

## Reviewer's Report

### Public Education Development Research Program Evaluation of the Final Report for the 2021–2025 Funding Period

Research Group Name	MTA–AVKF Research Group
Research Group Leader	Éva Gyarmathy
Score (publication performance)*	0
Overall Assessment (underline as appropriate)	<b>excellent / satisfactory / <u>unsatisfactory</u></b>
Research Group Website	<b>excellent / <u>acceptable</u> / inadequate or unavailable</b>

---

#### 1) Scientific Quality of Professional Results

**How novel and scientifically grounded are the outcomes?**

**Score (1–5): 3**

**Justification (500 characters):**

In the previous research report, the progress of the project was easy to follow, including the substantial work of integrating the Sakkpalota program as a control group into the design. By the time of the final report, results from the large-scale project had been produced. The current report shows that the Research Group completed all planned tasks, including those added during the expansion. However, when presenting the entire research—from aims through design to results—it would have been advisable to align more closely with disciplinary standards and publication conventions, so that the professional picture is easily comprehensible (e.g., no concise summary of the design; no quantitative or qualitative criteria defining minimum program implementation; figures and tables lack the usual precise explanations; some results are interpreted as hypothesis confirmation). The report reflects little on the fact that there were no clear expectations or minimum criteria for program implementation (e.g., required amount or type of practice or tools integrated into lessons).

---

#### 2) Publication Performance and Scientific Impact

**Evaluate the quantity and quality of publications (D1, Q1–Q4 articles, peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, books).**

**Score (1–5): 1**

**Justification (500 characters):**

At present, there is no publication that meets the required criteria (field and ranking).

---

### **3) Quality and Usability of Public Education Materials**

**Novelty, usability, and potential for integration into pedagogical practice of the materials, tools, and methods developed for public education.**

**Score (1–5): 3**

**Justification (500 characters):**

The Research Group created a complex system. The professional reasoning behind the selected areas/functions and tasks is less clearly articulated in the report. However, because many areas/functions were included, there was an opportunity to empirically determine the predictive value of each function for school success. Since the developed system could not be integrated into everyday teaching processes in the participating schools, its use appears rather ad hoc. Therefore, the potential for practical integration remains uncertain. The program may need to ensure more structured implementation in the future (as the established Sakkpalota program does), and/or incentives may be required. The extensive experience accumulated over four years may support this development.

---

### **4) Dissemination**

**Evaluate the group's professional outreach (workshops, conferences, teacher training, professional forums, scientific conferences).**

**Score (1–5): 5**

**Justification (500 characters):**

Although only one self-organized event was listed, the Research Group carried out dissemination activities with high intensity, including participation in scientific conferences and a wide range of public outreach efforts.

---

### **5) Contribution to the Development of the Professional–Scientific Community**

**To what extent did the group support the development of the professional/scientific community (supporting young researchers, completed doctoral dissertations, involved students, collaborating practicing teachers)?**

**Score (1–5): 5**

**Justification (500 characters):**

Three doctoral dissertations, several TDK papers, and numerous theses indicate that the Research Group performed excellent work with young researchers and students interested in research.

---

### **6) Overall Evaluation**

**What is your overall impression of the research group's performance and the final report?**

**Score (1–5): 3**

**Justification (500 characters):**

The Research Group completed the work it had planned. At one point, it expanded the original design by adding a new control group. It created a complex system intended to support the development of learning environments to enhance children's school success. However, the report raises methodological and interpretive questions. If the developmental program could not be implemented in public education settings as intended, or if it was less structured than the new control group (Sakkpalota), this should be more clearly reflected in the description and interpretation of the research. Reading only the final report leaves several questions open in this regard.

---

**Note: \* Publication Performance Score**

Publication score: **0**

- D1 = 100 points
- Q1 = 50 points
- Q2 = 40 points
- Q3 = 20 points
- Q4 = 10 points

This section should include the point value of Scopus-indexed publications produced during the four-year period.

For publications submitted jointly by two research groups, points should be divided 50–50%.