



Úřad vlády
České republiky

Rada pro výzkum, vývoj a inovace

**Metodika
hodnocení výzkumných organizací
List VO**

Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci

SOUHRNNÁ ZPRÁVA PRO VÝZKUMNOU ORGANIZACI
Agregace kompletního hodnocení v Modulech 1-5

VŠ	Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci	H24
		Avš
Oborové¹ kapacity cca +5 %	1.3 Physical sciences 1.4 Chemical sciences 1.6 Biological sciences 3.1 Basic medicine 3.2 Clinical medicine 3.3 Health sciences 5.1 Psychology and cognitive sciences 5.3 Education 5.5 Law 6.2 Languages and Literature	
Modul 1 a Modul 2	<p>Známka: diferencováno dle OP1–6 (FORD 1–6)</p> <p>OP1 – cca 26 % oborových kapacit instituce, dominantně obor Biologie. V Modulu 2 vysoká produktivita v oborech Informatika, ale i Fyzika a Chemie. Produktivita v biologii je na úrovni národního průměru. Souhrnně za panel je produktivita v přírodních vědách nadprůměrná. V matematice je vysoký podíl výstupů v Q4. Naopak ve fyzice a chemii jsou v Q1 vysoce nad úrovní ČR i EU. Podíl reprint autorů ve všech oborech pod úrovní ČR. Z pohledu Modulu 1 setrvale průměrný profil, kdy počet hodnocení stupni 1-2 a 3-5 je stejný. Celkově za panel A-, s doporučením zlepšit výběr výsledků do Modulu 1.</p> <p>OP2 – cca 3 % oborových kapacit instituce. V Modulu 1 kumulativně převládá hodnocení stupněm 2, výsledky jsou většinou přihlašovány v kritériu Přínos k poznání, hlavně v oboru Nano-technology. V Modulu 2 dominuje obor Materials engineering a Nano-technology, kde je ale méně článků. V Materials engineering jsou v Q1 nad úrovní EU. Za panel hodnocení A.</p> <p>OP3 – cca 26 % oborových kapacit instituce. V Modulu 1 přihlášeno velké množství výsledků, orientačně průměrná známka 2,6. V Modulu 2 jsou zastoupeny všechny obory, v oboru Clinical medicine podíl D1 i Q1 pod národním průměrem, oproti loňskému roku panel detekuje mírné zhoršení. Podíl reprint autorů těsně pod národním průměrem. Celkově za panel A-.</p> <p>OP4 – cca 1 % oborových kapacit instituce. Kumulativně velmi málo výsledků předložených do Modulu 1 (cca 1 ročně), hodnocení stupni 1 až 3 s dominancí hodnocení stupněm 2. V Modulu 2 je evidováno mezi</p>	

¹ dle Portfolia zasláného vysokou školou na základě požadavku RVVI 2022-2023, resp. dle údajů RIV in Modul 2 (Report II. - oborové kapacity a produktivita autorů a autorek podle údajů v RIV). Z důvodu odlišné metodologie součet nemusí činit 100 %.

30-50 výstupy ročně. Produktivita D1/Q1 je zhruba na úrovni ČR. Hlavní podíl na výstupech má Přírodovědecká fakulta. Celkově za panel A-

OP5 – cca 25 % oborových kapacit instituce. Do Modulu 1 přihlášeno kumulativně 167 výsledků, převládá hodnocení stupněm 3 a 1 a kritérium přínos k poznání. Nejvíce výsledků v oboru Law, kde dominuje hodnocení stupni 2 a 3. V oboru Education převažuje hodnocení stupni 3 a 4, v oboru Psychology and cognitive sciences dominuje hodnocení stupněm 3 a v Political sciences převládá hodnocení stupněm 2. Za Modul 1 panel hodnotí B+. Modul 2 v oborech Psychology and cognitive sciences a Social and economic geography zastoupení v Q1 lehce nižší než národní průměr. Produktivita ovšem v sociálních vědách převážně nízká. Celkově za panel B.

OP6 – cca 20 % oborových kapacit instituce. Vzhledem ke sporné vypovídací hodnotě bibliometrie uvnitř jednotlivých humanitních oborů (např. archeologie x historie) se panel soustředil na Modul 1. V Modulu 1 kumulativně jasně převažují hodnocení stupni 1 až 3, dominuje hodnocení stupněm 2. Nejlepší jsou Filozofická fakulta a Cyrilometodějská teologická fakulta. Za panel A.

Modul 3

Známka: A – Vynikající

Summary IEP (MEP)²: The social relevance of each unit has been evaluated by considering its size and typology of research (FORD), as well as other factors such as infrastructures and historical background. Palacký University (UPOL) is a comprehensive research and educational institution with large units such as FS, FA, FMD and FE, smaller ones such as CMFT, FL and FPC, and more recent ones such as FHS (still lacking its own facilities) and the research institute CATRIN (created in 2021). The IEP has found that all units have a strong commitment to the social relevance of their research activities in agreement with their vision and mission, albeit with different kinds of quantitative impact on society due to their research field and actual potential with respect to human and financial resources.

The recognition by the research community at the national level is excellent for all units but still needs to be improved at the European and international level for many of them. All units have demonstrated their ability to attract international lecturers, mainly from European universities, but also from USA and Asia. However, this has not been translated to identified partnerships in many units.

Research projects are mainly supported by public funds and, even in fields such as health and natural sciences, contract research with private companies appears limited to services. All units have been able to get financial support from national calls issued by the state (Ministries, Agencies, Academy of Science, ...) and research teams in several units have been highly successful in competitive European grants applications. Many examples of impact on society are given in the SER for all units. This is a clearly a strength of UPOL which can manage an equilibrium between basic and applied research, depending on the field of research. This is particularly important with respect to the objectives

² International Evaluation Panel / Mezinárodní evaluační panel

of national or European calls. As expected, transfer of results into practice takes various forms depending on the field of study. All units have shown very good examples of transfer, such as devices to improve the quality of life (culture, law, health, sports, ...) and/or to introduce interesting innovations in the socio-economic sector. UPOL should continue to pay attention to transfer conditions (IP, Patents, licenses) and, in some fields, may be more active in spin-off development.

Popularisation of VAVAI is considered as important by all units and university-wide initiatives are followed year after year. Some specific actions are taken by most units to integrate themes of interest to their field. More visibility of UPOL may be reached if participation at national, or even international, events (as shown by some units) is encouraged in the future.

Overall, recommendations made in the 2020 evaluation have been carefully followed. If some are still pending, this is not due to a lack of consideration but to the need to sustain a continuous effort in some domains.

Známka: A – Vynikající

Summary IEP (MEP): Palacký University has progressed during the reference period (2019–2023) and several more recent developments, already in the SER or disclosed during the site visit, indicate that this momentum is likely to continue in the future. This progress has been observed in many important areas that contribute to the sustainability of the institution.

Financial resources for research rely mainly on national and European public funding. The significant successes achieved during this period have made it possible to increase the human resources dedicated to research and to consolidate the infrastructure at a very high level. The university has set up, many years ago, a service and network that has proven to be effective. This is also true for transfer of knowledge and technology. Attempts to help young researchers to successfully apply to competitive European calls is also a noticeable initiative. Broadening the spectrum of disciplines that could be successful in European calls for projects is a challenge for the future. This may be possible with more tight partnerships, as well as mobilities, which may partly benefit from the Aurora Alliance membership.

However, the Sustainability Plan established in 2022, appropriately, goes much further by taking into account various elements such as management, knowledge transfer, ethics, etc. A large panel of systems, codes and rules have been established or extensively revamped during the period, in agreement with European standards.

The quality control system is based on the internal web-based application ISHAP, which is, and will be, the subject of continuous discussions on its development, particularly as the university has signed the European Agreement for Reforming Research Assessment and wishes to promote open science. This is not unusual in a comprehensive university gathering many fields. The same difficulty to find a good equilibrium holds for the splitting of LCDRO between faculties and CATRIN but the university has moved toward a more flexible strategy with the implementation of some modules targeting specific subjects.

These excellent results were achieved in an academic context resembling, more or less, a federation of faculties, which are themselves

Modul 4

divided into multiple departments. The organisation of research appears to be highly diverse in terms of structures (institutes, centres, laboratories, departments, etc.), resulting in a low visibility for certain fields, which may hinder their international outreach (On the other hand, this organisation has not impaired interdisciplinarity at the university level, even if it could be further strengthened). The organisation of PhD studies, under new national rules, remains also very scattered. Even if the professional insertion of PhD holders is excellent, some progress toward a more structured organisation (doctoral schools?) may be beneficial to students needing to combat the isolation felt by many of them.

The university should be commended for its efforts to facilitate work/life balance, which is particularly important for female staff, but little progress has been made in terms of gender balance which remains similar to that at many other universities. More incentive may be needed.

Overall, Palacký University is a well-managed university which has demonstrated its ability to move on key issues, even with a very decentralised organisation. Without slowing down the necessary bottom-up momentum, greater coordination of strategy could enable the university to reach a new milestone at the international level.

Známka: A – Vynikající

Summary IEP (MEP): The university's vision of being an institution of excellence at the national level, and beyond, is justified by the high-quality of research in many areas, but also on systems, codes and rules that have been established or extensively revamped during the period, showing the ability of the university to move forward.

The Strategic Plan 2021+ is comprehensive, taking into account relevant objectives and listing a large set of useful actions, although mainly remaining at the level of general principles. This should not be detrimental, even if a yearly revised action plan would be needed, to be confident in progress toward the proposed 2030 vision since the university has been able to implement 18 instruments or measures (plus one in progress) during the period. However, in order to keep a good cohesion, it will be necessary to cope with different methodologies and outputs of research fields, which have high impact on LCDRO criteria, as well as to solve the CATRIN/FS crisis. This challenges, as well the one to improve the salary gap between the staff of different components, to attract and support promising young researcher, to support career development of future research leaders, and to improve the gender balance, will be key issues with respect to human resources. With this in mind, the university has both the human resources and infrastructure, to remain at the highest national level and at the best European level. It is clear-sighted about its situation and has successfully integrated current European thinking on research management into its own practices.

Celková známka: A – Vynikající

Summary IEP (MEP): Since the previous MEYS evaluation, Palacký University (hereafter called « UP ») continued its development with only one major change in terms of organisation: the creation, in 2021, of CATRIN, a research institute in natural sciences, which has now been evaluated for the first time. Overall, the organisation of UP allows for a

**Souhrnné hodnocení
na úrovni
poskytovatele**

high degree of autonomy for the 8 faculties and CATRIN (hereafter called « the units »), even though common mechanisms exist.

UP is a leading comprehensive university for research in the Czech Republic as shown by the evaluation of research outputs in R&D&I (Modules 1 and 2)³, as well as the social relevance of the research carried out in all units (Module 3). During the review period, UP has been able to maintain, and often increase, the number of FTEs dedicated to research as demonstrated by an impressive list of successful application for national and/or European grant calls. The distribution between categories among the academic staff is similar to other universities, as well as the gender equilibrium which is, as expected, highly variable according to disciplines, but globally imbalanced for the top positions, with higher number held by men. Some efforts to improve this situation have already been made, but they need to be sustained and enhanced, in the long run, to encourage female researchers to target associate professorships and full professorships. The number of international staff hired by UP is still rather low, but not different from other eastern or southern European universities. The global infrastructure of the University is very good, except for the Faculty of Health Sciences which will benefit from its own premises in the near future. Overall, the research equipment is excellent and sometimes world-class.

National and international recognition by the research community is observed for all units, with awards, participation in editorial boards, invited lectures and invited lecturers. However, international recognition may be improved in some areas with more partnerships resulting from joint projects, including multidisciplinary approaches, and success in European tenders. Participation in the Aurora Alliance may also help and some positive results have been already noticed. In this respect, Project Service is an excellent tool to encourage, support and manage applications. This is particularly important, since most of the funding comes from public sources. Contract research is still limited, even in the fields more prone to collaboration with private entities.

Many examples were given of economic and non-economic impact on the society. Overall, UP has been exceptional during the COVID crisis, providing solutions for diagnosis and analysis of millions of patients. This is a good example of a fast response to an emerging major concern, but UP is also involved in many important ongoing issues related to education, culture, law, healthy lifestyle and sports. Popularisation of VAVAI is also a deep concern for all units, which organise key events, lectures, open facilities for the lay public and for children. Overall, the third mission of the University is well fulfilled with significant impact on society.

More efforts should be made in the area of communication for nearly all units. This is obvious with respect to the research organisation, which is highly diversified, and even fragmented, within a (too) large number of departments in several faculties. Even if this does not seem to have been detrimental to provide good or excellent research outputs, more visibility at the national level, and even more at the international one, may provide a better recognition, in line with the high quality of research.

The University has developed the necessary services and tools to manage the quality assurance of the research field. In 2023 an extensive external and international evaluation was carried out in 22 fields and the

³ Vyjádření MEP se vztahuje k výsledkům hodnocení na národní úrovni v modulech 1 a 2 z hodnocení H23, které byly součástí podkladů pro hodnocení MEP v roce 2025.

results were discussed and dispatched to all units. During the period under review, a large number of documents (plans, codes, handbooks, rules) have been either created or revamped on such important issues as: internal QA, good research practice, ethics, research data management, sustainable development, hiring (HR award obtained in 2021) and career development. The university has signed the Agreement on Reforming Research Assessment and started to promote Open science. All these elements demonstrate the ability of UP to develop a comprehensive quality system and that the University is at the heart of current issues concerning research evaluation in Europe.

Individual evaluation of researchers is managed by IS HAP, an application used by all units since 2016. Even if IS HAP is under continuous evolution, the difficulty to cope with different fields and methodologies of research has pushed the Faculty of Arts to develop its own criteria in collaboration with 2 other leading Czech universities. This is a current issue in all comprehensive universities.

This holds also for financial issues such as in the splitting of LCDRO or the salary gap observed for the staff between different fields of research. The University has chosen to use the increase in LCDRO to support specific actions, but a more dynamic policy may be needed, to ensure that all units are in line with the university strategy (the IEP is not able to comment on the splitting of LCDRO within the units). It may also be interesting to implement internal calls to support specific projects such as those related to emerging themes or teams, especially in less financially favoured areas of research, or to international partnerships, as well as interdisciplinary research.

The preceding 2020 evaluation, together with the internal one in 2023, pointed out 2 issues still pending about doctoral studies and the CATRIN/FS crisis. PhD students met during the site visit complained about the lack of a real community between them within the university. An action plan (2022-2025) has been implemented to deal with the support and supervision of PhD students and post-docs. However, this is only part of the problem and a more structured organisation of doctoral studies and supporting activities is probably necessary, whether or not it takes the form of doctoral schools. The appointment of a Vice-Rector in charge of doctoral studies and young researchers is a positive sign toward the resolution of this issue.

The ongoing CATRIN/FS crisis needs also to be solved as soon as possible. One may note that this is not the case for the IMTM part of CATRIN, co-managed with the Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry.

Since 2021 this crisis has not impaired the development of both units which are showing high quality projects for the future, but it is a bad public image for the University and it hinders some doctoral students in preparing their doctorates and probably other staff in using the premises. Whatever the solution will be, both units must be able to talk to each other and collaborate because certain topics are closely related. Overall, the IEP consider that the research at Palacký University has shown a positive trend in the reference period, both in quality and in terms of its impact on the society. This is true for all units and the site visit has shown that a high motivation for continuous improvement exist among them, whatever their field of research and size are. This is a positive sign for the future.

<p>Vyjádření poskytovatele</p>	<p><i>Analýza výsledků hodnocení VŠ provedená poskytovatelem s podporou stanoviska OPO⁴ (EAC Statement on the 2025 Evaluation of Higher Education Institutions) ukazuje, že UPOL nevybočuje z obecných trendů hodnocení. Hodnocení MEP v modulu 3-5 se jeví jako konzistentní. Hodnotící škála byla používána systematicky a reflektuje kontinuálně narůstající kvalitu hodnocené VŠ. Na národní úrovni je VŠ konzistentně hodnocena známkou A – Vynikající. Na úrovni poskytovatele byla VŠ v roce 2020 hodnocena rovněž známkou A – Vynikající. S ohledem na výše uvedené navrhuje poskytovatel v rámci tripartitních jednání udělit UPOL známku A – Vynikající.</i></p>
<p>Závěr</p>	<p>Po diskuzi se účastníci jednání shodli, že se uzavře hodnocení stupněm A ale s varováním v oblasti společenských věd. Zástupci Rady pro výzkum, vývoj a inovace po diskusi vyjádřili souhlas s navrženým hodnocením dané vysoké školy.</p> <p>Tripartita dospěla ke konsensu o přiřazení celkového hodnocení Avš.</p>
<p>IP DKRVO</p>	<p>Vysoká škola je příjemcem IP DKRVO.</p>

⁴ Odborný poradní orgán poskytovatele pro hodnocení výzkumných organizací v segmentu vysokých škol v roce 2025 / Expert Advisory Committee for Evaluation in the Higher Education Institutions Segment