in Trnava			UCM
University of SS. Cyril and Methodius	Faculty of Mass Media Communication	OTHER SPOL	FMK UCM
University of SS. Cyril and Methodius	Faculty of Natural Sciences	PRIR	FPriV UCM
University of SS. Cyril and Methodius	Faculty of Philosophy	FILOZOF	FiF UCM
University of Veterinary Medicine in Košice		AGRO	UVL
Academy of Music and Performing Arts in Bratislava			VŠMU
Academy of Music and Performing Arts	Theatre Faculty	UMEL	DF VŠMU
Academy of Music and Performing Arts	Film and Television Faculty	UMEL	FTF VŠMU
Academy of Music and Performing Arts	Faculty of Music and Dance	UMEL	HTF VŠMU
Academy of Fine Arts and Design in Bratislava		UMEL	VŠVU
Žilina University in Žilina			ŽU
University of Žilina	Faculty of Electrical Engineering	TECH	EF ŽU
University of Žilina	Faculty of Operation and Economics of Transport and Communications	EKONOM	FPEDAS ŽU
University of Žilina	Faculty of Natural Sciences	PRIR	FPriV ŽU
University of Žilina	Faculty of Management Science & Informatics	TECH	FRI ŽU
University of Žilina	Faculty of Special Engineering	TECH	FŠI ŽU
University of Žilina	Faculty of Civil Engineering	TECH	SvF ŽU
University of Žilina	Faculty of Mechanical Engineering	TECH	SjF ŽU

J. Selye University in Komárno			UJS
J. Selye University	Faculty of Economics	EKONOM	EF UJS
J. Selye University	Faculty of Reformed Theology	TEOLOG	FRT UJS
J. Selye University	Faculty of Education	PEDAGOG	PedF UJS
St. Elizabeth University in Bratislava		MED	VŠSA
International School of Management Slovakia		EKONOM	VŠMP

1. ARRA AND AUTHORS OF THE REPORT

ARRA is an independent civil association established in 2004 by Prof. Ferdinand Devínsky, Prof. Ján Pišút, Renáta Králiková, and Juraj Barta with the objective of assessing the quality of Slovak higher education institutions. In the course of its existence, it prepared and published six reports assessing Slovak higher education institutions. In its beginnings, ARRA was assisted by dr. Don Thornhill and dr. Lewis Purser, World Bank experts. ARRA continues its international collaboration and this year it obtained a founding member certificate of a global organisation of ranking agencies, the **IREG Observatory (International Ranking Expert Group, Observatory on Academic Ranking and Excellence)**, it co-founded in 2009. Prof. Ferdinand Devínsky acts as a member of the Executive Committee of the IREG Observatory.

The primary objective of ARRA is to stimulate positive changes in Slovak higher education.

ARRA is also engaged in other activities whose common denominator is the quality of higher education institutions in Slovakia. Projects implemented this year include the Classification of Higher Education Institutions, a study mapping the opinions of higher education teachers on the situation and quality of present higher education, and a similar study, unique in Slovakia, mapping the opinions of graduates of Slovak higher education institutions on their quality. Both were conducted in collaboration with the GfK company and with the Profesia portal. The results of these activities were presented by ARRA at three expert seminars.

AUTHORS OF THE 2010 REPORT

- **Mgr. Juraj Barta**, CFA
- Dr. h. c. prof. Ing. **Ferdinand Devínsky**, DrSc.
- PhDr. Daniela Drobná, PhD.
- **Mgr. Michal Fedák**
- Mgr. Katarína Hudecová
- doc. RNDr. Ivan Ostrovský, CSc. (report editor)
- prof. RNDr. **Ján Pišút**, DrSc.
- prof. Ing. **Ivan Štich**, DrSc.
- Ing. Ľubomír Varga

2. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY AND QUALITY INDICATORS

The methodology that ARRA used in assessing Slovak higher education institutions is based on the FRASCATI Manual and the assessment procedure for 2010 has not changed compared to that used in 2009.

Similarly as in the previous assessments, the higher education institution assessment procedure consists in the following steps in this Report:

- The selection of indicators for the quality of education and research in individual universities and the assignment of a certain number of points to each faculty for the performance in the particular indicator. Indicators are arranged in groups and faculties gain a certain number of points for each group of indicators. The number of faculty's points is calculated so that the faculty with the highest value (measure, indicator) in a group gets 100 points and other faculties in the group get points calculated as a linear proportion of the value of their indicator to the value of the highest indicator;
- The division of faculties into eleven field-specific groups in order to compare only faculties that have the same orientation and similar working conditions;
- Assigning summary point scores to faculties, the scores being expressed as an average of points for all indicators, i.e., the ranking of faculties in individual groups is based on average point score for all groups of indicators;
- Calculating point scores for the higher education institutions in individual groups, the ranking of the institution in the given group being given by the average assessment of all its faculties included in that group.

The Report divides faculties into the following groups:

- natural sciences (PRIR),
- medical sciences (MED),
- engineering and technology (TECH),
- agricultural sciences (AGRO),
- philosophical sciences (FILOZOF),
- theological sciences (TEOLOG),
- legal sciences (PRAV),
- pedagogical sciences (PEDAGOG),
- economic sciences (EKONOM),
- arts (UMEL),
- other social sciences (OTHER SPOL).

In 2007 and in 2009 again, the indicators were modified to reflect the quality of higher education institutions under assessment as correctly and accurately as possible. The version of indicators of 2009 has been used in unchanged form when compiling the present report. It should be emphasised that the assessment, as described in the first point above, is based on a relative scale using the performance of the best faculty in the given group for the last year as the benchmark. This implies that the year-on-year changes detected represent a change in the performance versus presently the best performer in the group, i.e., a relative rather than absolute change in

performance. Absolute changes in the indicators, and thus also development trends, if any, can be observed only by examining the underlying data from which the point values are derived.

ARRA does not prepare a cumulative table ranking all Slovak higher education institutions. It is also true that the quality of a higher education institution is determined by the quality of its faculties (except for the University of Veterinary Medicine the Academy of Fine Arts, and St. Elizabeth University of Health and Social Sciences, which have no faculties and are therefore assessed as a whole). ARRA, therefore, offers a ranking of higher education institutions in groups of subjects on the basis of the prevailing orientation.

ARRA assigns compensation points in certain criteria to faculties existing less than 10 years. These are criteria where parameter value depends on time (ten years' period is examined, while the faculties assigned compensation points exist for less than ten years). The compensation facilitates comparison of younger faculties with older faculties in the given criteria. A list of faculties with modified assessment including the compensation factors for the period under examination is given in Table 2.

Table 2. Faculties assigned compensation points in the 2010 Report

University	Faculty	Year established	Compensation factor
Comenius University	Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences	2002	10/7
University of Prešov	Faculty of Healthcare	2002	10/7
Catholic University	Faculty of Philosophy	2002	10/7
Catholic University	Faculty of Theology	2003	10/6
St. Elizabeth University	St. Elizabeth University	2003	10/6
Catholic University	Faculty of Education	2002	10/7
Constantine the Philosopher University	Faculty of Social Sciences and Healthcare	2002	10/7
University of Žilina	Faculty of Special Engineering	2002	10/7
Slovak University of Agriculture	Faculty of Biotechnology and Food Sciences	2002	10/7
Slovak University of Agriculture	Faculty of European Studies and Regional Development	2002	10/7
J. Selye University	Faculty of Economics	2004	10/5
J. Selye University	Faculty of Reformed Theology	2004	10/5
J. Selye University	Faculty of Education	2004	10/5
Slovak University of Technology	Faculty of Informatics and Information Technologies	2004	10/5
Technical University of Košice	Faculty of Aeronautics	2004	10/5
University of Prešov	Faculty of Management	2004	10/5
University of Prešov	Faculty of Sports	2004	10/5
Catholic University	Faculty of Healthcare	2004	10/5
Constantine the Philosopher University	Faculty of Central European Studies	2004	10/5

INDICATORS

EDUCATION

SV1 – The ratio of the number of full-time and part-time students per teacher in 2009;

SV2 – The ratio of the number of full-time and part-time students per professor or associate professor in 2009;

SV3 – The ratio of professors, associate professors, and teachers with PhD to the total number of teachers;

SV4 – The ratio of the number of professors and associate professors to the number of all teachers;

SV6 – The ratio of the actual number of applications received to the planned number in 2009;

SV7 – The ratio of the number of registered students to the number of admitted students in 2009;

SV8 – The ratio of foreign students to all students of the higher education institution.

RESEARCH

VV1 – Number of publications in the WoK for the years 2000 – 2009 per creative worker;

- VV1a – Number of journal publications (ABA, ADE, ABB, ADF, BDE, BDF, AFC, AFD, AFA, AFB) not included in WoK for 2009 (applies to the TEOLOG, PRAV, PEDAGOG, FILOZOF, EKONOM, UMEL, OTHER SPOL faculties);
- VV1b – Number of book publications (AAA, AAB, BAA, BAB, ABC, ABD, BBA, BBB, ACA, ACB, ACC, ACD, BCI, BCK, BCB) not included in WoK for 2009 (applies to the TEOLOG, PRAV, PEDAGOG, FILOZOF, EKONOM, UMEL, OTHER SPOL faculties);

VV2 – Number of citations in the WoK for the years 2000 – 2009 per creative worker;

VV2a – Number of citations in WoK per publication in WoK for the years 2000 – 2009,

VV4a – The ratio of the average number of PhD graduates in 2007 – 2009 to the average number of all first-year PhD students in 2004 – 2006;

VV5 – The ratio of the average annual number of full-time PhD graduates in 2007 – 2009 to the number of professors and associate professors;

VV6 – The ratio of the number of full-time PhD students to the number of bachelor's and master's degree full-time students;

VV7 – Total grant funding from the KEGA and VEGA agencies per creative worker in 2009;

VV8 – Total grant funding from the APVV agency per creative worker in 2009;

VV9 – Total funding from foreign grants per creative worker in 2009;

VV10 – Total grant funding from all the above-mentioned agencies per creative worker in 2009.

3. SUMMARY

ARRA presents the sixth assessment of Slovak higher education institutions which relies on a detailed analysis of publicly available and verifiable data on their scientific activity, teachers, numbers of students, interest in study, grants, and PhD studies.

This ranking, too, shows that the higher education system has been stagnating in performance for several years or at least throughout the period of assessment by ARRA.

Likewise, the values of ranking indicators for individual institutions as such changed very little. Changes in individual institutions' indicator values in the last year can be characterised by saying that out of twenty public higher education institutions under assessment, 15 (75%) increased the average indicator rates by at least 1.5 points (UJS). On average, the indicator values increased by 1.2 points, which means with respect to the methodology that the differences between leaders in individual categories and the average in the given category were reduced. Unfortunately, this often happened as a result of stagnating or even declining performance of the leader.

It can be said that for some institutions, the parameters under assessment grow faster than the average of the Slovak higher education system. However, there also are institutions that are slipping to average from previously leading positions in their categories, but also ones that increase their lagging behind the average in their category.

It should be noted that certain faculties of the Žilina University significantly improved in grant success.

Only the Catholic University in Ružomberok ("KU") exceeded the nationwide average more than four times, increasing this parameter most significantly of all (+5.3 points). The second group, whose members exceeded the Slovak average growth rate of average indicators at least three times in the last year, includes the Žilina University in Žilina ("ŽU") (+ 4.4 points), the Trenčín University of Alexander Dubček in Trenčín ("TUAD") (+ 4.1 points), the Slovak University of Agriculture in Nitra ("SPU") (+ 4.0 points), and the Technical University in Zvolen ("TUZVO") (+ 3.8 points). The average level of quality indicators was increased by at least twice the average by Comenius University in Bratislava ("UK"), Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra ("UKF"), the Trnava University in Trnava ("TU"), Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica ("UMB"), the Slovak University of Technology in Bratislava ("STU"), and the Academy of Arts in Banská Bystrica ("AU"). The performance of the Prešov University in Prešov ("PU"), the University of SS. Cyril and Methodius in Trnava ("UCM"), Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice ("UPJŠ"), and János Selye University in Komárno ("UJS") was comparable to the average.

Five institutions (a quarter of those under assessment) showed a performance drop in the quality indicators included in the assessment – the Technical University in Košice ("TUKE"), the Academy of Music and Performing Arts in Bratislava ("VŠMU"), the Academy of Fine Arts and Design

in Bratislava (“VŠVU”), the University of Economics in Bratislava (“EU”), and the University of Veterinary Medicine in Košice (“UVL”).

Table 3. Average values of higher education institutions’ quality indicators in the period 2005 – 2010 and their changes between 2009 and 2010

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Difference (2010 – 2009)
KU	29.2	29.3	20.6	21.5	36.2	41.5	5.3
ŽU	39.1	41.8	34.4	37.2	41.7	46.1	4.4
TUAD	34.1	35.9	26.7	26.7	26.5	30.6	4.1
SPU	46.7	54.6	46.7	44.7	48.1	52.1	4.0
TUZVO	56.0	54.0	47.1	47.1	47.2	51.0	3.8
UK	55.4	57.9	51.1	50.2	59.2	62.3	3.1
UKF	35.8	40.2	34.9	29.0	39.1	42.1	3.0
TU	47.6	49.8	45.6	35.6	49.2	52.2	3.0
UMB	32.3	34.0	30.0	28.0	44.4	47.3	2.9
STU	51.7	48.9	49.7	51.3	47.9	50.5	2.6
AU	38.0	35.9	29.3	30.0	35.5	38.0	2.5
PU	40.0	44.5	28.5	28.3	40.6	42.7	2.1
UCM	26.1	26.8	22.0	23.9	28.4	30.2	1.8
UPJŠ	50.3	50.6	41.5	42.9	53.0	54.6	1.7
UJS				27.0	30.8	32.4	1.5
TUKE	45.4	45.4	37.2	38.8	41.0	40.8	-0.1
VŠMU	46.5	49.8	42.1	36.7	50.0	49.4	-0.5
VŠVU	50.1	43.3	39.5	34.6	49.2	44.4	-4.8
EU	34.9	40.4	39.7	37.7	52.8	47.1	-5.7
UVL	83.8	87.7	81.1	83.8	83.1	76.9	-6.2
AVERAGE	44.4	45.8	39.4	37.7	45.2	46.4	1.2

In each faculty group, an “improver” of the year can be found, i.e., a faculty with the greatest positive change. FTVŠ UK leads with a growth of +12.8 points a year in the PEDAGOG group, closely followed by SvF ŽU with a growth of +12.7 points a year in the TECH group, the FILOZOF group is dominated by FHV UMB (+11.6 points), the MED group by LF UK (+11.2 points), and the PRIR group by PRIF UPJŠ (+9.5 points).

Other groups, too, included faculties with significant increases of ranking indicator averages: EF UMB (+10.4 points) in the EKONOM group and FSEV UK (+10.3 points) in the OTHER SPOL group.

Conversely, a negative record is held by FPEDAS ŽU (-16.0 points) which is the greatest individual change in average ranking indicators for the last year, and FMEV EU (-10.9 points) followed by other faculties of the Faculty of Economy with decreases in average indicators under assessment for the last year.

In general, the following can be concluded about the results of Slovak higher education institution assessment for the last year:

The overall scientific production of Slovak higher education institutions is increasing only very modestly. There is a moderate growth in scientific production among traditionally strong faculties, for example, at Comenius University's Faculty of Mathematics, Physics and Informatics, where this is attributable to collaboration in major international projects.

An unambiguously positive trend in several faculties is the growing number of foreign students, whether from the European Union countries or from third countries. A strong growth is seen particularly at medical and pharmaceutical faculties. Similarly, the percentage of foreign students at the University of Veterinary Medicine slightly dropped compared to the previous period, although still being above the Slovak average. The interest of foreign students in studying at some Slovak faculties indicates the faculties' good reputation abroad and represents recognition of their quality.

For some time, an interesting phenomenon could be observed in the Slovak higher education space. Faculties with poor scientific activity reflected by the number of scientific publications and their citation index generate large numbers of future scientists – PhD students. It is questionable how a high-quality scientist can be raised in an environment where research is done to a limited extent only, if at all. This anomaly is widespread particularly in the fields of technology, social sciences, and humanities.

What is also interesting is the fact that future students, when choosing an institution or faculty to attend, do not give much consideration to the quality of the institution expressed through success in science and often decide for faculties with average or even below-average results (results of the 2006, 2009 GfK surveys).

4. RESULTS OF THE ASSESSMENT

4.1 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the FILOZOF group

	FILOZOF	Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)	Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)	Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)	PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)	Grants (VV7 – VV10)	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING
=	1. Comenius University	100	72	50	79	54	71.1	1	2	1
=	2. University of Prešov	80	80	74	73	38	68.9	2	1	2
↑	3. Catholic University	86	47	26	75	68	60.3	4	3	6
↓	4. Trnava University	84	57	34	65	38	55.6	3	4	3
↑	5. Matej Bel University	75	72	18	75	25	52.9	6	6	5
↓	6. Constantine the Philosopher University	67	74	10	75	22	49.7	5	5	4
=	7. University of SS. Cyril and Methodius	70	53	14	3	21	32.3	7	7	7

	FILOZOF		Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)	Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)	Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)	PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)	Grants (VV7 – VV10)	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING
↑	1. Faculty of Humanities and Natural Sciences	University of Prešov	76	94	100	65	46	76.3	2	1	2
↓	2. Faculty of Philosophy	Comenius University	100	72	50	79	54	71.1	1	2	1
=	3. Faculty of Philosophy	University of Prešov	84	65	47	80	31	61.4	3	4	4
↑	4. Faculty of Philosophy	Catholic University	86	47	26	75	68	60.3	5	3	7
↓	5. Faculty of Philosophy	Trnava University	84	57	34	65	38	55.6	4	5	3
↑	6. Faculty of Humanities	Matej Bel University	75	72	18	75	25	52.9	7	7	6
↓	7. Faculty of Philosophy	Constantine the Philosopher University	67	74	10	75	22	49.7	6	6	5
=	8. Faculty of Philosophy	University of SS. Cyril and Methodius	70	53	14	3	21	32.3	8	8	8

In this group of faculties, a change occurred in the first rank with the Prešov University's Faculty of Humanities and Natural Sciences reclaiming the first place after a year's pause, substituting the Faculty of Philosophy, Comenius University, particularly in science indicators. This has apparently been driven by its natural science section. The third rank has been claimed again by the Prešov University's Faculty of Philosophy; conversely, the Trnava University's Faculty of Philosophy saw a drop to the fifth position. Traditionally, the last rank separated by a large gap is held by the UCM Faculty of Philosophy.

Conversely, the Catholic University's Faculty of Philosophy is a confirmation of the fact that younger faculties can get higher in the ranking if they systematically work on it – four years ago it ranked comparably to UCM, today its ranking is twice as good and it is very close to the first three faculties in the group.

Apart from a few exceptions, faculties stagnated with only moderate growths or even drops in their indicator values. More significant increases in performance and quality in the group were seen only by the Faculty of Humanities, Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica ("FHV UMB") (+11.6 points which is the most in the group and ranks among the highest gains overall) improving by one rank and by the Faculty of Humanities and Natural Sciences, Prešov University in Prešov ("FHPriV PU") (+8.7 points). On the other hand, the largest loss was suffered by the Faculty of Philosophy, Comenius University in Bratislava ("FiF UK") (-2.1 points) which lost its first rank. The scientific production of the above-mentioned group of faculties continues to be relatively low in journals listed in Current Contents.

The lowest indicator figures appear in the area of science and research at the Faculty of Philosophy, University of SS. Cyril and Methodius in Trnava ("FiF UCM") which has the lowest number of PhD students. Last but not one rank is held by the Faculty of Philosophy, Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra ("FiF UKF") which reports the lowest number of results in the area of publications and citations.

A balanced average of indicators is shown by the Faculty of Philosophy, Catholic University in Ružomberok ("FiF KU"), Faculty of Philosophy, Prešov University in Prešov ("FiF PU"), Faculty of Humanities, Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica ("FHV UMB"), and FiF TU, although there are clear differences between individual indicator groups.

The leaders of this group are FHPriV PU and FiF UK. The first one capitalises primarily on its mixed character. This is a singular phenomenon among Slovak faculties. The second one, despite large fragmentation of study and scientific programmes, gained a solid position in international cooperation (participation in EU framework programmes) which helps it significantly improve the grant success indicators. However, even this was not enough to win it the competition with FiF KU which was best in this indicator group.

Overall, the development of indicators in the FILOZOF group of faculties contributed very little to the general improvement of higher education institutions. FiF KU is an exception, contributing very significantly to the general positive increase in indicators of the Catholic University in Ružomberok in the last year (FiF KU's contribution was +6.6 points).

4.2 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the TEOLOG group

		TEOLOG	Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)	Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)	Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)	PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)	Grants (VV7 – VV10)	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING
=	1.	Comenius University	47	43	51	72	25	47.5	1	2	2
↑	2.	Trnava University	59	43	8	46	50	41.2	5	3	1
=	3.	J. Selye University	96	59	1	49	0	41.0	3	1	n.a.
↓	4.	Catholic University	48	58	5	37	39	37.3	2	5	4
↓	5.	University of Prešov	46	63	6	44	17	35.2	4	4	3

		TEOLOG		Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)	Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)	Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)	PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)	Grants (VV7 – VV10)	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING
=	1.	Evangelical Theological Faculty	Comenius University	55	44	100	75	50	65.0	1	3	2
↑	2.	Faculty of Theology	Trnava University	59	43	8	46	50	41.2	5	5	1
=	3.	Faculty of Reformed Theology	J. Selye University	96	59	1	49	0	41.0	3	1	n.a.
↑	4.	Faculty of Orthodox Theology	University of Prešov	49	77	7	48	13	38.6	7	4	4
↓	5.	Faculty of Theology	Catholic University	48	58	5	37	39	37.3	2	7	6
↓	6.	Greek Catholic Faculty of Theology	University of Prešov	44	48	6	40	21	31.8	4	6	5
↓	7.	Roman Catholic Faculty of Theology of Cyril and Methodius	Comenius University	39	41	2	68	0	30.0	6	2	3

For the second year, the group of theological faculties has been assessed separately. The development in the group in the last year was mathematically balanced with three faculties seeing positive growth, three showing a decrease in the indicators and one improving its indicators by a minimum. For the second year in a row, the lead is held by the Evangelical Theological Faculty of Comenius University (“EBF UK”) with absolutely the greatest number of points in the category of indicators covering publication and citation activities and the second greatest point score in the group for the last year (+8.0 points). Faculties in the second to fifth places have a very balanced performance; they are separated by less than 5 points on a hundred-point scale. What is more interesting than the final ranking is therefore the increase or decrease of values achieved in a year-on-year comparison. The second place has been claimed by the Faculty of Theology, Trnava University (“TF TU”) with a total of 41.2 points which also saw the greatest point score increase of +8.2 points in this group of faculties and moved two ranks up. A higher point score gain was also achieved by the Prešov University’s Faculty of Orthodox Theology (“PBF PU”) (+6.9 points) which sent it as many as three places up in the ranking. Conversely, the greatest point score loss was suffered by the Faculty of Theology of the Catholic University in Ružomberok (“TF KU”) (-5.2 points) which caused it to move three places down. Likewise, the Faculty of Greek Catholic Theology, Prešov University (“GKBF PU”) and the Roman Catholic Faculty of Theology, Comenius University (“RKCMBF UK”) lost points and fell by two and one place, respectively. J. Selye University’s Faculty of Reformed Theology (“FRT UJS”) saw no significant change in indicators for the last year.

The “production” of PhD students in the group is increasing; however, it does not correlate with the scientific and research results of the theological faculties’ academic staff.

4.3 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the PRAV group

		PRAV	Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)	Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)	Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)	PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)	Grants (VV7 – VV10)	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING
=	1.	Comenius University	94	66	29	92	50	66.2	1	1	2
=	2.	Trnava University	69	50	53	77	59	61.7	2	3	1
=	3.	Pavol Jozef Šafárik University	98	45	33	37	64	55.5	3	2	3
=	4.	Matej Bel University	74	66	2	10	15	33.5	4	4	4

		PRAV		Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)	Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)	Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)	PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)	Grants (VV7 – VV10)	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING
=	1.	Faculty of Law	Comenius University	94	66	29	92	50	66.2	1	1	2
=	2.	Faculty of Law	Trnava University	69	50	53	77	59	61.7	2	3	1
=	3.	Faculty of Law	Pavol Jozef Šafárik University	98	45	33	37	64	55.5	3	2	3
=	4.	Faculty of Law	Matej Bel University	74	66	2	10	15	33.5	4	4	4

Four faculties of law are characterised by enormous numbers of applications for study, whether full-time or part-time. The number of students per professor/associate professor is the lowest at the Faculty of Law, Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice (“PraF UPJŠ”) reaching 75; this figure is slightly higher, although still below 100, for the Faculty of Law, Comenius University in Bratislava (“PraF UK”) with 83 students. The Faculty of Law, Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica (“PraF UMB”) has 123 and the Faculty of Law, Trnava University in Trnava (“PraF TU”) has as many as 145 students per professor or associate professor. These high figures raise questions of quality and possibility of individual consulting or assistance provided by the teachers.

The development of indicators in this group of faculties in the last year was very similar to that of the EKONOM group, i.e., it was rather negative or stagnating with one minimum increase and three decreases (one being significant). This time, the order of the faculties has not changed. This ranking of four faculties under assessment is led by PraF UK with an average point score of 66.2 but with a drop of -1.1 points. PraF TU, ranking second, was the only one to see an increase, by 1.8 points. The third one, PraF UPJŠ with the result of 55.5 points, reduced its score by 0.7 points. The highest drop was seen by PraF UMB (-6.1 points). The results were affected primarily by indicators reflecting the number of students and PhD graduates (VV4a and VV5).

In spite of the fact that the in the last twenty years, the legal system and the entire legislation had to be transformed and made compliant with the conditions for the country’s accession to the EU, what is evident is the lack of participation of Slovak faculties of law in international scientific research activity. Although educational grants and networking grants for legislation-oriented institutions (e.g., Jean Monnet programme projects as part of the EU LLL Programme) are available, the faculties’ production failed to cross the border and contribute to the development of scientific research activity. This fact is reflected by the scientific outputs – numbers of publications and citations in international databases, which are very low. PraF UPJŠ scored best in the indicator reflecting the number of publications (VV1), being outperformed by PraF TU in the citation indicator (VV2).

As mentioned above, available public sources indicate no outputs and funds suggesting international cooperation in the area of grants. PraF UPJŠ did best in the framework of VEGA, KEGA, and APVV with an amount of EUR 2,569 per creative worker, followed closely by PraF TU with EUR 2,271 per worker, PraF UK coming third with EUR 2,126 per creative worker. A drop was seen by PraF UMB with EUR 592 per creative worker.

Similarly as faculties of economics and philosophy, the above-mentioned performance of faculties of law in the last year contributed very little to the general improvement of higher education institutions (almost negligibly).

4.4 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the PEDAGOG group

		PEDAGOG	Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)	Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)	Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)	PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)	Grants (VV7 – VV10)	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING
↑	1.	Comenius University	86	63	40	63	42	58.8	2	2	1
↑	2.	Trnava University	69	60	66	38	34	53.4	3	1	2
↓	3.	Matej Bel University	75	71	33	45	28	50.2	1	3	5
=	4.	University of Prešov	62	49	7	51	53	44.6	4	5	3
=	5.	Constantine the Philosopher University	80	64	11	55	10	43.9	5	4	4
↑	6.	Catholic University	77	70	24	17	21	41.7	7	6	6
↓	7.	J. Selye University	66	67	34	*	27	38.8	6	na	na

		PEDAGOG		Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)	Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)	Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)	PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)	Grants (VV7 – VV10)	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING
=	1.	Faculty of Physical Education and Sports	Comenius University	98	71	59	75	61	72.8	1	1	1
↑	2.	Faculty of Education	Trnava University	63	50	100	30	40	56.6	4	2	2
↓	3.	Faculty of Education	Matej Bel University	75	71	33	45	28	50.2	2	3	3
↓	4.	Faculty of Sports	University of Prešov	78	45	6	64	39	46.4	3	4	n.a.
=	5.	Faculty of Education	Comenius University	73	56	20	52	23	44.8	5	5	5
↑	6.	Faculty of Education	Catholic University	87	73	15	34	15	44.7	8	9	6
=	7.	Faculty of Education	Constantine the Philosopher University	80	64	11	55	10	43.9	7	6	4
↓	8.	Faculty of Education	University of Prešov	47	53	9	37	67	42.8	6	7	7
=	9.	Faculty of Education	J. Selye University	66	67	34	*	27	38.8	9	8	n.a.

* - The university or faculty does not offer PhD courses

The subgroup of the first four faculties of education formed two years ago underwent significant changes. The marked score gain of the Faculty of Physical Education and Sports, Comenius University in Bratislava (“FTVŠ UK”) (+12.8 points), which is absolutely the highest among all faculties for the last year, moved this faculty significantly forward and it continues to be an undisputed leader of the group. Stronger point gains were also scored by the Faculty of Education of the Catholic University in Ružomberok (“PedF KU”) (+10.8 points) and by the Faculty of Education of the Trnava University in Trnava (“PedF TU”) (+6.3 points) which moved both of them two places higher. However, two faculties saw a drop in their point scores, in addition to the Faculty of Education of Matej Bel University (“PedF UMB”, -0.9 points) it was particularly the Faculty of Sports of the Prešov University (“FŠ PU”, by 4 points). In both cases, the faculties fell one position in the ranking. The faculties in the fourth to eight places, however, are separated by less than four points; their performance is therefore comparable. J. Selye University lags behind more significantly.

The number of students per teacher at these faculties reaches 12 to 28 students on average. However, the number of students per professor/associate professor at some faculties of education increased again. For example, at PedF PU it increased last year by almost 50% from the initial 100 to 149 students.

In the field of science and research in indicators VV1 and VV2, the first position was reclaimed by PedF TU followed by FTVŠ UK and by PedF UMB in the third place.

Indicators concerning PhD studies and the development of the number of PhD graduates (VV4 to VV6) have a strong impact on the ranking of faculties in the given category. However, it is generally true that in this period, apart from FTVŠ UK, the indicator values fell in the last year.

A moderate improvement could be seen in some faculties’ indicators reflecting their ability to obtain grants. The strongest support through funds from domestic grants went to PedF PU. FTVŠ UK ranks second, moving from the fourth place in the last year. Again, it should be stated that the internationalisation of the educational science occurs only slowly – only FTVŠ UK, PedF UK, and PedF KU succeeded in foreign grants.

4.5 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the EKONOM group

		EKONOM	<i>Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)</i>	<i>Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)</i>	<i>Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)</i>	<i>PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)</i>	<i>Grants (VV7 – VV10)</i>	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING
↑	1.	Slovak University of Agriculture	81	55	79	94	21	65.9	2	2	2
↓	2.	Technical University of Košice	80	46	75	59	63	64.4	1	1	1
↑	3.	Matej Bel University	85	47	50	62	10	50.7	6	6	6
↓	4.	University of Žilina	78	56	7	85	15	48.4	3	3	3
↓	5.	University of Economics	72	31	47	61	20	46.0	4	5	5
↓	6.	Comenius University	58	48	51	56	3	43.1	5	4	4
=	7.	University of Prešov	42	51	8	26	4	25.9	7	7	n.a.
=	8.	J. Selye University	30	42	4	*	10	17.3	8	8	n.a.
		International School of Management Slovakia	86	72	2	*	25	37.0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

		EKONOM		<i>Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)</i>	<i>Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)</i>	<i>Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)</i>	<i>PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)</i>	<i>Grants (VV7 – VV10)</i>	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING
↑	1.	Faculty of Economics and Management	Slovak University of Agriculture	81	55	79	94	21	65.9	2	2	2
↓	2.	Faculty of Economics	Technical University of Košice	80	46	75	59	63	64.4	1	1	1
=	3.	Faculty of National Economy	University of Economics	84	29	80	65	60	63.9	3	4	4
↑	4.	Faculty of Economics	Matej Bel University	85	47	50	62	10	50.7	9	10	6
=	5.	Faculty of Operation and Economics of Transport and Communications	University of Žilina	78	56	7	85	15	48.4	5	3	3
↓	6.	Faculty of Business	University of Economics	66	36	42	76	9	45.9	4	5	5
=	7.	Faculty of Management	Comenius University	58	48	51	56	3	43.1	7	6	9

↓	8.	Faculty of Business Economics	University of Economics	63	32	50	56	5	41.2	6	7	8
↓	9.	Faculty of Economic Informatics	University of Economics	68	24	44	51	12	39.7	8	9	10
=	10.	Faculty of Business Management	University of Economics	78	33	20	56	10	39.4	10	8	7
=	11.	Faculty of Management	University of Prešov	42	51	8	26	4	25.9	11	11	n.a.
=	12.	Faculty of Economics	J. Selye University	30	42	4	*	10	17.3	12	12	n.a.

		International School of Management Slovakia	International School of Management Slovakia	86	72	2	*	25	37.0	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
--	--	---	---	----	----	---	---	----	------	------	------	------

* - The university or faculty does not offer PhD courses

The group of faculties of economics represents the most unpleasant surprise of the last year. Except two faculties, all others in the group saw a drop in the point score. The exceptions are Matej Bel University's Faculty of Economics ("EF UMB") gaining +10.4 points and the University of Economics' Faculty of National Economy (NHF EU) gaining +8.2 points in the year. The highest point score loss not only in the group but overall was suffered by the Žilina University's Faculty of Operation and Economics of Transport and Communications (FPEDAS ŽU) (-16.0 points) followed by the Faculty of Business, University of Economics ("OF EU") (-9.6 points). This result means, inter alia, that the University of Economics in Bratislava saw the second greatest drop in point scores in the last year of all higher education institutions (-5.7 points).

In the last twenty years, faculties of economy could benefit from high numbers of applications for study. A characteristic feature of faculties of economics is the high number of students per teacher, although it should be noted that the pressure resulting from comprehensive accreditation forced these faculties to improve the SV1 indicator. What also changed is the ratio of the number of professors and associate professors to all teachers in the SV4 indicator with NHF EU reaching the highest values (82 points) followed by Comenius University's Faculty of Management ("FM UK") (76 points) and the Faculty of Business Management, University of Economics ("FPM EUBA") (73 points). What continues to be questionable is the quality and possibilities of academic contacts of professors and associate professors with students; the situation only slightly improved compared to the last year with the Prešov University's Faculty of Management ("FM PU") "reducing" the number of students per professor/associate professor from 377 to 302, while at the Faculty of Economics, János Selye University ("EF UJS"), the figure for the current year is 395. Unfavourable situation persists at other faculties where the number of students exceeds 100 per 1 professor/associate professor (FM UK, PHF EU).

Similarly as in the last year, the group of faculties specialising in economics has its leaders in the Faculty of Economics and Management, Slovak University of Agriculture ("FEM SPU"), the Košice University of Technology's Faculty of Economics ("EFF TUKE"), and NHF EU; however, their ranking changed. The first rank was taken by FEM SPU followed by EF TUKE with NHF EU coming third, improving its position by one place compared to the last year's assessment. What becomes apparent is the large differences in assessment results for individual faculties.

The low production of publications and insufficient use of opportunities to publish in journals listed in Current Contents is an unfavourable factor of the group. The qualification structure of the faculties does not correlate with the scientific production and citations. The best results in the VV1 indicator, i.e., publications in the WoK, are shown by EF TUKE (100 points), NHF EU (72 points), and FHI EU (71 points); the best faculties in the VV2 indicator representing the citation index are NHF EU (100 points), FEM SPU (95 points), and EF TUKE (86 points).

If the private International School of Management Slovakia was included in the assessment (having kindly provided the necessary data to ARRA and publishing them on their website at the same time), it would end up eleventh among the thirteen faculties under assessment. However, it can be included in the official ranking only after their data, as well as data of other private higher education institutions, have been verified by the Ministry of Education in the same manner as those of public higher education institutions.

4.6 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the UMEL group

		UMEL	<i>Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)</i>	<i>Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)</i>	<i>Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)</i>	<i>PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)</i>	<i>Grants (VV7 – VV10)</i>	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING
=	1.	Academy of Music and Performing Arts	72	58	6	90	20	49.4	1	1	1
=	2.	Academy of Fine Arts and Design	49	69	4	42	58	44.4	2	2	2
=	3.	Academy of Arts	69	59	13	24	25	38.0	3	3	3
=	4.	Technical University of Košice	55	64	1	*	7	25.4	4	4	4

		UMEL		<i>Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)</i>	<i>Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)</i>	<i>Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)</i>	<i>PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)</i>	<i>Grants (VV7 – VV10)</i>	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING
↑	1.	Film and Television Faculty	Academy of Music and Performing Arts	81	55	4	93	26	51.8	3	4	3
↓	2.	Faculty of Music and Dance	Academy of Music and Performing Arts	78	70	9	91	5	50.8	1	2	1
↑	3.	Theatre Faculty	Academy of Music and Performing Arts	59	51	4	86	28	45.6	4	3	2
↓	4.	Academy of Fine Arts and Design	Academy of Fine Arts and Design	49	69	4	42	58	44.4	2	5	4
=	5.	Faculty of Music	Academy of Arts	81	60	33	33	5	42.5	5	1	5
=	6.	Faculty of Fine Arts	Academy of Arts	56	63	2	39	50	42.0	6	6	6
=	7.	Faculty of Dramatic Arts	Academy of Arts	69	54	4	*	21	29.5	7	7	7
=	8.	Faculty of Arts	Technical University of Košice	55	64	1	*	7	25.4	8	8	8

* - The university or faculty does not offer PhD courses

In the last year, exactly half of the art faculties saw an increase and half saw a decrease in point scores. The greatest gain has been posted by the Faculty of Fine Arts, Academy of Arts in Banská Bystrica ("FVU AU") (+7.1 points) and, conversely, the largest loss has been suffered by the Academy of Music and Performing Arts in Bratislava ("VŠVU") (-4.8 points).

Art faculties are characterised by a very low ratio of students to teachers which is given by the nature of the study in art fields requiring a high measure of individualisation and support to students' creativity.

Studying art at Slovak higher education institutions is a popular option among foreign students. The best performers in this indicator are the Faculty of Music and Dance, Academy of Music and Performing Arts in Bratislava ("HTF VŠMU") and the Faculty of Music, Academy of Arts in Banská Bystrica ("FMU AU") with about 20 percent of foreign students. The need to increase qualification and skills in recent years had a positive response particularly in art fields and it can be concluded that carrier growth is consistently paid attention to at these faculties.

First four places in the group were taken by faculties of art institutions of Bratislava, although they switched positions among themselves. However, FMU AU outperformed them with a high index of publication and citation activity (33.3 points versus the average results of 9 points and less for other faculties). The ranking in the fifth to eighth places remained unchanged.

In the area of grants, faculties of visual arts (VŠVU with an average of 57.7 points and FVU AU with 50 points) highly outperformed other representatives of art institutions that scored half the number of points at best.

The high number of PhD students does not correlate with convincing results in scientific activity of teachers at these faculties. With respect to the fact that art production and its outputs are not reflected in existing databases, mechanisms will have to be developed that would be able to verify and record the given outputs at both national and international level.

4.7 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the OTHER SPOL group

		OSTATNÉ SPOL	<i>Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)</i>	<i>Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)</i>	<i>Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)</i>	<i>PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)</i>	<i>Grants (VV7 – VV10)</i>	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING
↑	1.	Comenius University	72	69	76	57	85	71.8	3	2	2
=	2.	Matej Bel University	94	69	42	86	10	60.2	2	3	4
↓	3.	University of Economics	83	63	27	88	3	52.8	1	1	1
=	4.	Slovak University of Agriculture	55	60	15	21	49	40.0	4	4	3
=	5.	University of SS. Cyril and Methodius	53	67	2	15	7	28.7	5	5	5
=	6.	Constantine the Philosopher University	66	39	16	4	15	28.1	6	7	n.a.
=	7.	Pavol Jozef Šafárik University	49	56	12	*	7	24.7	7	6	6
=	8.	Alexander Dubček University in Trenčín	38	79	2	*	3	24.2	8	8	7

		OSTATNÉ SPOL		<i>Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)</i>	<i>Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)</i>	<i>Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)</i>	<i>PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)</i>	<i>Grants (VV7 – VV10)</i>	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING
↑	1.	Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences	Comenius University	72	69	76	57	85	71.8	3	2	2
=	2.	Faculty of Political Sciences and International Relations	Matej Bel University	94	69	42	86	10	60.2	2	3	4
↓	3.	Faculty of International Relations	University of Economics	83	63	27	88	3	52.8	1	1	1
=	4.	Faculty of European Studies and Regional Development	Slovak University of Agriculture	55	60	15	21	49	40.0	4	4	3
=	5.	Faculty of Mass Media Communication	University of SS. Cyril and Methodius	53	67	2	15	7	28.7	5	5	5

=	6.	Faculty of Central European Studies	Constantine the Philosopher University	66	39	16	4	15	28.1	6	7	n.a.
=	7.	Faculty of Public Administration	Pavol Jozef Šafárik University	49	56	12	*	7	24.7	7	6	6
=	8.	Faculty of Social and Economic Relations	Alexander Dubček University in Trenčín	38	79	2	*	3	24.2	8	8	7

* - The university or faculty does not offer PhD courses

The above-mentioned group of faculties represents a very broad coverage of social science disciplines where overlaps can be identified with other fields of science and research or education, e.g., with those of philosophy, law, or economics. These mostly include newer university faculties; however, it should be admitted that in an inhomogeneous group, comparisons are more complicated than in other segments (e.g., EKONOM or PRAV). This is reflected in the irregular development of some of these faculties. Exceptions characterised by regular development include Comenius University's Faculty of Social and Economic Sciences ("FSEV UK") with continuously growing performance and quality, and the Faculty of Mass Media Communication, SS Cyril and Methodius University ("FMK UCM") whose performance and quality are stagnating in the long term.

Graduates of these faculties can pursue careers in a broad range of public administration jobs at the national level, in European institutions, but also in fields such as media, journalism, marketing and communication. These courses are therefore highly preferred by prospective students and faculties in these fields are looking to respond to the needs of individuals and society.

In the last year, the indicators of faculties in this group were developing as unconvincingly as those of faculties of the related HUM and SPOL disciplines. Half of the faculties scored a positive increase and half a loss of points. The lead in the given group has been taken by FSEV UK gaining 71.8 points in the overall assessment but also having the highest point gain in the year (+10.3 points). The Faculty of Political Sciences and International Relations, Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica ("FPV UMB") claimed the second place again, however, suffering the second highest loss in the group (-2.9 points). A drop from the first to the third place was seen by the Faculty of International Relations, University of Economics in Bratislava ("FMV EU") which suffered the second highest loss in the group (-10.9 points). The success of FSEV UK, which has been the most progressive faculty in the group in the long term, consists primarily in its scientific production and obtaining scientific research grants – this is particularly noteworthy for a social science faculty. The amount obtained per creative worker of this faculty represents EUR 5,172 for the last year.

The ranking of the remaining faculties is unchanged. The Faculty of Social and Economic Relations, Trenčín University of Alexander Dubček in Trenčín ("FSEV TUAD") came last, facing, among other things, unpleasant allegations concerning the faculty management and organisation and granting diplomas in the last year. The Accreditation Commission of the Slovak Government also examined the unreasonably high student-to-professor ratios that ARRA pointed out in the last year's assessment. However, the gap to the last but one Faculty of Public Administration, Pavol Jozef Šafárik University, is a minimum one.

4.8 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the PRIR group

		PRIR	<i>Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)</i>	<i>Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)</i>	<i>Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)</i>	<i>PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)</i>	<i>Grants (VV7 – VV10)</i>	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING
=	1.	Pavol Jozef Šafárik University	99	55	88	85	62	77.8	1	2	2
=	2.	Comenius University	86	65	79	81	77	77.5	2	1	1
=	3.	Constantine the Philosopher University	67	70	21	74	25	51.3	3	3	4
=	4.	Technical University in Zvolen	61	52	23	53	28	43.6	4	4	3
↑	5.	Matej Bel University	55	65	19	29	13	36.4	6	5	5
↓	5.	University of Žilina	45	83	5	39	10	36.4	5	7	7
=	7.	University of SS. Cyril and Methodius	50	56	30	6	7	29.7	7	6	6

		PRIR		<i>Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)</i>	<i>Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)</i>	<i>Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)</i>	<i>PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)</i>	<i>Grants (VV7 – VV10)</i>	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING
=	1.	Faculty of Mathematics, Physics, and Informatics	Comenius University	91	62	94	72	71	78.0	1	1	1
↑	2.	Faculty of Natural Sciences	Pavol Jozef Šafárik University	99	55	88	85	62	77.8	3	3	3
↓	3.	Faculty of Natural Sciences	Comenius University	81	68	63	90	84	77.0	2	2	2
=	4.	Faculty of Natural Sciences	Constantine the Philosopher University	67	70	21	74	25	51.3	4	4	5
=	5.	Faculty of Ecology and Environmental Sciences	Technical University in Zvolen	61	52	23	53	28	43.6	5	5	4

↑	6.	Faculty of Natural Sciences	Matej Bel University	55	65	19	29	13	36.4	7	6	6
↓	6.	Faculty of Natural Sciences	University of Žilina	45	83	5	39	10	36.4	6	8	8
=	8.	Faculty of Natural Sciences	University of SS. Cyril and Methodius	50	56	30	6	7	29.7	8	7	7

The development in the last year confirms that natural science faculties can be further divided into those that are capable of adequate research performance in the long term and those that focus more on the preparation of science teachers. This characterisation reflects the resulting indicator values which are higher in scientific production for faculties of science focusing on research and which are higher in the area of education for those focusing on teaching.

Similarly as in other faculty groups, the resulting indicator values and thereby the positions of faculties in the ranking are significantly influenced by their history and by the continuity in the development of science, research and other professional activities.

The three longest operating faculties of science have the best results in science and research, citation indexes, and number of publications per creative worker in the long term. Repeatedly, the first places have been taken by Comenius University's Faculty of Mathematics, Physics and Informatics (FMFI UK, 78 points), Pavol Jozef Šafárik University's Faculty of Natural Sciences (PriF UPJŠ, 77.8 points), and Comenius University's Faculty of Natural Sciences (PriF UK, 77 points). These faculties score extraordinarily high in citation indexes, outperforming other faculties several times with their outputs. They are successful in obtaining grants – PriF UK is a leader in this indicator having outperformed FMFI UK and PriF UPJŠ. Cooperation in international scientific programmes opens space for young postdocs and helps stabilise and improve the age structure of the academic staff. Moreover, grant activity has a motivational component, as it results in an improvement of remuneration (e.g., PriF UK obtained as many as EUR 11,165 per creative worker). However, even these faculties cannot capitalise on inertia alone. The results for the last year confirm the continuing decrease in indicator values for FMFI UK. Although it kept the first position, it saw a drop (-1.8 points) as the only faculty of this group. The other two faculties of natural sciences show essentially an identical level with FMFI UK for the last year, the difference between the extreme values being only 1 point. For the third year in a row, PriF UPJŠ has been showing increasing performance, reporting a growth by 8.7 points for the last year and taking the second position ahead of PriF UK.

Faculties of natural sciences focusing on teaching continue to significantly lag behind those focusing on research as reflected by the indicators. All of them, however, saw increases in these indicators for the last year in the range from 5.2 points (UMB Faculty of Natural Sciences) to 1.8 points (UCM Faculty of Natural Sciences). They are lagging behind particularly in the area of publications and citations.

4.9 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the MED group

	MED	Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)	Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)	Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)	PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)	Grants (VV7 – VV10)	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING	
=	1.	Comenius University	74	87	69	44	43	63.3	1	1	1
=	2.	Pavol Jozef Šafárik University	67	63	45	48	79	60.4	2	2	3
=	3.	Trnava University	65	39	46	68	18	47.1	3	3	2
=	4.	Constantine the Philosopher University	44	49	11	74	9	37.5	5	5	5
=	5.	Catholic University	57	49	0	*	12	23.6	7	7	n.a.
=	6.	University of Prešov	31	58	5	*	1	18.7	6	6	6

		St. Elizabeth University	48	62	45	44	40	47.6	4	4	4
--	--	--------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	-------------	----------	----------	----------

	MED		Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)	Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)	Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)	PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)	Grants (VV7 – VV10)	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING	
=	1.	Jessenius Faculty of Medicine	Comenius University	77	79	73	61	44	66.8	1	1	1
↑	2.	Faculty of Pharmacy	Comenius University	61	91	85	25	47	61.8	3	2	2
↑	3.	Faculty of Medicine	Comenius University	83	91	50	47	37	61.5	4	3	4
↓	4.	Faculty of Medicine	Pavol Jozef Šafárik University	67	63	45	48	79	60.4	2	4	5
=	5.	Faculty of Healthcare and Social Work	Trnava University	65	39	46	68	18	47.1	5	5	3
=	6.	Faculty of Social Sciences and Healthcare	Constantine the Philosopher University	44	49	11	74	9	37.5	7	7	7
↑	7.	Faculty of Healthcare	Catholic University	57	49	0	*	12	23.6	9	9	n.a.

↓	8.	Faculty of Healthcare	University of Prešov	31	58	5	*	1	18.7	8	8	8
---	----	-----------------------	----------------------	----	----	---	---	---	------	---	---	---

		St. Elizabeth University	St. Elizabeth University	48	62	45	44	40	47.6	6	6	6
--	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	------	---	---	---

* - The university or faculty does not offer PhD courses

According to results achieved in science and education for the last year, this group of faculties is characterised by a clear division into two subgroups. Faculties of medicine and the Faculty of Pharmacy (“FaF UK”) benefit from high production in science and research, the number of publications, citations, and a favourable basis for new scientific research potential. The first place in the group under assessment has been kept by Comenius University’s Jessenius Faculty of Medicine (“JLF UK”) owing to a balanced growth of indicators in the field of education, publication activity, and PhD studies. However, the most marked increase of indicators for the last year was shown by Comenius University’s Faculty of Medicine (“LF UK”, 11.2 points). Only the Faculty of Medicine of Pavol Jozef Šafárik University (“LF UPJŠ”) suffered a drop in its indicators (-0.6 point) moving to the last position in this subgroup as a result.

Faculties of medicine are characterised by high numbers of foreign students – about 20 – 24% of the total number of students.

In PhD studies, FaF UK ranks last in this group of four faculties with an average of 25 points which is 16 points higher than in the last year.

LF UPJŠ surprised by a high success rate in grants claiming the first place with 79 points versus the first three leaders having maximums of 47 (FaF UK), 44 (JLF UK), and 37 (LF UK).

Faculties with a healthcare, nursing, and social focus have been characterised by high numbers of students per teacher. In spite of that, all of them, except the Faculty of Health and Social Work of the Trnava University in Trnava (-1.3 points), saw an increase in their quality of up to +8.9 points (Catholic University’s Faculty of Health).

Studying healthcare disciplines continues to evoke questions as to whether the qualification growth is adequate to the position of the graduates in the practice and whether this might involve mostly existing healthcare workers obtaining additional qualifications. Changes in the area concerned are based on new requirements placed on regulated professions and, at the same time, on the demand from prospective students. Career prospects in Slovak healthcare and assisting professions could be the subject of special studies.

4.10 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the TECH group

		TECH	Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)	Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)	Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)	PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)	Grants (VV7 – VV10)	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING
=	1.	Slovak University of Technology	65	61	34	51	41	50.5	1	1	1
↑	2.	University of Žilina	62	58	9	66	42	47.6	3	4	3
↑	3.	Slovak University of Agriculture	59	57	23	62	20	44.1	4	2	5
↓	4.	Technical University of Košice	61	49	16	47	26	39.6	2	3	2
=	5.	Technical University in Zvolen	70	46	1	50	18	36.8	5	5	4
=	6.	Alexander Dubček University in Trenčín	48	40	17	49	9	32.7	6	6	6

		TECH		Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)	Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)	Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)	PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)	Grants (VV7 – VV10)	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING
=	1.	Faculty of Chemical and Food Technology	Slovak University of Technology	99	55	100	74	90	83.4	1	1	1
↑	2.	Faculty of Mechanical Engineering	University of Žilina	82	48	10	83	90	62.5	4	3	3
=	3.	Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Informatics	Slovak University of Technology	77	50	40	48	61	55.3	3	2	2
↑	4.	Faculty of Metallurgy	Technical University of Košice	91	49	28	75	16	51.9	5	7	6
↑	5.	Faculty of Industrial Technologies	Alexander Dubček University in Trenčín	54	36	46	91	22	50.0	6	10	8
↓	6.	Faculty of Civil Engineering	Slovak University of Technology	61	65	29	47	37	47.7	2	4	9

↑	7.	Faculty of Electrical Engineering	University of Žilina	69	54	15	63	33	46.5	13	17	15
↑	8.	Faculty of Civil Engineering	University of Žilina	53	60	2	58	59	46.3	19	21	11
↓	9.	Faculty of Mechanical Engineering	Slovak University of Technology	66	69	15	43	36	45.8	8	5	4
=	10.	Faculty of Management Science & Informatics	University of Žilina	59	58	20	67	25	45.7	10	20	18
=	11.	Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Informatics	Technical University of Košice	64	40	23	55	43	45.0	11	13	10
↑	12.	Faculty of Engineering	Slovak University of Agriculture	59	57	23	62	20	44.1	16	14	19
↓	13.	Faculty of Architecture	Slovak University of Technology	59	72	0	64	17	42.5	12	11	7
=	14.	Faculty of Civil Engineering	Technical University of Košice	58	60	22	46	25	42.2	14	8	12
↑	15.	Faculty of Informatics and Information Technologies	Slovak University of Technology	42	57	36	37	32	40.9	20	6	n.a.
↓	16.	Faculty of Mechanical Engineering	Technical University of Košice	54	46	8	51	44	40.5	9	12	13
↓	17.	Faculty of Mining, Ecology, Process Control and Geotechnology	Technical University of Košice	57	54	17	45	22	39.1	7	9	5
=	18.	Faculty of Material Sciences and Technology	Slovak University of Technology	52	58	19	44	16	37.8	18	16	16
↑	19.	Faculty of Special Engineering	University of Žilina	50	71	0	60	5	37.2	21	18	20
↓	20.	Faculty of Environmental and Manufacturing Technology	Technical University in Zvolen	70	46	1	50	18	36.8	17	19	17
↓	21.	Faculty of Manufacturing Technologies	Technical University of Košice	58	47	4	49	19	35.5	15	15	14
=	22.	Faculty of Special Technology	Alexander Dubček University in Trenčín	43	34	1	47	3	25.4	22	23	21
=	23.	Faculty of Aeronautics	Technical University of Košice	44	45	9	8	10	23.3	23	24	n.a.
=	24.	Faculty of Mechatronics	Alexander Dubček University in	47	50	5	9	2	22.8	24	22	22

			Trenčín									
--	--	--	---------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Faculties of technology represent the most numerous group in the annual assessment. However, their subject fields overlap with other fields of science and research and suggest potential positive development of certain faculties that are of interdisciplinary nature and can prosper in the present European scientific and research space with continuous transfers to the area of education.

The Faculty of Chemical and Food Technology, Slovak University of Technology in Bratislava ("FCHPT STU") has been a leader in the long term and with its positive shift by 6.3 points on average it has further strengthened its position. Further ranking of the faculties changed relatively significantly versus the last year with a total of 15 faculties changing their position, although this is particularly due to the small differences in the assessment of 18 faculties (i.e., except for the first and last three). This conclusion is not applicable to the Žilina University's Faculty of Civil Engineering ("SvF ŽU", +12.7 points, which is the second largest positive shift in the assessment of all faculties of all groups after FTVŠ UK) and the Žilina University's Faculty of Mechanical Engineering ("SjF ŽU", +11.0 points). While the first one improved its position in the group by 13 places and outperformed the Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Informatics of the Slovak Technical University in Bratislava (FEI STU) in the previously safely held second position, the second one moved two ranks up. Somewhat lower year-on-year positive shift was seen by another faculty of the Žilina University – the Faculty of Special Engineering (FŠI ŽU, +9.2 points).

Its result for the last year has been a continuation of the positive development of the Žilina University for the third year in a row. The positive development at this University has been seen primarily in the quality of the teachers, greater interest in study expressed in the higher ratio of registered students to admitted students, but also in the increasing number of publications, growing proportion of PhD students and PhD course graduates, but **particularly in the significant increase of these faculties' success rate in grant schemes**. In grant scheme success rate indicators, these two faculties caught up with or even outperformed the previously dominating FCHPT STU.

An negative year-on-year shift was seen primarily by three faculties of the Technical University in Košice (TUKE) with its Faculty of Mechanical Engineering ("SjF TUKE") losing 1.5 points year-on-year, the Faculty of Manufacturing Technologies ("FVT TUKE") losing 2.0 points, and the Faculty of Mining, Ecology, Process Control and Geotechnology ("FBERG TUKE") losing 5.6 points – a record in the group. On year-on-year average, TUKE thus lost 0.1 points and slowed down the already weak grow. Of other faculties in the group, positive development has been seen for the Faculty of Metallurgy of the Technical University in Košice ("HF TUKE"), which kept the fourth place, but also for the Faculty of Industrial Technologies, Trenčín University of Alexander Dubček ("FPT TUAD").

The faculties show solid results in the field of PhD studies, science, and research. FCHPT STU is again the best in generating publications and their listing in the WoK (the VV1 indicator) with an index of 100 (it is thus the most successful one in all indicators of scientific production) followed by FEI STU, FPT TUAD, and the STU Faculty of Informatics and Information Technologies ("FIIT STU"). Likewise, the leader in citation success indicators is FCHPT STU but further ranking is slightly modified: the second place has been taken by the Slovak University of Agriculture's Faculty of Engineering ("TF SPU") followed by the Slovak University of Technology's Faculty of Civil Engineering ("SvF STU") and FPT TUAD in the fourth place.

4.11 Universities, higher education institutions and faculties of the AGRO group

		AGRO	Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)	Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)	Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)	PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)	Grants (VV7 – VV10)	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING
=	1.	University of Veterinary Medicine	91	93	82	56	63	76.9	1	1	1
=	2.	Technical University in Zvolen	77	70	48	61	53	61.8	2	2	2
=	3.	Slovak University of Agriculture	68	61	34	75	33	54.2	3	3	3

		AGRO		Students and Teachers (SV1 – SV4)	Applications for Study (SV6 – 8)	Publications and Citations (VV1 – VV2a)	PhD Studies (VV4a – VV6)	Grants (VV7 – VV10)	2010 AVERAGE	2009 RANKING	2008 RANKING	2007 RANKING
=	1.	University of Veterinary Medicine	University of Veterinary Medicine	91	93	82	56	63	76.9	1	1	1
=	2.	Faculty of Forestry	Technical University in Zvolen	88	48	76	61	81	70.9	2	2	3
↑	3.	Faculty of Biotechnology and Food Sciences	Slovak University of Agriculture	73	58	60	68	47	61.3	4	3	2
↑	4.	Faculty of Wood Sciences and Technology	Technical University in Zvolen	66	91	19	62	25	52.8	5	5	5
↓	4.	Faculty of Agrobiography and Food Resources	Slovak University of Agriculture	70	55	34	79	26	52.8	3	4	4
=	6.	Faculty of Horticulture and Landscape	Slovak University of	62	71	6	78	27	48.7	6	6	6

		Engineering	Agriculture									
--	--	-------------	-------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

The ranking of institutions and faculties in the AGRO group, which includes the fields of veterinary medicine, agriculture, food industry, forestry, and wood technology, remains unchanged but the differences between faculties changed with four of six faculties in the group improving their averages and two changing negatively. Traditionally, the first place has been kept by the University of Veterinary Medicine in Košice (“UVL”) but this institution represents one of the unpleasant surprises of the last year, as it saw the greatest drop in point score (-6.2) of all higher education institutions in the assessment and the trend of its indicators has been declining for several years. The decline in indicators was seen primarily in the area of education, including PhD studies, but also in the field of research where the success rate in obtaining funds for research from domestic as well as foreign sources dropped significantly.

The Zvolen University of Technology’s Faculty of Forestry (“LF TUZVO”) is second keeping its position that it has occupied for three consecutive years but its gain of +4.4 points significantly closed the gap on UVL. In the amount of grant funds and total grant funds per creative worker it even outperformed UVL (with an average of 81 in the VV7 – VV10 indicators versus an average of 63 for UVL). It is achieving excellent results confirming the second place ranking thanks to the ratio of students to professors and citation indexes as well as the number of publications. The defended second place in grant activity confirms stable performance in foreign and domestic grants.

Faculty of Biotechnology and Food Sciences, Slovak University of Agriculture (“FBP SPU”) stays third (a positive shift by +5.1 points). Averages of all indicators confirm balanced outputs in all areas – science, research and education alike.

The Zvolen University of Technology’s Faculty of Wood Sciences and Technology (“DF TUZVO”) improved its standing in the ranking of AGRO faculties by several tenths of a point and moved to the fourth place from the last year’s fifth thanks to a high average in the SV6 – 8 indicators, indicating great interest among students in studying at this faculty, and thanks to the second highest number of foreign students in the given category of study programmes (average gain of +5.9 points, which is the highest positive shift among the faculties in the group).

The last places are held by two faculties of the Slovak University of Agriculture in Nitra. Although the number of their PhD students confirms the improving trend, they continue to have poor results in publications and citations and, not surprisingly, also in the ability to obtain extrabudgetary funds for science and research. The Faculty of Agrobiological and Food Resources, Slovak University of Agriculture (“FAPZ SPU”) suffered a year-on-year drop by 0.7 points and fell by one position in the ranking. Considering the results of other faculties of the Slovak University of Agriculture in technical and economic fields it is justified to ask to what an extent the atomisation of the University and creating new faculties helped maintain a solid position of the institution faced with an increasing pressure on the quality of science and research.