



Úřad vlády
České republiky

Rada pro výzkum, vývoj a inovace

Metodika
hodnocení výzkumných organizací
List VO

Vysoká škola báňská – Technická univerzita Ostrava

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

VŠ	Vysoká škola báňská – Technická univerzita Ostrava	H24
		Cvš
Oborové ¹ kapacity cca +5 %	1.2 Computer and information sciences 1.3 Physical sciences 1.4 Chemical sciences 1.5 Earth and related environmental sciences 2.2 Electrical engineering, Electronic engineering, Information engineering 2.3 Mechanical engineering 2.5 Materials engineering 2.7 Environmental engineering 2.10 Nano-technology 5.2 Economics and Business	
	<p>Známka: diferencováno dle OP1-6 (FORD 1–6)</p> <p>OP2 – cca 45 % oborových kapacit instituce. Celkem v Modulu 1 kumulativně hodnoceno 127 výsledků. Profil je posunutý směrem k horším známkám, viz. 44 hodnocení stupněm 4 a 13 hodnocení stupněm 5. V Modulu 2 se propisují v oborech Mechanical, Chemical a Materials engineering. Podíl výstupů v pásmech D1 a Q1 je výstupy i nadále pod úrovní ČR a EU. Celkově za panel navrženo hodnocení C.</p> <p>OP1 – cca 21 % oborových kapacit instituce. V Modulu 1 převažuje hodnocení stupni 3 a 4 nad 1 a 2, a to i kumulativně. Velké množství výsledků a dobře hodnocených uplatňují v Společenské relevanci, což panel oceňuje. V Modulu 2 je významné zastoupení v oborech od matematiky po environmentální vědy, zejména obor Computer sciences. Jednotlivé obory jsou ale podle profilu v Q1 pod úrovní ČR i EU. V Q2 naopak nad úrovní ČR i EU. Produktivita v Chemii a Computer sciences je výrazně nad úrovní ČR, ale u ostatních oborů je pod. Celkově panel hodnotí jako B/C.</p> <p>OP5 – cca 10 % oborových kapacit instituce. Kumulativně v Modulu 1 předloženo 36 výsledků. Převládá hodnocení stupněm 3, nicméně 2/3 výsledků jsou přihlášeny v kritériu Společenská relevance, kde je hodnocení lepší známkou náročnější získat (6x hodnocení 2). V Modulu 2 se propisují v oboru sociální geografie a dále ekonomie. V sociální geografii je univerzita v podílu Q1 na produkci instituce pod úrovní ČR (87 ze 119 výsledků je navíc publikována v MDPI, nicméně z Reportu 2 je zřejmé, že to není produkce autorů sociálních věd), zatímco v ekonomii se úrovní ČR přibližuje a produktivita je také zhruba na úrovni ČR. Za panel celkově navrženo hodnocení B/C.</p>	
Modul 1 a Modul 2		

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 %.

Modul 3

Známka: B – Velmi dobrá

Summary IEP (MEP)²: VSB–Technical University of Ostrava (VSB-TUO) demonstrates a broadly positive and, in several areas, exemplary level of social relevance and impact within Module 3. The University’s research and innovation activities show clear alignment with its mission to contribute to regional transformation and to address global technological and environmental challenges. At the same time, the level of maturity and external visibility varies substantially between units, resulting in a pattern of “islands of excellence” alongside faculties where potential remains under-realised.

Three units—FEECS (Faculty of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science), IT4Innovations National Supercomputing Center (IT4I) and CEET (Centre for Energy and Environmental Technologies)—form the University’s leading edge. These units combine high scientific visibility with strong integration into international networks (especially Horizon Europe and other EU schemes), well-articulated partnerships with industry and public bodies, and evidence of translating research results into practical solutions (e.g., digitalisation tools, energy-transition technologies). They exhibit mature management of intellectual property, consistent generation of third-party income, and a culture of outreach (workshops, open days, media engagement). The evaluators judged these three units at the “A” level for Module 3, reflecting best practice in both the quality and consistency of societal impact activities.

A second group—FMST (Faculty of Materials Science and Technology), FME (Faculty of Mechanical Engineering), FMG (Faculty of Mining and Geology) and FSE (Faculty of Safety Engineering)—earns an overall “B” rating. These faculties benefit from strong historic ties with industrial partners in the Moravia–Silesia region, well-defined application areas (advanced manufacturing, critical infrastructure, mining rehabilitation, safety and risk management) and steadily improving publication and patent records. Nevertheless, the social-relevance profile in these units typically relies on a limited number of senior academics who act as “gatekeepers” for major grants and international collaboration. Early-career researchers (ECRs) are active but under-represented in leadership roles, which could pose a sustainability issue as senior researchers retire or shift focus. In addition, while consultancy and contract research are healthy in these faculties, the pathway to higher-impact, collaborative R&D projects (especially in Horizon Europe) is less systematic than in the A-rated units. There is clear potential to elevate performance by formalising mentoring, internal proposal review, and cross-faculty clustering around shared societal missions (e.g., decarbonisation of heavy industry, smart manufacturing).

The Faculty of Economics (FE) and the Faculty of Civil Engineering (FCE) were assessed at “C”. Both units fulfil important educational and regional service roles but lag in terms of internationally visible research, high-value external grants, and wider knowledge transfer. FE’s societal engagement appears to be primarily local and consultative (e.g., studies for regional authorities), with limited evidence of scalable outputs (datasets, tools, policy briefs) that gain traction beyond the immediate stakeholder group. FCE exhibits pockets of specialised expertise but struggles to assemble critical

² International Evaluation Panel / Mezinárodní evaluační panel

mass, especially in doctoral supervision and project leadership. Both units would benefit from stronger integration into the University's central support structures (e.g., project office, technology transfer office), more proactive pursuit of interdisciplinary collaborations with the STEM faculties, and targeted investment in staff development to raise their participation in competitive schemes.

Across the University, several cross-cutting strengths stand out:

Clear thematic relevance: Digitalisation, smart systems, sustainable energy and environmental remediation are recurring, mission-oriented themes that resonate with both regional priorities and EU policy directions.

Growing culture of engagement: Even where impact remains modest, most units now recognise the need to demonstrate societal benefit, and they are developing internal indicators and outreach activities.

Infrastructure and platforms: VSB-TUO maintains or partners with specialised infrastructures (e.g., supercomputing at IT4I, energy labs within CEET) that attract industrial and public-sector collaborations and enhance research visibility.

At the same time, there are systemic weaknesses that constrain the University's ability to convert strong research into broad, sustained impact:

- Uneven participation in EU and international collaborative projects—several faculties remain largely national or regional in focus, missing out on resources and networks that could elevate their societal reach.
- Fragmented technology transfer and spin-off support—practices differ across units, and central services are not yet universally perceived as proactive partners in commercialisation.
- Variable doctoral capacity and supervision quality—some faculties have limited PhD enrolment and lack structured training programmes, which impacts both research depth and future impact potential.
- Limited institutional narrative for impact—while individual units communicate achievements, the University lacks a cohesive, cross-faculty story that can attract external partners and funding on a larger scale.

Známka: B – Velmi dobrá

Summary IEP (MEP): VSB-TUO's research and institutional environment is robust and steadily improving. The University offers well-developed support schemes for high-quality science—such as the PhD Academy, SGS, and Global Postdoc—alongside a transparent LCDRO allocation system and a generally effective governance framework. However, the division of responsibilities among senior leadership bodies and advisory boards remains insufficiently clear, occasionally hindering strategic agility.

The University demonstrates commendable practices in sustainability and resilience, including the adoption of a comprehensive Sustainable Development Strategy 2024+, major investments in energy efficiency, and active community engagement. Human resources data reflect a generational rejuvenation and a rise in international staff, yet persistent structural imbalances remain—particularly a shortage of associate professors and underrepresentation of women in senior academic roles.

Career development systems are a strength, noted for their transparency and alignment with European standards (e.g., the HR Excellence in Research Award, open recruitment). However, the absence of mechanisms to reintegrate staff after parental leave represents a gap in the support structure. Researcher mobility is actively promoted through Erasmus+ and out-of-EU

Modul 4

	<p>schemes, although the university's inbound attractiveness remains relatively limited.</p> <p>Research infrastructure is strategically managed and frequently upgraded, with a clear emphasis on digital and computational facilities. Still, a broader range of physical testbeds would encourage more inclusive participation and generate greater applied impact. Financial management is strong, with significant national and EU funding streams, although prestigious international projects remain concentrated within a small number of top-performing units.</p> <p>Examples of external collaboration are notable but uneven across faculties, indicating the need to diversify and strengthen strategic partnerships. While many of the 2020 recommendations have been partially or fully addressed, several remain incomplete—particularly in areas such as open science, research data management, gender equality, and the creation of independent feedback mechanisms.</p> <p>In summary, the University has established processes that meaningfully support its mission and vision. However, to reach an “A” level, it must focus on improving consistency and institutionalising its best practices across the board.</p>
<p>Modul 5</p>	<p>Známka: B – Velmi dobrá</p> <p>Summary IEP (MEP): The university's goals are clearly formulated, relevant to its profile as a technical HEI, and increasingly aligned with national and European research priorities.</p> <p>The strategy is backed by solid instruments, performance-based internal mechanisms, and growing coordination across governance structures. Implementation is progressing across core areas such as infrastructure, doctoral training, internationalisation, and project support — though some institutional ambitions are still emerging and unevenly realised across its units.</p> <p>The vision for the next five years is ambitious yet realistic, grounded in institutional experience and regional strengths, particularly in energy, digitalization, and intelligent systems. The long-term sustainability of this vision will depend on deeper internal integration, international competitiveness, and capacity to attract and retain research talent.</p>
<p>Souhrnné hodnocení na úrovni poskytovatele</p>	<p>Celková známka: B – Velmi dobrá</p> <p>Summary IEP (MEP): VSB – Technical University of Ostrava presents itself as a university with a distinct techno-economic profile and a strong regional mission, increasingly complemented by internationally oriented research ambitions.</p> <p>Across Modules 3–5, the institution demonstrates maturing capacity, with tangible improvements in research infrastructure, incentive mechanisms, doctoral support, and societal impact pathways. However, performance remains uneven across faculties, and persistent system-level constraints still limit the university's ability to set its own course rather than follow external frameworks.</p> <p>Module 3 (Social Relevance and Impact) reveals a university developing at dual speeds. Leading units—FEECS, IT4Innovations (IT4I), and CEET—combine high scientific visibility with strong societal engagement, robust international funding, state-of-the-art research infrastructure, and mature knowledge-transfer practices, each earning an “A” in their individual evaluations. In contrast, several large engineering faculties (FMST, FME,</p>

FMG, FSE) received “B” grades: they are active and productive, but their societal impact often depends on small clusters of senior academics, making achievements vulnerable to leadership transitions. The Faculties of Economics (FE) and Civil Engineering (FCE) were rated “C”, reflecting modest external funding and limited international engagement, despite playing relevant regional roles. The aggregate assessment for Module 3 is therefore a “B”, characterizing a university with strong “islands of excellence” that have not yet elevated the full institutional landscape.

Module 4 (Viability, Organization & Management) confirms significant internal improvements since the 2020 evaluation, in spite of the fact that very limited evidence was provided on progress in implementing the 2020 recommendations. These include targeted incentive schemes for early-career researchers (e.g., PhD Academy, SGS, Global Postdoc), the implementation of strategic analysis and performance-based internal funding (LCDRO methodology), sustainability planning, and generally sound infrastructure development. However, governance structures remain opaque: the roles and responsibilities of the Rector, Vice-Rectors, Scientific and Industrial Boards, and Academic Senate lack a clear definition, and the Rector’s College may be too large to support agile decision-making. Policies on open science and research data management are still fragmented, and doctoral education practices vary significantly by faculty. While gender equality measures exist, monitoring and evaluation are insufficiently systematic. Despite these challenges, Module 4 receives a “B / Very Good” rating, reflecting functioning systems that now require consolidation and sharper accountability.

Module 5 (Strategy & Policies) highlights a mostly coherent strategic plan (2021–2027), supported by KPIs and clearly assigned responsibilities—particularly in the areas of research excellence, interdisciplinarity, and infrastructure development. However, there is no mission statement in the strategic plan, and its Vision statement lacks a forward-looking focus and should be revised to clearly articulate the institution’s desired positioning beyond 2030. Internationalisation is a stated goal, but leadership is fragmented (e.g., between Study Affairs and R&D) and could be strengthened through a dedicated vice-rector. Targets for international co-authorship remain modest; to enhance visibility and competitiveness, more ambitious goals are needed. The PhD Academy represents a major step forward, but participation by students is inconsistent, and the transition to a Graduate School model remains incomplete. While most 2020 recommendations under Module 5 have been addressed, long-term strategic priorities—such as open science integration, gender equity, and interdisciplinary alignment—are still evolving. The module is assessed as “B (Very Good)”.

Modules 1–2, evaluated nationally³, reveal uneven bibliometric performance and limited presence in high-impact publication venues or prestigious funding schemes (e.g., ERC, MSCA), particularly outside the university’s top three units. These weaknesses affect Modules 3–5 by reducing the pool of internationally competitive researchers and limiting the university’s participation in large-scale consortia. While the IEP avoids deep bibliometric analysis, it is evident that improving publication quality, citation impact, and grant competitiveness in the weaker units is vital to raising institutional performance. The “B-C” grade assigned to Modules 1–2 reflects these challenges and, with its 50% weighting, acts as the main limiting factor on an otherwise solid institutional profile.

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.

	<p>Synthesis and Weighting: With Modules 1–2 at “B-C”, and Modules 3, 4, and 5 each at “B”, the weighted outcome converges on an overall grade of “B” (Good). The University is clearly moving in the right direction, especially in terms of infrastructure investment, early-career researcher support, and internationally recognized clusters of excellence. To reach an “A” level across the board, VSB-TUO must now focus on institutionalizing its best practices and lifting the baseline performance of its weaker faculties.</p>
<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 VŠB-TUO nevybočuje z obecných trendů hodnocení. V roce 2020 byla VŠB-TUO hodnocena jako C. Z hodnocení na národní úrovni vyplývá zlepšující se trend C/B. Poskytovatel dochází k závěru, že v hodnocení na úrovni poskytovatele dochází k pozitivnímu trendu stejně jako na národní úrovni. Poskytovatel považuje zlepšení hodnocení z C na B za opodstatněné a doporučuje, aby pro účely tripartitních jednání bylo uvažováno o přiřazení celkového hodnocení B – Velmi dobrá.</i></p>
<p>Závěr</p>	<p>Zástupci Rady pro výzkum, vývoj a inovace po diskusi vyjádřili souhlas s navrženým hodnocením dané vysoké školy.</p> <p>Tripartita dospěla k závěru, že i přes zlepšující se trend v hodnocení vysoké školy nebylo zatím dosaženo kvality odpovídající zvýšení hodnocení na B. Tripartita dospěla ke konsensu o přiřazení celkového hodnocení C_{vš}.</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