

Minutes of the online meeting of the Expert Advisory Committee of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports for the Evaluation of Higher Education Institutions in 2025 – 27 October 2025

Present: Johan A Haarberg; Prof. Giuseppe Ciccarone; Prof. Stefan Michael Newerkla; Prof. Luděk Bláha; Mgr. Vojtěch Fikar; Prof. Ladislav Křišťoufek; PhDr. Sandra Štollová, Ph.D.; Prof. Martin Weiter; Prof. dr. hab. Ewa Joanna Bulska; Doc. Robert Antonín; Prof. Tomáš Kašpárek; Prof. Paul Lunn

Absent: doc. Pavlína Adam; Mgr. Vojtěch Tomášek

Recording of the meeting available at:

<https://uschovna.msmt.cz/index.php/s/4vXh7GqGc8Vw901>

Password for shared folder: Evaluation2025

1. Opening of the meeting

On behalf of the chair Mgr. Vojtěch Tomášek (Chairperson), the meeting of the Expert Advisory Committee (hereinafter referred to as "EAC") of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (hereinafter referred to as "MEYS") for the Evaluation of Higher Education Institutions in 2025 was chaired by the representatives of the Research Organization Evaluation Team PhDr. Sandra Štollová, Ph.D. and Mgr. Vojtěch Fikar.

A quorum of the EAC was present at the meeting.

Agenda:

- The current progress of the evaluation
- Analysis of Trends in HEI Evaluation
- Workflow and Tasks of EAC
- Upcoming meetings

Discussion

The current progress of the evaluation

The EAC was informed of the current state of the evaluation process. Prior the EAC meeting MEYS has received all 33 Evaluation Reports. Following the submission of reports and the check of formal correctness MEYS asked rectors to provide their statement on the IEP evaluation.

Analysis of Trends in HEI Evaluation

MEYS has prepared three types of analyses, which indicates possible issues in evaluation of International Evaluation Panels (IEPs):

- Relation between results of M1-2 and M3-5
- Comparison of 2020 vs 2025 Results
- Analysis of the IEP Rating Trends

During the meeting methodology of these analyses were presented as well as the results (for details please see document *Analysis of Trends in HEI Evaluation 2025*). Results of analyses remains virtually unchanged with several more HEIs where possible problems in evaluation process might have occurred.

Analysis of the IEP Rating Trends

The analysis of general rating trends shows that panels tend to use only the upper half of the evaluation scale. Ratings 5 – *Outstanding* (33%) and 4 – *Very good* (46%) dominate. Ratings 3 – *Average* (17%) are less frequent, and ratings 2 – *Below average* (3%) and 1 – *Inadequate* (0,8%) are extremely rare. This trend seems to be consistent across all size and time of the HEI with exception of the small size HEI (average grade for all modules is 3,51). However, there is disproportionate number of D rated HEIs among small size institutions and lower ratings would be expected.

Relation between results of M1-2 and M3-5

The aim of the comparison is to illustrate the relationship between the evaluation of the quality of selected results (M1) and the publication performance of higher education institutions (HEIs) (M2), as assessed by the Research, Development and Innovation Council, and the evaluation of social relevance (M3), viability (M4), and research strategy and concept (M5).

HEIs significantly deviating from the trend line:

- Anglo-American University (AAVŠ)
- Paneuropean University (PEUNI)
- University of Veterinary Sciences Brno (VETUNI)
- Mendel University in Brno (MENDELU)
- Brno University of Technology (VUT)
- The Academy of Fine Arts in Prague (AVU)
- Tomas Bata University in Zlín (UTB)
- Silesian University in Opava (SLU)

Comparison of 2020 vs 2025 Results

Analysis simply compares grades awarded to the individual unit, and modules 3-5 between 2020 and 2025. A one-grade difference is not considered problematic and may indicate partial improvement or decline. Focus was placed on the cases of two-grade differences and/or multiple one grade improvements across units and modules.

Following the discussion prof. Ciccarone suggested additional analysis especially in the cases which were identified for further attention. Since grades 5 – *Outstanding* and 4 – *Very good* were used almost exclusively the analysis will focus on the distribution of these top grades. Inclination towards dominant 5 – *Outstanding* rating could indicate over rating. Analysis will be prepared by MEYS.

HEIs with significant up grading:

- University of Ostrava (OU)
- Brno University of Technology (VUT)
- University of Veterinary Sciences Brno (VETUNI)
- Mendel University in Brno (MENDELU)
- Institute of Technology and Business in České Budějovice (VŠTE)
- Technical University of Liberec (TUL)
- Tomas Bata University in Zlín (UTB)

Workflow and Tasks of EAC

MEYS following the from 27 October, MEYS prepared model case study for University of Veterinary Sciences Brno (VETUNI) and Czech University of Life Sciences (ČZU) as a basis for EAC decision making and proposed that the EAC members with appropriate FORD specialization check the MEYS findings and formulate appropriate statements on the case-by-case basis.

Proposed approaches were refused by EAC members based on the argument that without being the direct part of the evaluation IEP in these cases EAC cannot know the exact reasoning behind awarded grades and therefore, cannot make any conclusion about the balance of evaluation in the specific cases.

EAC member instead propose formulation of the statement on the overall state of the evaluation process pointing out that there are outliers based on the available data, however, identifying the specific causes is not possible. Statement going to point out main trends and will be formulated as a recommendation for further development of the evaluation process.

Private HEIs

Following the findings of MEYS regarding The Anglo-American University and Paneuropean University MEYS would like to EAC members to express their opinion in form of recommending statement. The proposal of statement will be sent by MEYS into per rollam vote.

Proposed recommendary statements:

The Anglo-American University

The evaluation of Anglo-American University (AAVŠ) reveals systemic underperformance and lack of basic research activity. Its negligible research productivity, lack out outcomes with social impact are raising questions about its very qualification as a research organization. Even in comparison to other institutions awarded the lowest grade D the performance is significantly below expectations. From the perspective of research performance, this HEI appears to be unassessable, therefore, MEYS proposes excluding AAVŠ from the evaluation as a low-quality HEI. Based on the provided data Expert Advisory Committee support the MEYS findings and recommendation of MEYS to take appropriate steps for keeping the integrity of evaluation process.

Paneuropean University

Although the PEUNI SER indicates that, a) PEUNI contributes insufficiently to research progress, b) its peer-reviewed data are minimal or negligible (D-grade in modules 1 and 2), c) PEUNI lacks institutional mechanisms for grant schemes, research & data management, and for supporting excellence and young researchers, the IEP rated PEUNI in most cases with top rating 5 – Outstanding resulting in overall grade of B. The case of Pan-European University (PEUNI) presents not only academic *underperformance* but also serious *concerns regarding integrity, data reliability, and potential misconduct* in the evaluation process including the *conflict of interest* in the International Evaluation Panel and unclear self-financing structure. EAC supports MEYS opinion that there is reasonable suspicion of an uncritical external evaluation by the IEP, which accepted PEUNI's self-reported claims without verification or supporting evidence, raising further doubts about the integrity of the evaluation outcome. Therefore, MEYS propose to exclude PEUNI from the evaluation process. Based on the provided data Expert Advisory Committee support the MEYS findings and recommendation of MEYS to take appropriate steps for keeping the integrity of evaluation process.

Upcoming meetings

According to the Doodle pol the next November meeting is set on Wednesday 26 November 17:00 CET and December meeting on Monday 8 December 17:00 CET. Calendar invites for the online meeting via MS Teams will be sent to EAC members in following days.

2. Conclusions

Following the outcomes of EAC discussion MEYS will formulate model statement regarding the evaluation process. EAC statement shall be discusses in detail during the next EAC meeting.

3. Voting

No new agenda items were submitted for voting during the meeting.

Prepared by: Mgr. Vojtěch Fikar

Approved by: Mgr. Vojtěch Tomášek

Mgr.
Vojtěch
Tomášek

Digitálně
podepsal Mgr.
Vojtěch Tomášek
Datum:
2025.11.18
08:56:40 +01'00'