Úřad vlády
České republiky

Rada pro výzkum, vývoj a inovace

Metodika
hodnocení výzkumných organizací
List VO

Vysoká škola finanční a správní

SOUHRNNÁ ZPRÁVA PRO VÝZKUMNOU ORGANIZACI

Agregace kompletního hodnocení v Modulech 1-5

VŠ	**Vysoká škola finanční a správní**	**H24**
		D VŠ
Oborové[1] **kapacity cca +5 %**	1.2 Computer and information sciences 5.2 Economics and Business 5.4 Sociology 5.5 Law 5.8 Media and communications	
Modul 1 **a** **Modul 2**	**Známka: diferencováno dle OP1-6 (FORD 1–6)** OP5 – cca 87 % oborových kapacit instituce. V Modulu 1 bylo zhodnoceno celkem 20 výsledků, převážně podle kritéria Přínos k poznání. V hodnocení dominuje známka 4. Nejvíce se profilují v oborech Law a Economics and Business. V Modulu 2 je vidět z hlediska oboru neadekvátně nízká publikační produkce. V Q1 nevykazují žádný výsledek, v Q2 + Q3 mají 3 výsledky, v Q4 mají 11 článků. Kvalita publikací v oboru Economics and Business je tedy celkově špatná. V dalších oborech vykazují také velmi nízký počet článků bibliometricky hodnocených v Modulu 2. Celkově panel konstatuje, že podle hodnocení v Modulu 1 je VŠFS sice na dobré cestě, ale pro posun na škále bylo potřeba i nadále produkci zkvalitňovat. Publikační činnost v časopisech ve srovnání s ostatními podobně zaměřenými pracovišti je velmi nízká. Celkově panel konstatuje, že podle hodnocení v Modulu 1 je VŠFS sice na dobré cestě, ale pro posun na škále k hodnocení C je potřeba i nadále produkci zkvalitňovat a zvyšovat, zejména v M2. Celkově za panel navrženo hodnocení D. OP1 – cca 11 % oborových kapacit instituce, v Modulu 1 mají pouze 2 výsledky, oba hodnocené známkou 3. V Modulu 2 není v žádném z oborů registrováno v kumulaci ani 10 výsledků. Celkově hodnocení C/D spíše však hodnocení D.	
Modul 3	**Známka: C – Průměrná** Summary IEP (MEP)[2]: The University of Finance and Administration consists of two individually evaluated units: the Faculty of Economics and the Faculty of Law and Public Administration. The Faculty of Economics is larger, with a higher number of academic staff, more students, a greater volume of project funding from public sources, and higher revenues from contract research activities. However, as shown by the information provided in the self-	

[1] dle Portfolia zaslaného 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 %*.

[2] International Evaluation Panel / Mezinárodní evaluační panel

	evaluating reports, as well as during the on-site visit, both faculties play a crucial role in the university's activities and in fulfilling its objectives. In terms of social relevance, both faculties show several strengths, but also several weaknesses. Therefore, after carefully evaluating all the aspects and specifics of both faculties and their research fields, the International Evaluation Panel awarded both faculties with grade of C. As a result, the overall grade of the University of Finance and Administration in Module 3 is C as well. Both faculties are successful in securing externally funded research projects, including applied and contract research. The university also shows very good ability to disseminate the obtained research results via traditional, as well as modern communication platforms, which increases the national as well as international visibility of the university and its faculties. The academic staff members are included in various advisory boards, international societies, and editorial boards, and they receive invitations for expert lectures abroad. All of this confirms the relevance of the staff members and their educational and research activities. Of high social relevance are the partnerships with government bodies and private entities, which ensure research relevance beyond the academic area. However, there are also several areas for improvement. Both faculties should enhance the diversity of their foreign collaborations, to include a wider array of countries and institutions, preferably beyond the CEE region. Also, the impact of media and popularization efforts, though strong, could be further evaluated and optimized to ensure even broader public engagement. Although strong government-linked partnerships are a positive feature, the university should seek more diversification in this area. And more attention should be devoted to publishing research outcomes in high-impact international journals, to bolster academic recognition and the faculty's global research profile. Further weaknesses worth mentioning represent the underdeveloped strategy for commercializing intellectual property and the deteriorating age structure of the academic staff.
Modul 4	**Známka: C – Průměrná** Summary IEP (MEP): Compared to the previous evaluation period, VSFS has experienced improvements in numerous areas. What is positive the university has shown the will to improve and addressed the majority of recommendations from the previous evaluation report. The university has diversify the R&D&I funding sources, it is involved in a broader variety of national and international research grant schemes, it further developed the mechanisms for support of international mobility of the academic staff, re-focused on applied research, adopted clear and effective governance mechanisms, managed to internationalize its doctoral study program, further supported the broad spectre of collaborations with business entities, etc. However, some issues persist. Worth mentioning are especially the high drop-out rates of the PhD students, aging academic staff, or missing strategy of recruitment of foreign academicians.
Modul 5	**Známka: B – Velmi dobrá**

	Summary IEP (MEP): The University of Finance and Administration maintains a very good level of performance across all four assessed criteria related to its Research, Development, and Innovation activities. The main positives are clear mission and vision, clearly aligned with broader national and international strategies; clear, quality-driven, and internationally oriented research objectives that reflect contemporary trends in science and society; a wide range of institutional measures to implement the research strategy, including incentives for high-quality publications, systematic evaluation processes, support mechanisms for grant applications, etc.; efficient implementation of recommendations from the previous evaluation report, especially in the field of international collaboration, improvement of doctoral education quality, and support of early-career researchers. However, there are also several deficiencies, such as the missing international scientific advisory board dedicated to R&D&I oversight. In general, VSFS shows a solid institutional foundation and commitment to advancing its research and innovation agenda. The consistent "very good" ratings reflect effective strategic planning, institutional support, and adaptive implementation practices. The university's ability to integrate previous evaluation feedback further demonstrates its dedication to quality enhancement and international competitiveness.
Souhrnné hodnocení na úrovni poskytovatele	**Celková známka: C – Průměrná** Summary IEP (MEP): Overall, the R&D&I activities of the University of Finance and Administration, and their societal impacts, are at a good level, and in numerous areas, the university achieved notable improvements compared to the previous evaluation period. Based on the Self-evaluation report, as well as the interactions during the on-site visit, the International Evaluation Panel was able to identify several strengths and weaknesses, and to formulate numerous recommendations for further improvements. They can be found in reports for modules M3, M4, and M5. To focus only on the most important points, among the main strengths belongs the ability of the university to disseminate its research results via various traditional as well as modern communication channels. It, along with the inclusion of the academic staff members in various advisory boards, international societies, and editorial boards, helps to increase the national as well as international visibility of the university and its faculties. Another positive is that the research is focused on internationally relevant contemporary trends in science and society. Moreover, the quality of research outputs is supported by incentives for high-quality publications, systematic evaluation processes, support mechanisms for grant applications, etc. It is also important to note that the university has shown the will and the ability to improve and to listen to the recommendations provided by the previous evaluation panel. It is possible to expect further improvements in the future. Among the main weaknesses that should be addressed are the worsening age structure of the academic staff, high drop-out rates of the PhD students, a missing strategy of recruitment of foreign academicians, and a lower level of participation in big international research projects. The University of Finance and Administration is in a specific position, as in Modules 1 & 2, it received a grade of C/D. After a thorough evaluation, the International Evaluation Panel awarded the university a grade C in M3, a grade C in M4, and a grade B in M5. Therefore, given specific weights awarded to individual modules, if the overall rating is calculated with a grade

	C for M1 & M2[3], the resulting overall grade is C. However, if it is calculated with a grade D for M1 & M2, the overall grade is D. After we thoroughly investigated the Self-evaluation report, visited the university and communicated with the university and faculty managements, academic staff, and students during the on-site visit, we prefer the University of Finance and Administration to be awarded the overall rating of "C – Average". We realize that the University of Finance and Administration is not a leading research institution in the Czech Republic; however, we recognize its societal impact, its public outreach, and its close ties with other research, public, and private entities, as well as the potential for further improvement. The university has already shown a notable improvement in numerous areas since the last evaluation period, and it is moving in the right direction. Therefore, the overall grade of C is reasonable.
Vyjádření poskytovatele	*Analýza výsledků hodnocení VŠ provedená poskytovatelem s podporou stanoviska OPO[4] (EAC Statement on the 2025 Evaluation of Higher Education Institutions) ukazuje, že VŠFS výrazně nevybočuje z obecných trendů hodnocení. V roce 2020 byla VŠFS hodnocena jako D. Hodnocení poskytovatelem a z národní úrovně se shodují na hodnocení na pomezí C/D. Poskytovatel dochází k závěru, že vzhledem ke* ***shodě obou úrovní hodnocení na známkách C/D*** *bude pro finální stanovení hodnocení nezbytné srovnání s dalšími obdobnými VŠ během jednání tripartity.*
Závěr	Zástupci Rady pro výzkum, vývoj a inovace po diskusi vyjádřili souhlas s navrženým hodnocením dané vysoké školy. Účastníci jednání po diskusi dospěli k názoru, že vysoká škola nedosahuje kvality potřebné pro zlepšení celkové známky. **Tripartita dospěla ke konsensu o přiřazení celkového hodnocení $D_{VŠ}$.**
DKRVO	Vysoká škola je příjemcem IP DKRVO.

[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.
[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