

**EVALUATION REPORT FOR EVALUATION OF RESEARCH
ORGANIZATION IN THE SEGMENT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
INSTITUTIONS IN YEAR 2025**

HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION NAME: Anglo-americká vysoká škola, a.s.

COMPANY REGISTRATION NUMBER (CRN): 19194951

THE LIST OF EVALUATION UNITS IN MODULE 3:

School of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences; School of Business; School of International Relations and Diplomacy

CHAIRPERSON OF INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION PANEL

Name and surname: Enrico Colombatto

Phone number:

E-mail:

LIST OF INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION PANEL MEMBERS		
Name and surname	Position in IEP	Current position
Prof. Enrico Colombatto	chairman	Professor Emeritus of Economics, University of Turin (Italy)
Apl. Prof. Dr. Hardy Bouillon	member	Extracurricular Professor of Philosophy, University of Trier
Prof. Agnieszka Slomka-Golebiowska, Ph.D.	member	Professor of Economics, Warsaw School of Economics (Poland)
Prof. PhDr. JUDr. Barbora Holá, LL.M.	member	Professor of Empirical Legal Studies of International Criminal Justice, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
Doc. Ing. Marek Hudík, Ph.D.	member	Associate Professor of Economics, University of Economics in Prague
Doc. Ing. Josef Montag, Ph.D.	member	Associate Professor of Economics, Faculty of Law, Charles University, Prague
Doc. PhDr. Tomáš Nigrin, Ph.D.	member	Associate Professor, Director of the Institute of International Studies

PROVIDERS METHODOLOGIST

Name and surname: Tereza Neumann Kotásková

Phone number:

E-mail:

Date of on-site visit of higher education institution: 13.6.2025

In Prague, date 29.9.2025

Signature



(IEP chairperson)

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: School of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences

FORD: 6 - Humanities and the arts

SOCIAL CONTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATED UNIT

3.1 Introductory information about the unit under evaluation

Indicator 3.1 is a non-evaluated indicator that provides basic information about the evaluated unit such as its mission and vision, organizational structure, size and staffing, or R&D&I capacities.

Commentary: The activities of the School are widely focused on teaching. Hence, the resources assigned to research are limited. Thus, faculty members have little time and incentives to engage in research. The facilities and the overall organization of the School reflect this vision and explain the modest research and innovation output.

RECOGNITION BY THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY

3.2 Recognition by the research community

Evaluate the position of the evaluated unit in the R&D&I research community based on the facts presented in indicator 3.2 and its annexed tables (3.2.1 to 3.2.5).

Rating [1–5]:

2 - Below average

Qualitative assessment:¹

The School is not sufficiently equipped to develop constant and intense interaction with the research community, be it domestic or international. The funds to host/organize research events are scarce and the School's members do not play a significant role in current academic debates.

Recommendations:

In order to enhance research, AAU should coordinate existing views on a credible and detailed development strategy over the medium-long run (5 years). Funds, recruitment and incentive structures must then follow in cooperation with the faculty deans of the School.

¹ Provide verbal assessment of the indicator and briefly comment on the reasons for awarding the specific rating. Follow a similar procedure for the other indicators.

RESEARCH PROJECTS

3.3 Research projects

Evaluate the most important research projects of the evaluated unit, especially regarding the results achieved and the application potential of the project, the proportionality with respect to the R&D&I capacities of the evaluated unit, the degree of interdisciplinarity and collaboration with other parts of the evaluated HEI, and the consistency with the declared mission and vision of the evaluated unit. Use the data from the full list of research projects and contract research activities in Tables 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 to supplement the evaluation.

Rating [1–5]:

2 - Below average

Qualitative assessment:

During the entire proposed period, the School engaged in one project (responses to the COVID pandemic). The funds outside providers committed to this project were limited (19,000 euro) and the allocation of these funds has not been detailed. No other research institutions were involved.

Recommendations:

AAU should continue to focus on major topics relevant for policymaking. However, if its faculty cannot count on suitable resources (lack of facilities, time or expertise), it should consider engaging in (more ambitious) joint projects.

3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society

Evaluate the research results already applied in practice or intended to be applied in practice. When evaluating, consider whether the results are proportionate to the R&D&I capacities of the evaluated unit, how they contribute to the fulfilment of the mission and vision of the evaluated unit and, if stated in the self-evaluation, how the results take into account the gender dimension and sustainability. Use the data from the full results summary in Table 3.4.1 to supplement the evaluation.

Rating [1–5]:

1 - Inadequate

Qualitative assessment:

The unit presented no results.

Recommendations:

Research projects should always lead to publishable results that contribute to academic knowledge or offer practical relevance. Otherwise, they should be discontinued as early as possible.

TRANSFER OF RESULTS INTO PRACTICE

3.5 Transfer of results into practice

Evaluate the effectiveness of the transfer of results into practice by the unit being evaluated. Pay attention to whether the composition of the stated users of the results or the way the R&D&I results are commercialised (if stated) is consistent with the R&D&I results produced and the mission and vision of the evaluated unit and how successful the evaluated unit is in its activities, such as attracting new users of the results, commercialising the R&D&I results and obtaining funding from non-public, non-grant sources.

Rating [1–5]:

1 - Inadequate

Qualitative assessment:

The project led to no results.

Recommendations:

Research projects should always lead to publishable results that contribute to academic knowledge or offer practical relevance. Otherwise, they should be discontinued as early as possible.

POPULARIZATION OF VAVAI

3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public

Evaluate how active and successful the evaluated unit is in the field of popularisation of R&D&I and communication with the public.

Rating [1–5]:

2 - Below average

Qualitative assessment:

The faculty engaged in several contributions through a variety of media. However, it seems that these contributions consisted of “opinions”, rather than in efforts to popularize the outcome of the research efforts developed by the School or to discuss “work in progress”.

Recommendations:

Popularization is important and so is the presence of the School in the social media. However, more efforts must be devoted to producing original results that strengthen the credibility and standing of the School and that can be later and more effectively popularized.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module 3

Evaluate how the evaluated unit has reflected the recommendations from the previous evaluation of the IEP, if applicable.

If the evaluated unit has not been evaluated before, the indicator will be marked as N/A – Not Applicable.

Rating [1–5]:

N/A - Not Applicable

Qualitative assessment:

The unit has not been evaluated before

Recommendations:

The unit has not been evaluated before

EVALUATED UNIT RATING

Evaluation of unit	
Having evaluated the individual criteria of module M3, please summarise your evaluation in the context of the module, describing and justifying the strengths and weaknesses of the unit being evaluated.	
3.1 Introductory information about the unit under evaluation	NOT RATED
3.2 Recognition by the research community	2 - Below average
3.3 Research projects	2 - Below average
3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society	1 - Inadequate
3.5 Transfer of results into practice	1 - Inadequate
3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public	2 - Below average
3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module	N/A - Not Applicable
Average rating [1–5]:	2 - Below average
Grade [A–D]:	D
Summary assessment:	
In the past, the School did pay insufficient attention to research. As a result, resources dedicated to research (facilities, budgets and faculty time devoted to research) have not been satisfactory. It appears that internal communication between the AAU's governing bodies and those in charge of research and the researchers themselves has sometimes been difficult.	
Summary recommendations:	
AAU should clarify the role research will have in the future: how it is going to finance it and which disciplines are prioritised. This vision should then be shared with the School, minimum goals should be detailed and budgetary plans should follow.	

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: School of Business

FORD: 5 - Social sciences

SOCIAL CONTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATED UNIT

3.1 Introductory information about the unit under evaluation

Indicator 3.1 is a non-evaluated indicator that provides basic information about the evaluated unit such as its mission and vision, organizational structure, size and staffing, or R&D&I capacities.

Commentary:

The activities of the School are almost entirely focused on teaching and the resources devoted to research are limited. Despite its ambitions to cover a lot of ground, faculty members have little time and incentives to devote their efforts to research. The facilities (office space) and the overall organization of the School (including the number of research professors) reflect AAU's overall vision and explain why research is modest.

RECOGNITION BY THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY

3.2 Recognition by the research community

Evaluate the position of the evaluated unit in the R&D&I research community based on the facts presented in indicator 3.2 and its annexed tables (3.2.1 to 3.2.5).

Rating [1–5]:

2 - Below average

Qualitative assessment:¹

The School has very limited interaction with the international and the domestic research community. Its researchers rarely present their work abroad and the School does not host visiting professors or academic speakers.

Recommendations:

The School should clarify its minimum research targets and then act consistently, in cooperation with the AAU's governing bodies. It should have access to adequate funds and be accountable. To the extent research funds are not available, the School should reduce research ambitions and use academic resources for teaching.

¹ Provide verbal assessment of the indicator and briefly comment on the reasons for awarding the specific rating. Follow a similar procedure for the other indicators.

RESEARCH PROJECTS

3.3 Research projects	
Evaluate the most important research projects of the evaluated unit, especially regarding the results achieved and the application potential of the project, the proportionality with respect to the R&D&I capacities of the evaluated unit, the degree of interdisciplinarity and collaboration with other parts of the evaluated HEI, and the consistency with the declared mission and vision of the evaluated unit. Use the data from the full list of research projects and contract research activities in Tables 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 to supplement the evaluation.	
Rating [1–5]:	3 - Average
Qualitative assessment: During the entire proposed period, the School engaged in three interesting projects: one on traffic accidents, one on inflation and one on tobacco.	
Recommendations: AAU should continue to focus on major topics relevant for policymaking. However, it should be clarified that consultancy is not the same as academic research. This should be kept in mind when allocating the funds, setting academic goals (publications, academic seminars etc.) and engaging in recruitment. The ability to acquire profitable consultancy contracts also depends on reputation for academic excellence.	

3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society	
Evaluate the research results already applied in practice or intended to be applied in practice. When evaluating, consider whether the results are proportionate to the R&D&I capacities of the evaluated unit, how they contribute to the fulfilment of the mission and vision of the evaluated unit and, if stated in the self-evaluation, how the results take into account the gender dimension and sustainability. Use the data from the full results summary in Table 3.4.1 to supplement the evaluation.	
Rating [1–5]:	1 - Inadequate
Qualitative assessment: The unit presented no results of academic relevance.	
Recommendations: Research projects should always lead to publishable results that contribute to academic knowledge or offer practical relevance. Otherwise, they should be discontinued as early as possible.	

TRANSFER OF RESULTS INTO PRACTICE

3.5 Transfer of results into practice	
Evaluate the effectiveness of the transfer of results into practice by the unit being evaluated. Pay attention to whether the composition of the stated users of the results or the way the R&D&I results are commercialised (if stated) is consistent with the R&D&I results produced and the mission and vision of the evaluated unit and how successful the evaluated unit is in its activities, such as attracting new users of the results, commercialising the R&D&I results and obtaining funding from non-public, non-grant sources.	
Rating [1–5]:	1 - Inadequate

Qualitative assessment:

The project presented led to no results.

Recommendations:

Research projects should always lead to publishable results that contribute to academic knowledge or offer practical relevance. Otherwise, they should be discontinued as early as possible.

POPULARIZATION OF VAVAI

3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public

Evaluate how active and successful the evaluated unit is in the field of popularisation of R&D&I and communication with the public.

Rating [1–5]:

2 - Below average

Qualitative assessment:

The faculty engaged in a number of contributions through a variety of media. However, it seems that these contributions consisted of “comments and opinions”, rather than of efforts to popularize the outcome of the research efforts developed by the School or to discuss “work in progress”.

Recommendations:

Popularization is important and so is the presence of the School in the social media. However, more efforts must be devoted to producing original results that strengthen the credibility and standing of the School and that can be later and more effectively popularized.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module 3

Evaluate how the evaluated unit has reflected the recommendations from the previous evaluation of the IEP, if applicable.

If the evaluated unit has not been evaluated before, the indicator will be marked as N/A – Not Applicable.

Rating [1–5]:

N/A - Not Applicable

Qualitative assessment:

The unit has not been evaluated before.

Recommendations:

The unit has not been evaluated before.

EVALUATED UNIT RATING

Evaluation of unit	
Having evaluated the individual criteria of module M3, please summarise your evaluation in the context of the module, describing and justifying the strengths and weaknesses of the unit being evaluated.	
3.1 Introductory information about the unit under evaluation	NOT RATED
3.2 Recognition by the research community	2 - Below average
3.3 Research projects	3 - Average
3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society	1 - Inadequate
3.5 Transfer of results into practice	1 - Inadequate
3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public	2 - Below average
3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module	N/A - Not Applicable
Average rating [1–5]:	2 - Below average
Grade [A–D]:	D
Summary assessment: During the period under examination, research resources (facilities, budgets and faculty time devoted to research) have not been satisfactory and the link between consultancy and academic research has been blurred. As a result, research has failed to produce satisfactory academic outcomes. Although the development of this School seems to be a priority for AAU, it is hard to detect a clear strategy. Moreover, communication between the AAU's governing bodies and those in charge of research could be improved.	
Summary recommendations: AAU should clarify the role of research for the future of the School of Business and for future recruitment. This vision should then be shared with the School, minimum goals should be detailed and budgetary plans should follow. AAU and the School also need a clearer and more persuasive incentive structure to motivate research and its consequences for policymaking.	

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: School of International Relations and Diplomacy

FORD: 5 - Social sciences

SOCIAL CONTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATED UNIT

3.1 Introductory information about the unit under evaluation

Indicator 3.1 is a non-evaluated indicator that provides basic information about the evaluated unit such as its mission and vision, organizational structure, size and staffing, or R&D&I capacities.

Commentary:

Despite its ambitious targets, the activities of the School are currently focused on teaching. The resources devoted to research are limited and faculty members have little time and incentives to engage in research. The facilities (office space) are inadequate and the organization of the School (including the number of research professors) reflects AAU's overall vision and explains why research is modest.

RECOGNITION BY THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY

3.2 Recognition by the research community

Evaluate the position of the evaluated unit in the R&D&I research community based on the facts presented in indicator 3.2 and its annexed tables (3.2.1 to 3.2.5).

Rating [1–5]:

1 - Inadequate

Qualitative assessment:¹

The School has limited interaction with the international and domestic research community. Its researchers rarely present their work abroad and the School does not host visiting professors or academic speakers.

Recommendations:

The School should intensify its international exposure (guest lecturers and seminars with speakers from abroad), clarify its minimum research targets and then act consistently, in cooperation with AAU's governing bodies. It should have access to adequate funds and be accountable. To the extent research funds are not available, the School should reduce research ambitions and use academic resources for teaching.

¹ Provide verbal assessment of the indicator and briefly comment on the reasons for awarding the specific rating. Follow a similar procedure for the other indicators.

RESEARCH PROJECTS

3.3 Research projects	
Evaluate the most important research projects of the evaluated unit, especially regarding the results achieved and the application potential of the project, the proportionality with respect to the R&D&I capacities of the evaluated unit, the degree of interdisciplinarity and collaboration with other parts of the evaluated HEI, and the consistency with the declared mission and vision of the evaluated unit. Use the data from the full list of research projects and contract research activities in Tables 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 to supplement the evaluation.	
Rating [1–5]:	1 - Inadequate
Qualitative assessment: During the 2019-2023 period, the School engaged in one project financed by the Czech Science Foundation. No results were reported.	
Recommendations: The School should engage in more joint projects and in its own research initiatives.	

3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society	
Evaluate the research results already applied in practice or intended to be applied in practice. When evaluating, consider whether the results are proportionate to the R&D&I capacities of the evaluated unit, how they contribute to the fulfilment of the mission and vision of the evaluated unit and, if stated in the self-evaluation, how the results take into account the gender dimension and sustainability. Use the data from the full results summary in Table 3.4.1 to supplement the evaluation.	
Rating [1–5]:	1 - Inadequate
Qualitative assessment: The unit presented no results of academic relevance.	
Recommendations: Research projects should always lead to publishable results that contribute to academic knowledge or offer practical relevance. Otherwise, they should be discontinued as early as possible.	

TRANSFER OF RESULTS INTO PRACTICE

3.5 Transfer of results into practice	
Evaluate the effectiveness of the transfer of results into practice by the unit being evaluated. Pay attention to whether the composition of the stated users of the results or the way the R&D&I results are commercialised (if stated) is consistent with the R&D&I results produced and the mission and vision of the evaluated unit and how successful the evaluated unit is in its activities, such as attracting new users of the results, commercialising the R&D&I results and obtaining funding from non-public, non-grant sources.	
Rating [1–5]:	1 - Inadequate
Qualitative assessment: The project led to no results.	

Recommendations:

Research projects should always lead to publishable results that either contribute to academic knowledge or offer practical relevance. Otherwise, they should be discontinued as early as possible.

POPULARIZATION OF VAVAI

3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public

Evaluate how active and successful the evaluated unit is in the field of popularisation of R&D&I and communication with the public.

Rating [1–5]:

2 - Below average

Qualitative assessment:

The faculty engaged in a number of contributions through a variety of media. However, it seems that these contributions consisted of “comments and opinions”, rather than of efforts to popularize the outcome of the research efforts developed by the School or to discuss “work in progress”.

Recommendations:

Popularization is important and so is the presence of the School on the social media. However, more efforts must be devoted to producing prestigious and original results that strengthen the credibility and standing of the School and that can be later and more effectively popularized.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module 3

Evaluate how the evaluated unit has reflected the recommendations from the previous evaluation of the IEP, if applicable.

If the evaluated unit has not been evaluated before, the indicator will be marked as N/A – Not Applicable.

Rating [1–5]:

N/A - Not Applicable

Qualitative assessment:

The unit has not been evaluated before.

Recommendations:

The unit has not been evaluated before.

EVALUATED UNIT RATING

Evaluation of unit

Having evaluated the individual criteria of module M3, please summarise your evaluation in the context of the module, describing and justifying the strengths and weaknesses of the unit being evaluated.

3.1 Introductory information about the unit under evaluation

NOT RATED

3.2 Recognition by the research community	1 - Inadequate
3.3 Research projects	1 - Inadequate
3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society	1 - Inadequate
3.5 Transfer of results into practice	1 - Inadequate
3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public	2 - Below average
3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module	N/A - Not Applicable
Average rating [1–5]:	1 - Inadequate
Grade [A–D]:	D
Summary assessment: During the period under examination, research efforts were not satisfactory. These subpar results originate from difficulties regarding facilities, budgets and faculty time devoted to research. Career prospects – promotions and remuneration – through research do not appear appealing. Although the development of this School seems to be a priority for AAU, it is hard to perceive a clear strategy and adequate budgetary commitments. Communication between the AAU’s governing bodies and those in charge of research is not very easy.	
Summary recommendations: AAU should clarify the role of research for the future of the School and for future recruitment. This vision should then be shared with the School, minimum goals should be detailed, and budgetary plans follow. There is also a need for a clearer and more persuasive incentive structure to motivate research and the transfer of the research results into practice. In particular, a relatively large number of part-time faculty members publicize their activities by referring to other affiliations. Although this does not affect the teaching outcome at AAU, the visibility of AAU as a reputable research institute suffers.	

SUMMARY RATING IN MODULE 3

MODULE 3 – SUMMARY RATING

After evaluating the individual units, please provide a summary evaluation of social relevance in Module 3 for the HEI as a whole. Please assess the balance of the evaluated units, how they contribute to the mission and vision of the HEI and describe the strengths and weaknesses of the HEI assessed in Module 3.

The summary rating is determined in accordance with the rules of the Methodology HEI2025+ as the average of the grades of the individual units, weighted by their size in terms of FTE staff.

EVALUATED UNIT	Grade [A–D]
School of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences	D
School of Business	D
School of International Relations and Diplomacy	D
Summary grade	D

Summary quality assessment:

The HEI has devoted its resources and focused its activity on teaching. Thus, little time and limited facilities were available to carry out research, engage in significant interaction with the international research community and present to a wider audience the policymaking implications of the research results.

Summary recommendation:

If the HEI wants to engage in significant research, drastic changes are required: the HEI must have access to adequate funding, it must be able to develop medium- and long-term plans (incentives and recruitment), and it must engage in better communication with the HEI's governing bodies.

EVALUATION REPORT FOR MODULES 4 & 5

HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION NAME: Anglo-americká vysoká škola, a.s.

COMPANY REGISTRATION NUMBER (CRN): 19194951

MODULE 4 – VIABILITY

ORGANISATION AND MANAGEMENT OF R&D&I

4.1 Organisation and management of R&D&I

Evaluate the organizational structure and setup of the R&D&I management system in relation to the size and type of the university and its mission and vision. Also consider comparisons with foreign universities of similar size and focus.

Rating [1–5]:

2 - Below average

Qualitative assessment:¹

There is a clear governance framework, which in principle ensures balanced oversight between administration, academia, and stakeholder engagement. The dual career model (Teaching vs. Research Track) provides flexibility for staff and allows research-active academics to focus their efforts, while also keeping teaching-focused staff engaged in the university's mission of student-centred education. Biennial Research Plan reviews represent a suitable mechanism for ensuring alignment between institutional strategy and individual performance.

One constraint is a limited research staff and support capacity. With only two full-time administrative staff in the Research Office, AAU's ability to scale project acquisition and management is constrained. This could limit the feasibility of ambitious R&D&I goals (e.g., a 30% increase in external grant applications). While AAU seeks to become a research-active and socially engaged university, its current staffing and infrastructure are better suited to incremental rather than rapid expansion of R&D&I activities.

Another constraint is the small scale of the research community. While the Research Track model is effective, the overall number of research-active faculty is modest. Moreover, some researchers have multiple affiliations and do not submit some of their outputs under the AAU affiliation.

Recommendations:

1. **Expand research support capacity:** Gradually increase staffing in the Research Office, with roles divided across grant writing, project administration, and knowledge transfer.
2. **Develop specialized research centers:** Establish thematic institutes or centers (e.g., for AI & Society, Public Policy & Economics) to act as hubs for interdisciplinary work, fundraising, and visibility.
3. **Strengthen international networks:** Formalize external advisory boards for research evaluation, including foreign experts, to bring AAU closer to international peers' governance practices.
4. **Leverage shared infrastructure:** Explore partnerships with other universities to share research infrastructure to offset resource constraints.

¹ Provide verbal assessment of the indicator and briefly comment on the reasons for awarding the specific rating. Follow a similar procedure for the other indicators.

R&D&I QUALITY MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT SYSTEM

4.2 System of support for a quality R&D&I environment and incentive measures for quality science	
Evaluate the systems/measures/tools described to stimulate high-quality science at the HEI being evaluated. In your evaluation, consider the documented effectiveness of the measures described, their impact on achieving the mission and vision of the HEI being evaluated, the realization of excellent science and the possible absence of key systems/measures/tools.	
Rating [1–5]:	3 - Average
Qualitative assessment: The support structure, which includes financial incentives, workload relief, and administrative support, seems to be working reasonably well, as demonstrated by the increase in the quantity and quality of research outputs. However, the research support capacity does not match the rising ambitions. Bonuses for grant applications motivate activity, but there's no explicit tool to improve success probability. Internal funding lacks a formal seed path (a seed-grant scheme is a step in the right direction, but is currently only "under discussion"), and there is a limited structured mentorship and principal investigator development. Adhoc mentorship is available "upon request," but there's no codified development track. Policy relevance and citizen-facing work are highlighted, but there's no impact framework (e.g., tracked policy citations, testimonials, uptake metrics) to evidence societal impact over time. Recommendations: Expand research support capacity: Gradually increase staffing in the Research Office, with roles divided across grant writing, project administration, and knowledge transfer. Develop specialized research centers: Establish thematic institutes or centers (e.g., for AI & Society, Public Policy & Economics) to act as hubs for interdisciplinary work, fundraising, and visibility. Codify principal investigator development. This can include workshops, checklists on budgeting, compliance, supervision, authorship, and data ethics; pair first-time PIs with an experienced internal/external mentor. Establish impact tracking. This can include policy citations, stakeholder briefings delivered, datasets reused, and media mentions	

4.3 Quality control system for R&D&I environment	
Evaluate the described internal and external evaluation system in terms of its quality, effectiveness and suitability for the HEI.	
Rating [1–5]:	3 - Average
Qualitative assessment: The use of Individual Research Plans (IRPs) tied to performance expectations and reviewed on a two-year cycle provides a clear framework for accountability. Evaluation goes beyond outputs to also consider grant activity, student engagement, and service. This reduces the risk of "publication-only" assessment and promotes a holistic research culture. Internal data analysis directly informs adjustments to the incentive system, demonstrating a feedback loop between evaluation and policy.	

Research quality feeds into program reviews, syllabi, and accreditation cycles, ensuring alignment between R&D&I and AAU's educational mission.

One limitation is that evaluation depends heavily on the Director of Research and Deans, leaving potential vulnerabilities if leadership changes. While "Research Points" create comparability, there is little evidence of external benchmarking of these metrics against peer institutions. This may reduce their external credibility. Moving low-output staff to the Teaching Track secures teaching capacity but may not address the root causes of weak research performance (e.g., mentoring gaps, collaboration opportunities).

Project audits (TAČR, GAČR), MŠMT reporting, and peer-reviewed publications ensure AAU's research outputs are externally validated. Collaborations with institutions like CNB and Charles University provide high-level validation of AAU's applied, interdisciplinary relevance. The move to formalize an External Research Advisory Group shows a commitment to systematizing external feedback and aligning with international norms.

At present, AAU lacks a permanent international advisory board to regularly benchmark research quality. Current external feedback is ad hoc and project-specific. Informal comparisons with Czech private HEIs are useful but insufficient; systematic benchmarking against international institutions of similar size and focus would add rigor.

Recommendations:

1. **Formalize an International Scientific Advisory Board.** This would provide structured, independent benchmarking of research performance.
2. **Introduce developmental evaluation measures,** such as mentoring schemes for Research Track faculty, to complement corrective mechanisms.
3. **Expand benchmarking practices** to include international peers of similar size.

4.4 Sustainability and resilience of R&D&I

Evaluate the described system of measures for sustainability and resilience of R&D&I in terms of their quality, effectiveness or possible absence of key measures.

Rating [1–5]:

3 - Average

Qualitative assessment:

The research conducted at the HEI reflects a situation in which the institution was primarily oriented towards teaching, while research was pursued mainly to meet the minimum requirements necessary for accreditation. Over time, however, academics began to emerge who were able to achieve respected research outcomes. In light of the gradual relocation of staff's primary professional activities towards the evaluated HEI, the institution was compelled to adjust employment contracts and introduce motivational instruments for grant holders and authors of significant publications.

The HEI's approach has therefore been of a rather reactive nature, yet it is moving in the right direction. Based on background materials and interviews conducted during the on-site visit, it is evident that this is a path the HEI clearly intends to follow and further develop. The driver of this shift lies in the results delivered by the gradually emerging system.

Recommendations:

1. Develop a **strategy for research teams or centers** within individual faculties that, in line with human resources policy, are capable of operating effectively and strengthening their scientific excellence.

2. Clearly define **advertised positions as either teaching- or research-oriented**, with differentiated weighting of required activities, and align these with the focus of the respective research teams. Establish, within career development plans for both current and new staff, clearly articulated expectations regarding research and project-related outputs.
3. Formulate a **concept of strategic cooperation with leading and/or international research institutions** and progressively integrate the HEI as a collaborative partner in research consortia.
4. Design and implement a **system of rewards for grant acquisition and publication activities**, and maintain this system consistently over several years, so that project leaders and authors are not compelled to constantly adjust their project and publication strategies.

PERSONNEL POLICY

4.5 Structure of human resources

Evaluate the described structure of human resources at the evaluated HEI in terms of age composition, degree of internationalization, distribution by job classification, and gender balance. For the assessment, use the data from the annexed tables 4.5.1 and 4.5.2; it is also possible to draw on the more detailed staffing data presented in indicator 3.1 of the self-evaluation reports for the evaluated units.

Rating [1–5]:

2 - Below average

Qualitative assessment:

The evaluated HEI belongs among smaller institutions; therefore, statistical indicators may be significantly affected by a relatively small number of individuals. Its age structure corresponds to that of many higher education institutions in the Czech Republic, with associate and full professorships typically held by considerably older academics. The data indicate that a substantial proportion of staff belong to the 40–49 age cohort, which represents a very positive outcome and, in the Czech context, an unusual one. Similarly, the internationalization of staff and their ability to communicate in foreign languages, stemming from the very mission of the institution, is at an excellent level.

A weakness of the current situation, however, lies in the prevalence of part-time contracts and numerous external arrangements, which result in the evaluated HEI not serving as the primary workplace for all staff members. Evaluation interviews made it clear that for many employees, the HEI is primarily an institution where they teach, while their main workplace is where they conduct research activities and produce publications.

Recommendations:

1. The objective of the HR approach should be the consolidation of employment contracts and the **maximization of the number of staff working exclusively at the evaluated HEI**.
2. Attention should already be given to addressing the future ageing of the evaluated HEI's personnel by announcing **recruitment procedures targeted at more junior staff** in terms of both career stage and age.
3. **Career advancement of younger employees should be actively supported**, particularly the attainment of further academic qualifications (habilitation and professorial appointment procedures), which will, in the long term, ensure the AAU's compliance with accreditation requirements for teaching and simultaneously provide future leaders of research and scientific activities.

4.6 Academic and Research Careers

Evaluate the described system for the recruitment and career development of academic and research staff. Evaluate the system in terms of its quality and effectiveness, as well as the potential absence of key elements.

Rating [1–5]:

3 - Average

Qualitative assessment:

The current situation reflects the original orientation of AAU, primarily a teaching institution. Although research activities and project work have gradually gained in importance, they have not yet been fully integrated into the HR policy of the evaluated HEI. Until now, positions have been filled mainly in response to teaching and accreditation needs, with regard to the required academic titles of staff. Research orientation has appeared rather as an additional asset, and in its early stages was not substantially taken into account within AAU's recruitment policy.

Nevertheless, the foundations of effective research teams have been established, particularly among younger and mid-career staff. At the same time, in response to this development and the ambition to advance the evaluated AAU to a higher level, the research component of employees' activities has come to be much more strongly recognized.

Recommendations:

1. Define a clear and realistic vision of science and research within the institution's strategic and programmatic documents.
2. Link the long-term plan with concrete steps at the level of individual faculties and reflect these in HR policy.
3. Set realistic career objectives in teaching as well as in research for individual staff members, taking into account their career progression and academic focus.

4.7 Gender equality measures

Evaluate the gender equality measures described in self-evaluation. Evaluate the measures in terms of their quality and effectiveness, as well as the potential absence of key measures.

Rating [1–5]:

3 - Average

Qualitative assessment:

The institutional policies related to gender equality at AAU remain at a nascent stage. While the self-evaluation report notes a generally diverse and international academic community, no formalised gender equality plan is currently in place. AAU does have a Code of Ethics that covers non-discrimination and harassment, which could serve as a foundation for further work in this area.

Recommendations:

1. Develop and implement a formal **Gender Equality Plan (GEP)** aligned with national and European standards, including Horizon Europe eligibility requirements.

4.8 Mobility of academic and research staff (including sectoral and inter-sectoral mobility)

Evaluate the described mobility of academic and researcher staff. Pay attention to whether the evaluated HEI achieves the set objectives, whether the mobility objectives are appropriately set for the HEI and whether the strategies in place lead to their achievement or help remove existing barriers to mobility.

Rating [1–5]:

2 - Below average

Qualitative assessment:

The self-evaluation provides only a limited account of academic staff mobility at AAU, with no evidence of a structured institutional strategy. International mobility is inherently facilitated by AAU's English-language instruction model and international recruitment patterns. There is no reference to sectoral or inter-sectoral mobility, either as a past achievement or a strategic priority.

The university does not report any formal participation in Czech or EU mobility schemes (e.g., MSCA, Erasmus+ staff mobility), nor does it seem to offer internal mechanisms to incentivise staff exchanges, fellowships, or secondments to non-academic sectors. The lack of institutional tools or support systems, such as a mobility officer, grants database, or mobility-tracking framework, further compounds the issue.

While individual members of staff do engage in international activities, including occasional visiting lectureships, sabbatical exchanges, or conference participation, these seem to be largely self-initiated and unsystematic. In sum, AAU does not currently meet the expectations of Module 4.8 in terms of planning, implementing, or monitoring mobility as a strategic component of R&D&I development.

Recommendations:

1. AAU should **establish a structured strategy to promote academic staff mobility**, both internationally and across sectors. This includes setting clear institutional objectives, introducing targeted support mechanisms (such as mobility grants, sabbatical schemes, or Erasmus+ engagement), and formalising partnerships that facilitate staff exchanges and secondments. Systematic tracking of mobility and alignment with research career development frameworks would further enhance AAU's research ecosystem and staff retention.

RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE

4.9 Research infrastructure

Evaluate the system described for the acquisition/optimisation of core facilities and other equipment and their renewal. Evaluate the system in terms of its effectiveness and suitability for the HEI. Also consider the system for sharing instruments and equipment, including core facilities and equipment of evaluated units. Use the data in Annex Table 4.9.1 to support your evaluation.

Rating [1–5]:

1 - Inadequate

Qualitative assessment:

AAU reports no dedicated research infrastructure at present. According to the self-evaluation and Annex Table 4.9.1, the institution does not maintain any core facilities, specialised equipment, or shared digital resources to support research activities. There is no system for the acquisition, maintenance, renewal, or shared use of research infrastructure across schools or disciplines. There is also a lack of office space conducive to focused work. The university does not participate in national or international infrastructure consortia, nor does it maintain any centralised research data management system, archive, or repository.

This absence is not surprising given the institution's size and stage of research development. However, the complete lack of even basic infrastructure (e.g., shared software platforms for qualitative analysis, data storage protocols, or access to digital research tools) poses a challenge to any future scaling of research ambitions. Particularly in light of AAU's plans to expand into doctoral education and increase external research funding, this gap will need to be addressed with clear priorities and investments.

The self-evaluation acknowledges this shortcoming but presents no immediate roadmap or budgeted plan for improvement. As a result, AAU currently does not meet the basic standards set out in Module 4.9 for supporting sustainable and high-quality research through infrastructure.

Recommendations:

1. To ensure the viability of its emerging research ambitions, AAU should develop a phased plan for the acquisition and development of basic research infrastructure. This may begin with shared digital tools, data management systems, and research support software, and evolve toward more discipline-specific infrastructure as external funding and research volume grow. Institutional investment in even modest infrastructure will be essential to support quality research and future doctoral education.

FINANCES

4.10 Budget and structure of financial resources

Evaluate the budget and financial resource structure of the evaluated HEI in terms of its suitability for the HEI, i.e. whether the financial resource structure is appropriate for the size and type of the evaluated HEI. You should also pay attention to the ability of the evaluated HEI to attract prestigious research projects. Use the data in the annexed tables 4.10.1 to 4.10.5 to support your evaluation.

Rating [1–5]:

1 - Inadequate

Qualitative assessment:

The university's financial structure is not suitable or sustainable for its stated R&D&I ambitions. The total dedicated research budget of CZK 8.4 million is minuscule for an institution with three schools and is insufficient to foster a competitive research environment. While the university has

commendably attracted some national grant funding, notably two Czech Science Foundation (GAČR) grants, the panel's own Module 3 evaluations found that these projects have failed to produce significant academic results, indicating that the current funding model is ineffective at generating quality research.

The overwhelming reliance on private funding (95.5% of the total university budget), which is primarily tuition-driven, makes R&D&I funding precarious and secondary to teaching operations. There is no evidence of a protected, strategic, multi-year financial commitment to research that would be necessary to build a viable program.

Recommendations:

1. Establish a **dedicated and protected multi-year budget for R&D&I** that is independent of short-term enrolment fluctuations to provide stability and allow for strategic planning.
2. Ensure that funding is **strategically allocated to the one or two focus areas** identified in the university's revised strategy, rather than being spread thinly and ineffectively across all departments.
3. Develop a more robust support system to **improve the quality and success rate of grant applications**, with a goal of increasing the proportion of stable, prestigious public funding for research.

4.11 Rules for the use of institutional support for the LCDRO

Evaluate the strategy described and the rules for the use of institutional support for the LCDRO. In your evaluation, consider the effectiveness of the implemented strategy and policies and whether they contribute to the mission and vision of the HEI.

Rating [1–5]:

2 - Below average

Qualitative assessment:

The university is in the early stages of building a research environment, and the establishment of rules for distributing institutional support is a necessary step. The Self-Evaluation Report states that the university uses a system of performance-based bonuses to incentivize research and has even restructured this system to better reward Q1 (Q2) publications. However, the specific rules of this restructured system are insufficiently described in the report, making a full assessment of its design impossible (the report points to the University Statute, which contains no information about the reward system).

In any case, the effectiveness of the overall strategy is not yet demonstrated and shows early signs of weakness. The outputs generated and rewarded by this system are of inconsistent quality, as evidenced by the poor results in Modules 1, 2, and 3. While intended to incentivize activity, the rules may have the unintended effect of rewarding the quantity of outputs over their quality or strategic impact. Consequently, it remains unclear how this system, in its current form, will meaningfully contribute to the "long-term conceptual development" of the university as a credible research organization.

Recommendations:

1. **Strengthen the link of funding to quality, de-incentivize low-quality publications** (do not reward publishing per se), and concentrate funding on ambitious (high-risk-high-reward) projects.
2. A significant portion of LCDRO funds should be allocated to **proactive capacity building**, such as providing seed funding for high-potential projects in designated focus areas or supporting

dedicated time for grant writing, rather than being used almost exclusively for retrospective bonuses.

3. The use of institutional support must be fully integrated with the university's overall R&D&I strategy, ensuring funds are directed to the **one or two priority areas** identified for development, thereby maximizing the impact of limited resources.

NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

4.12 Significant collaborations in R&D

Evaluate listed examples of significant R&D&I collaborations with respect to the effectiveness of the collaborations established, their proportionality and appropriateness to the type of HEI and its mission and vision.

Rating [1–5]:

2 - Below average

Qualitative assessment:

The university has established a number of collaborations with respectable national partners. On paper, these partnerships are appropriate for a higher education institution and show a positive effort to engage with public and academic bodies.

However, these collaborations have been largely ineffective at producing tangible, high-quality academic results. The panel's own Module 3 evaluations of the projects stemming from these collaborations concluded that they have yielded "no results of academic relevance". Furthermore, several listed activities are more akin to consultancy or student projects than genuine research collaborations, which points to a systemic confusion between these distinct activities. The collaborations appear to be ad hoc and driven by individuals rather than being part of a coherent institutional strategy to build a strong, collective research profile.

Recommendations:

1. Develop a collaboration strategy that prioritizes the generation of high-quality, peer-reviewed academic outputs (e.g., co-authored publications in reputable journals) over simply establishing partnerships.
2. Move beyond individual-driven contacts and focus on building formal, sustainable, institutional-level partnerships within the one or two designated priority areas.
3. The university must clearly distinguish between academic research collaborations, paid consultancy, and student-led projects in its strategy, internal processes, and external reporting.

STUDIES

4.13 Doctoral studies	
Evaluate the described organisation of doctoral studies. Pay attention to the setup and quality of the processes, as well as their effectiveness through basic statistics, such as drop-out rate or data on the future career of graduates.	
Rating [1–5]:	N/A - Not Applicable
Qualitative assessment: This indicator is not applicable, as the HEI does not currently offer any doctoral study programs, and therefore no evaluation of doctoral processes, quality, or graduate outcomes can be provided.	
Recommendations: -	

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

4.14 Implementation of recommendations in Module 4	
Evaluate how the HEI has reflected the recommendations from the previous evaluation of the IEP, if applicable.	
If the HEI has not been evaluated before, the indicator will be marked as N/A – Not Applicable.	
Rating [1–5]:	N/A - Not Applicable
Qualitative assessment: The HEI was not evaluated before.	
Recommendations: -	

MODULE 4 RATING

MODULE 4 – SUMMARY EVALUATION

After evaluating each indicator, please provide an overall evaluation of Module 4. Assess the overall state of the research and institutional environment and the quality of the internal processes of the HEI. Consider whether and how the set processes contribute to the fulfilment of the HEI's mission and vision.

The aggregate grade is determined in accordance with the rules of the Methodology HEI2025+ as a simple average of the scores for each indicator.

INDICATOR	RATING [1–5]
4.1 Organisation and management of R&D&I	2 - Below average
4.2 System of support for a quality R&D&I environment and incentive measures for quality science	3 - Average
4.3 Quality control system for R&D&I environment	3 - Average
4.4 Sustainability and resilience of R&D&I	3 - Average
4.5 Structure of human resources	2 - Below average
4.6 Academic and Research Careers	3 - Average
4.7 Gender equality measures	3 - Average
4.8 Mobility of academic and research staff (including sectoral and inter-sectoral mobility)	2 - Below average
4.9 Research infrastructure	1 - Inadequate
4.10 Budget and structure of financial resources	1 - Inadequate
4.11 Rules for the use of institutional support for the LCDRO	2 - Below average
4.12 Important collaborations in R&D&I	2 - Below average
4.13 Doctoral studies	N/A - Not Applicable
4.14 Implementation of recommendations in Module 4	N/A - Not Applicable
AVERAGE RATING	2 - Below average
GRADE [A–D]	D

Summary assessment:

AAU has established the basic formal architecture of a research-active institution, including a Research Office, a dual-career track for faculty, and a system of financial incentives. These measures have resulted in a quantifiable increase in the volume of grant applications and publications.

However, this formal structure is a hollow shell. The university's institutional environment is **fundamentally non-viable** due to a critical failure in its most foundational elements. The entire R&D&I system is undermined by:

1. **A critical lack of resources:** The dedicated research budget is minuscule, precarious, and, therefore, ineffective at generating quality research.
2. **A flawed personnel policy:** The university relies heavily on part-time faculty for whom AAU is not their primary workplace. As a result, their primary research is conducted and

credited elsewhere, preventing the development of a stable, institutionally loyal research community.

3. Furthermore, the university has **no dedicated research infrastructure**—not even basic shared software or adequate office space for faculty.
4. **Ineffective support systems:** The systems for distributing funds and fostering collaborations have proven ineffective. They appear to reward the quantity of outputs over quality, and the resulting projects have largely failed to produce tangible, high-quality academic results.

In conclusion, realistically, while some processes are in place, the absence of committed funding, basic infrastructure, and a dedicated core research staff renders the university's institutional environment for research non-viable. Significant systemic changes, including strategic resource allocation, inflow of new resources, and aggressive and strategic hiring (also costly), would be required to change this over time.

Clear, institutionally grounded commitment of resources and effort would be required to overcome the AAU's reputation as a non-research university and attract new research-active faculty. If undertaken, such an effort should be focused on developing one or two strong disciplines (psychology, international relations, business, or economics), where some research activity already occurs and may have the potential to expand.

Summary recommendations:

1. **Secure Foundational Resources (Precondition):** Commit to a **protected, multi-year research budget** and immediately develop a funded plan to provide **adequate office space and basic research tools**. This is the non-negotiable precondition for viability.
2. **Build a Core Research Staff:** Revise the human resources strategy to focus on **consolidating employment contracts** and making AAU the primary institutional home for a core group of research-active faculty in one or two focused areas.
3. **Appoint Strategic Research Leadership:** Establish a senior leadership role (e.g., a Vice-President for Research) to provide the strategic oversight currently lacking and ensure that all support systems are redesigned to **reward verifiable quality over mere quantity**.

MODULE 5 – STRATEGY AND POLICIES

5.1 Mission and vision of the evaluated institution in R&D&I

Evaluate the described vision and general mission of the university emphasizing R&D&I (in context of its educational function and the educational policy strategy of the state or the relevant ministry for higher education. Compare the defined mission with reality. The evaluation should consider how the mission and vision of the HEI has been fulfilled in the past five-year period and whether the vision for the next five-year period is adequately set and realistically achievable.

Rating [1–5]:

2 - Below average

Qualitative assessment:

The mission is comprehensive, it addresses ecosystem building, interdisciplinarity, and alignment with national/EU policy frameworks. It also reflects modern research governance principles. However, it remains primarily educational in orientation, with no explicit reference to research, innovation, or the creation of new knowledge, focusing instead on preparing learners rather than advancing sustained disciplinary or interdisciplinary research agendas.

The vision is broad and policy-heavy, but its operationalization is vague, with limited evidence of full implementation in the past five years. While there has been measurable progress — e.g., WoS-

indexed outputs tripled from 5 to 15 and the introduction of incentives such as the Research Track, IRPs, and publication bonuses — these reforms are at an early stage.

Ambitions rely heavily on securing large-scale external funding without a clear track record of success in major grant acquisition. Research activity remains fragmented, with only a few unconnected projects and no evident pipeline or strategic plan to build sustained specialization.

Overall the next five-year vision is ambitious. Yet, it is disconnected from the AAU's current research capacity and scale.

Recommendations:

1. **Embed Research in the Mission:** Revise the mission to explicitly focus on research, innovation, and knowledge creation. This will emphasize that research is integral to AAU's identity and commit the institution to building capacity, impact, and funding in R&D&I.
2. **Prioritise and Specialise in Research Themes:** Concentrate limited capacity by identifying 2–3 distinctive research themes where AAU has the expertise and potential for international visibility. Build these areas through targeted recruitment, infrastructure support, and selective grant applications, starting with smaller-scale funding to develop experience before pursuing large grants

5.2 Research and development objectives

Evaluate the set goals of the HEI in both the area of R&D&I and the development of the HEI as an institution. Consider whether the goals are adequately established in relation to the size and type of the HEI, as well as its mission and vision, and whether they are achievable within the proposed timeframe.

Rating [1–5]:

3 - Average

Qualitative assessment:

AAU's R&D&I goals are well-defined and measurable, but ambitious and only partially achievable within the next five years, given its small size and limited research capacity. The university has set clear targets — such as a 30% increase in grant applications and an annual output of 15–20 WoS/Scopus publications — and it has made modest progress, tripling WoS-indexed outputs from 5 to 15 between 2022 and 2025. This demonstrates some emerging capability, though sustaining and scaling this trajectory will be difficult. Structural limitations — including deficits in long-term funding, inadequate physical infrastructure, and the absence of a doctoral or early-career pipeline — are significant obstacles. Furthermore, as noted in Module 3, a lack of clarity at leadership level between academic research and consultancy risks undermining the coherence of AAU's research strategy. Unless these systemic issues are addressed, objectives for academic excellence are likely to remain self-deceptive rather than realistically achievable.

Some of the goals seem to be too ambitious, given the existing research capacity.

1. Research, Development, Innovation & Knowledge Transfer

The focus of the interdisciplinary research clusters reflects global trends, but not necessarily HEI strengths. The focus should be on the areas where AAU has the expertise and potential for international visibility.

Expanding both external grant applications and publications may stretch faculty unless additional hiring and support structures materialize quickly. GAČR, TAČR, and Horizon Europe are highly competitive; a 30% increase in applications may not yield a proportional increase in success rates.

Timeline for Open Science policy is achievable, though dependent on technical and governance investments.

2. Collaboration with Public Administration, Entrepreneurs & Civil Society

Policy projects, citizen science, student projects, and NGO partnerships align with social relevance highlighted in the AAU's mission. Deep collaboration with ministries and NGOs requires consistent delivery and staff continuity, which can be difficult given the AAU's size and turnover risk. Recognition as a "reliable applied research partner" by 2030 is realistic, but requires continuous investment in visibility and trust-building.

3. Human Potential Development

A 2025 GEP adoption is timely and aligns with EU research funding requirements. Student involvement offers valuable early-stage research engagement. Attracting international postdocs is commendable but may be difficult given resource limitations compared to larger universities. Mobility and sabbatical programs require careful funding prioritization.

4. Institutional Resilience & Research Infrastructure

Formalizing a research evaluation framework enhances accountability and transparency. Setting up cybersecurity systems is reasonable but requires technical expertise that may be scarce internally. EU consortia participation is highly competitive and demands strong networks.

5. Ethics, Scientific Integrity & Open Research Culture

The goals are reasonable and feasible.

Recommendations:

1. **Clarify the definition of research:** AAU's leadership must formally distinguish academic research from consultancy and ensure that all objectives, evaluation criteria, and incentive structures are aligned with this definition.
2. **Refocus research clusters on existing strengths:** AAU should narrow the interdisciplinary focus to areas where AAU already has established expertise and potential for international visibility. This ensures resources are concentrated and reputation is built more quickly.
3. **Phase the grant application target:** Instead of aiming for a blanket 30% increase, adopt a staged approach with clear support structures (grant-writing workshops, pre-submission peer review). This aligns ambitions with realistic capacity.
4. **Strengthen research support services:** Expand the Research Office's role to provide administrative and technical assistance with grant applications, project management, and compliance. This reduces the burden on faculty.
5. **Link faculty expansion to research growth:** Develop a hiring plan with a view to increasing the number of grant applications and publication output. This should be underpinned by a multi-year research budget, ensuring ambitions do not overstretch the current small faculty base.

5.3 Institutional instruments and measures for the implementation of the research and development strategy

Evaluate the described institutional and strategic instruments for the fulfilment of the research and development objectives regarding how they will contribute to the fulfilment of these objectives. In your evaluation, also pay attention to the possible absence of key instruments or measures.

Rating [1–5]:

2 - Below average

Qualitative assessment:

AAU has begun to implement several standard tools to support research, such as Individual Research Plans (IRPs), a Research Track, publication bonuses, and the establishment of a Research Office. These instruments are positive first steps that, together with the recent tripling of WoS-indexed publications (from 5 to 15 between 2022 and 2025), demonstrate some emerging research capability. They provide a basic framework for incentivizing and tracking research performance, and have already shown impact.

However, the university's broader strategic plan remains largely hollow and incomplete. According to AAU's own data in Table 5.3.1 of the Self-Evaluation Report, the vast majority of its key strategic instruments are marked as "Not implemented." Critical tools that are supposed to be central to the five-year strategy are still several years away from realization, including:

An Innovation Hub (planned for 2027)

A Mobility and Sabbatical Program (2027)

A Career Development Handbook (2026)

A formal Open Science Policy (2028)

This demonstrates that AAU currently lacks the institutional toolkit to execute its own strategy, rendering many elements of the plan aspirational and paper-based rather than operational.

Recommendations:

1. **Prioritise foundational instruments:** Ensure that the most basic enablers of research — adequate offices, research spaces, and a functional career development framework — are in place before pursuing new initiatives.
2. **Develop a realistic implementation plan:** Create a year-by-year roadmap for introducing strategic instruments, with a committed budget. Progress should be monitored annually to avoid further delays in implementation.
3. **Accelerate the rollout of delayed instruments:** Tools central to the strategy — such as the Innovation Hub, Mobility and Sabbatical Program, Career Development Handbook, and Open Science Policy — should be brought forward. Leaving them until 2026–2028 risks rendering the current five-year plan ineffective.
4. **Introduce a multi-year research budget:** Establish a fully costed budget dedicated to R&D&I activities, covering infrastructure, staffing, and programmatic instruments. This would provide the financial foundation currently missing from AAU's institutional toolkit.

5.4 Implementation of recommendations in Module 5

Evaluate how the HEI has reflected the recommendations from the previous evaluation of the IEP, if applicable.

If the HEI has not been evaluated before, the indicator will be marked as N/A – Not Applicable.

Rating [1–5]:

N/A - Not Applicable

Qualitative assessment:

The HEI was not evaluated before.

Recommendations:

-

MODULE 5 RATING

MODULE 5 – SUMMARY EVALUATION

After evaluating each indicator, please provide an overall evaluation of Module 5. Evaluate the overall setting of the HEI's strategic objectives and development plan.

The aggregate grade is determined in accordance with the rules of the Methodology HEI2025+ as a simple average of the scores for each indicator.

INDICATOR	RATING [1–5]
5.1 Mission and vision of the evaluated institution in R&D&I	2 - Below average
5.2 Research and development objectives	3 - Average
5.3 Institutional instruments and measures for the implementation of the research and development strategy	2 - Below average
5.4 Implementation of recommendations in Module 5	N/A - Not Applicable
AVERAGE RATING	2 - Below average
GRADE [A–D]	D

Summary assessment:

AAU has articulated a coherent strategy aligned with national and EU frameworks and introduced initial support instruments such as a Research Office, IRPs, and publication bonuses, leading to modest progress in research outputs. However, the university's R&D&I system is critically undermined by a profound gap between ambition and reality. Most key strategic tools remain unimplemented or scheduled far into the future, while structural weaknesses persist, including the absence of multi-year funding, inadequate infrastructure, reliance on part-time faculty with external affiliations, and limited strategic research leadership. Research activity remains fragmented and dependent on external funding streams without a proven track record. While there is isolated potential for excellence, the overall system is currently non-viable, as reflected in consistent 'D' evaluations across Modules 1–3. Without urgent investment in foundational instruments, AAU's research ambitions remain aspirational rather than realistically achievable.

Summary recommendations:

- Secure Funding and Infrastructure (Precondition):** Commit a realistic, multi-year research budget with protected funds for essential infrastructure (offices, research spaces). Without this foundation, no strategy can succeed.
- Appoint Credible Research Leadership:** Create a senior leadership role (e.g., Vice-President for Research) with a strong academic and management background to provide strategic guidance and bridge the gap between management and faculty.
- Adopt a Strategy of Radical Focus:** Concentrate all research investment and incentives on one or two areas with the most verifiable potential, building a genuine "center of excellence" instead of spreading resources too thin.

4. **Build Human Capacity and Pipeline:** Establish partnerships to co-develop PhD programs and create a sustainable early-career researcher pipeline. Link research growth to faculty expansion through a planned, budget-backed hiring strategy.
5. **Accelerate and Implement Key Instruments:** Fast-track delayed tools (Innovation Hub, Sabbatical Program, Open Science Policy) and strengthen the Research Office to provide grant support and compliance services. Implementation must follow a realistic year-by-year roadmap with clear monitoring.

OVERALL EVALUATION IN MODULES 1 TO 5

OVERALL EVALUATION

Provide a summary evaluation of the HEI as a whole across all five modules. Justify your evaluation and highlight the main strengths and/or weaknesses of the evaluated HEI. The overall grade is determined according to the rules of the "Methodology VŠ2025+".

MODULE	MODULE WEIGHT	GRADE [A–D]
MODULE 1 and 2	50 %	D
MODULE 3	30 %	D
MODULE 4	10 %	D
MODULE 5	10 %	D

OVERALL RATING

D – Below average

Qualitative assessment:

The overall performance of the HEI in research and innovation is below average. Teaching remains the primary mission, while research plays a secondary role and is not supported by adequate resources or clear long-term commitments. The mismatch between ambitions and actual capacity is evident in all modules. Although formal measures and strategies have been adopted, they are underfunded, inconsistently implemented, and often scheduled far into the future. At present, the HEI lacks the necessary financial, infrastructural, and human resources to achieve its stated R&D&I objectives.

Recommendations:

- Secure funding:** Establish a protected, multi-year budget for R&D&I and invest in essential infrastructure (offices, digital research tools, data management systems).
- Build a core research staff:** Make AAU the primary workplace for a stable group of research-active faculty and design recruitment and motivation strategies consistent with the research ambitions. Reduce overreliance on part-time staff.
- Appoint strategic leadership:** Create a senior research leadership role (e.g., Vice-President for Research with executive powers and budgetary autonomy) to provide oversight and align research with institutional strategy.
- Clarify the role of research:** Distinguish between consultancy and academic research and include research explicitly into the mission and vision.
- Prioritize and specialize:** Focus resources on one or two disciplines with potential for excellence and international visibility, building recognized centres of expertise.
- Strengthening support systems:** Expand the Research Office, introduce structured mentorship, grant-writing support, and systematic impact tracking.
- Develop international networks:** Engage in mobility schemes (Erasmus+, MSCA) and formalize external advisory boards to benchmark against international peers.
- Accelerate implementation of strategic tools:** Bring forward delayed initiatives (Innovation Hub, Mobility Program, Career Development Handbook, Open Science Policy) with realistic timelines and allocated budgets.