

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; Mgr. Vojtěch Tomášek; PhDr. Sandra Štollová, Ph.D.; Prof. Martin Weiter

Absent: Prof. dr. hab. Ewa Joanna Bulska; Doc. Robert Antonín; Prof. Tomáš Kašpárek; Prof. Paul Lunn; doc. Pavlína Adam

Recording of the meeting available at:

<https://uschovna.msmt.cz/index.php/s/952Em5V9Tx8RuaE>

Self-evaluation and Evaluation Reports are available at:

<https://uschovna.msmt.cz/index.php/s/3tRGeharjuz6Mjn>

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
- 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 in total 24 complete Evaluation Reports (part of these in form of drafts part was already officially submitted). Following the submission of reports MEYS will offer a consultation to the rectors prior to the submission of their statement to the IEP Evaluation reports.

Deadline for submission of Evaluation Reports is set on 31. October 2025.

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*).

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* (16%) are less frequent, and ratings 2 – *Below average* (3%) and 1 – *Inadequate* (0,9%) 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 3,52). 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).

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.

Points for Further Analysis

Based on the above-mentioned analyses several HEIs were flagged where potential problems with assessment might have occurred. For better orientation we divided the HEIs by the segments of the research focus or type:

Private HEIs

MEYS identified two private HEIs with major issues.

The Anglo-American University

Evaluation on all level show almost non-existent results of research. MEYS is considering discontinuing the evaluation of this institution. It would be beneficial if the EAC double checked the MEYS' findings a formulated statement on the matter. Issue will be discussed on the next meeting.

PanEuropean University

Evidence of serious misconduct were identified. In the very least evaluation was based on incorrect or misleading information. Numerous individuals listed in M3 are not in fact affiliated to the PEUNI. Significant proportion of the projects and outcomes presented in the SER were obtained by questionable circumstances through the funding organization controlled by PEUNI employees (this was supported by prof. Hančil who is familiar with issue due to his activities in the Accreditation Bureau). Due to the conflict of interest, the IEP of PEUNI was strictly speaking dysfunctional. For further details please see case study of PEUNI and AMBIS in the document *Analysis of Trends in HEI Evaluation 2025*.

MEYS is considering further steps in this case. It would be beneficial if the EAC double checked the MEYS' findings a formulated statement on the matter. Issue will be discussed on the next meeting.

Agriculture and veterinary HEIs

Two issues of possible the significant over-grading were identified. (University of Veterinary Sciences Brno - VETUNI and Mendel University in Brno - MENDELU). MEYS would suggest closer examination or cross comparison of these HEIs against the top performing Agriculture and veterinary HEIs the Czech University of Life Sciences Prague (ČZU) by EAC.

Since doc. Adam is affiliated to the MENDELU MEYS will discuss the process with another EAC expert in the field prof. Lunn.

Multidisciplinary HEIs

One issue of possible significant over-grading was identified in case of University of Ostrava (OU). MEYS would suggest closer examination or cross comparison with similar size and regionally oriented HEIs. For this comparison either University of West Bohemia (ZČU) as closer by size and grading on the national level or University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice (JČU) as and etalon of quality in the category comparable to OU.

Since the OU is a multidisciplinary HEI closer analysis should be divided among EAC members.

Technical HEIs

One issue of possible significant over-grading was identified in case of Brno University of Technology (VUT). However, while over-grading seems significant it has little impact on overall grad of the VUT and is consistent with upward trajectory of VUT in national evaluation.

Non-university HEIs

In case of Institute of Technology and Business in České Budějovice (VŠTE) the significant upgrade in all units and modules warrant the closer examination of the evaluation. This upgrade doesn't corresponds with results in M1-2 which should be in this case taken even more seriously since, there are doubts about the evidence value of the results of M1-2 due to doubts about the ethical conduct of certain authors.

MEYS would suggest closer examination or cross comparison with The College of Polytechnics Jihlava (VŠPJ) and once available the Technical University of Liberec (TUL).

General discussion

Following the suggestion of prof. Křišťoufek, MEYS will specify on the next meeting the depth of the analysis necessary for the evaluation process and its communication strategy towards the HEI community.

Next meetings

Before the 10 November meeting MEYS will provide EAC with analyses consisting of the complete data for all 33 HEI (which will be available after 31. October).

MEYS would like to organise one additional meeting at the end of November (week 24-28. November) and one in early December (week 8.-12. December). Please let us know your availability via doodle polls:

November: <https://doodle.com/group-poll/participate/b8Yr96rd>

December: <https://doodle.com/group-poll/participate/e50orRKd>

2. Conclusions

MEYS would like to ask EAC members to familiarize themselves with the provided materials before the next meeting. MEYS will provide EAC with example of cross comparison suggested above for chosen public HEIs as template for further case by case analyses. Modification of the model cross comparison and division of task among EAC will be discussed during the 10 November 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:
2025.11.04
10:36:04 +01'00'