

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

**HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION NAME: Masaryk University**

**COMPANY REGISTRATION NUMBER (CRN): 00216224**

**THE LIST OF EVALUATION UNITS IN MODULE 3:** Faculty of Law, Faculty of Medicine, Faculty of Science, Faculty of Arts, Faculty of Education, Faculty of Pharmacy, Faculty of Economics and Administration, Faculty of Informatics, Faculty of Social Studies, Faculty of Sports Studies, Institute of Computer Science, Central European Institute of Technology

### CHAIRPERSON OF INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION PANEL

Name and surname: Toivo Maimets

Phone number: [REDACTED]

E-mail: [REDACTED]

| LIST OF INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION PANEL MEMBERS |                                               |                                                                                                                              |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Name and surname                               | Position in IEP                               | Current position                                                                                                             |
| Toivo Maimets                                  | IEP Chair<br>FORD NATURAL SCIENCES            | Professor, Institute of Molecular and Cell Biology, University of Tartu, Estonia                                             |
| Petra Mořkovská                                | IEP Secretary                                 | Analyst at Centre for Scientometric Support and Evaluation, Masaryk University                                               |
| Samuel Jezný                                   | MEYS Methodologist                            | Head of Unit<br>HE Policy Implementation Unit<br>Department of Higher Education,<br>Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports  |
| Zoë Opačić                                     | IEP Member – FORD ARTS AND HUMANITIES         | Reader, Department of History of Art, Birkbeck University of London, UK                                                      |
| Jan Don                                        | IEP Member – FORD ARTS AND HUMANITIES         | Dean, Faculty of Humanities,<br>Professor at Linguistics and Language teaching<br>Open University, Heerlen, Netherlands      |
| Emilia Jamroziak                               | IEP Member – FORD ARTS AND HUMANITIES         | Professor, Medieval Religious History<br>University of Leeds, UK                                                             |
| Johannes Berger                                | IEP Member – FORD MEDICAL AND HEALTH SCIENCES | Professor, Head of the Department of Pathobiology of the Nervous System<br>Medical University of Vienna, Austria             |
| Lucyna Wozniak                                 | IEP Member – FORD MEDICAL AND HEALTH SCIENCES | Professor, Vice-rector for Science and International Cooperation,<br>Head of the Department of Medical Biology, Lodz, Poland |

|                     |                                    |                                                                                                                                |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Jana Roithová       | IEP Member – FORD NATURAL SCIENCES | Professor, Spectroscopy and Catalysis<br>Radboud University, Netherlands                                                       |
| Torsten Möller      | IEP Member – FORD NATURAL SCIENCES | Professor and former Vice-dean, Group Leader - Research Group Visualization and Data Analysis<br>University of Vienna, Austria |
| Jörg Matthes        | IEP Member – FORD SOCIAL SCIENCES  | Professor, Department of Communication<br>University of Vienna, Austria                                                        |
| Karola Dillenburger | IEP Member – FORD SOCIAL SCIENCES  | Professor of Behaviour Analysis and Education, Director of the Centre for Behaviour Analysis<br>Queen's University Belfast, UK |
| Jan Komárek         | IEP Member – FORD SOCIAL SCIENCES  | Professor, iCourts - Centre of Excellence for International Courts and Governance<br>University of Copenhagen, Denmark         |
| Sigmund Loland      | IEP Member – FORD SOCIAL SCIENCES  | Professor, Department of Sport and Social Sciences<br>Norwegian School of Sport Sciences, Norway                               |

## PROVIDERS METHODOLOGIST

Name and surname: Samuel Jezný

Phone number: [REDACTED]

E-mail: [REDACTED]

**Date of on-site visit of higher education institution: June 2-6, 2025**

In Tartu date Sept 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2025

Signature



(IEP chairperson)

## EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

**NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Law, Masaryk University**

**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 faculty left a somewhat mixed impression with us. On the one hand, there are excellent research units and individuals - the Judicial Studies Institute in particular, the Institute of Law and Technology too. These were also noted in the previous report from 2020. However, that Report also stated: "While it is not to be expected that all units score equally high, we encourage the faculty leadership to come up with strategies for disseminating the best practices to broader parts of the faculty". Unfortunately, this does not seem to be the case of what has happened in the following years. It is still these two institutes (especially the former) which produce the faculty's most excellent results. There does not seem to be any strategy or plan in this regard.

There is also an issue with maintaining excellent researchers who come from abroad to the faculty. It was mentioned during the meeting that another member of the Judicial Studies Institute obtained an ERC Starting Grant – and left immediately, as she was offered a position of associate professor at another university in Europe. It appeared to us that there was no strategy on the part of the faculty on how to maintain (let alone attract) excellent researchers from abroad, besides their employment on the few (but significant) projects hosted by the faculty.

Relatedly, while it is mentioned in the faculty's SER that "the gender composition was less favourable and women accounted for approximately 30 per cent of the workforce", in the meeting, it was clear that there is no strategy on how to improve this (or even the lack of interest in this problem). What is particularly worrying is the imbalance among associate professors between 40-49 years – 18 male/3 female colleagues. As these are academics that can be expected to be at the top of their research performance, and many of them should later become professors, this is something that requires more attention to be given by the faculty's leadership.

Finally, in contrast to the 2020 report, we are more sceptical about the faculty's claim that "legal scholars apply their research directly in legal practice" as "many academics work as judges, law clerks, or legal advisors at these institutions". There should be a clearer line drawn between legal academics working *in practice* – which is hardly to be considered "applied research", and legal academics who *provide research* that can be directly utilized *by practice* (such as doctrinal commentaries or consultancy for public institutions or in the context of private law disputes). As much as there is a line between an academic doing research, e.g., at the Faculty of Medicine and that same person's clinical practice in a hospital or even their private practice, the same line needs to be drawn for legal academics when they work *as practitioners*. We provide some suggestions

below, but as the first step, the faculty's management should be much better aware of the ancillary activities of the members of the staff.

## 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

#### Qualitative assessment:<sup>1</sup>

If we based our assessment of this criterion solely on the information provided in the faculty's SER, it would have to be worse than we believe is justified: as was also discussed at the meeting with the faculty, many of the examples provided in the SER hardly count as evidence of the recognition by the research community. Moreover, the rating we eventually gave results from the work of too few members of the faculty; and there seems to be little strategy on how to make other members of the faculty perform better.

Starting with the "Prestigious R&D&I awards": it is not clear to us at all how, e.g., "Liberty Award (Award for extraordinary achievements in the legal profession and in promoting the rule of law in the Czech Republic, as well as for remarkable cooperation with American colleagues)" or "Recognition of Achievement in Global Legal Skills Education" contribute to this. Other awards listed were internal to MUNI (e.g., MUNI Scientist - Award of the Vice-rector for Research for Extraordinary Scientific Achievement). The faculty should aim broader than this.

Concerning "the most important invited lectures", the picture is also rather mixed: very often these lectures do not occur in the context of the *research* community (however broadly defined). The most startling example was that of the lecture by Kateřina Šimáčková, nominally an assistant professor at LAW, but a judge of the Czech Constitutional Court at the same time. It was delivered in her latter capacity – the conference was organised by the Presidency of Germany in the Council of Europe (hardly an institution related to research, being its object at most) and the only affiliation of Dr. Šimáčková stated in the programme was that of a judge.

At the same time, there ARE academics who are widely recognized by the international research community, and the examples of membership in editorial boards of international journals could confirm this.

However, some of the information provided seems out of date. E.g., Pavel Molek is said to be a member of the editorial board of Vienna Journal of Constitutional Law; however, the webpage of the journal does not confirm this (<https://www.icl-journal.com/editorial-board/>). The same issue seems to apply to Josef Bejček, listed as a member of the Editorial Board of the International Review of Intellectual Property and Competition Law, also not confirmed by the Review's webpage: <https://link.springer.com/journal/40319/editorial-board>. This makes us wonder whether there is any systemic process of collecting and evaluating this information.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

#### Recommendations:

- The faculty needs to develop a better-defined notion of excellence and recognition in the research community, also for strategic reasons: to be able to justify funds to be provided for its research (especially applied research in the form of doctrinal legal science), which is hard to support by external grants.
- Moreover, the 2020 Report recommended that “the Dean to help spread the good practices beyond the faculty’s top researchers. It is important that this becomes general practice for all researchers and not only the most recognised researchers at the faculty”. We suggest that some concrete steps be taken in this respect.

## 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### Qualitative assessment:

Obtaining two ERC grants consecutively speaks very highly about research projects conducted at the faculty. Other projects come from national sources (especially the Czech Science Foundation and public authorities). We wonder if there is some plan or vision with respect to getting more grants from abroad (especially the ERC). It was also mentioned at the meeting that a member of the Judicial Studies Institute obtained an ERC Starting Grant – and left immediately, as she was offered a position of associate professor at another university in Europe. It appeared to us that there was no strategy on the part of the faculty (or University) on how to maintain (let alone attract) excellent researchers from abroad, besides their employment on the few (but significant) projects hosted by the faculty.

#### Recommendations:

- The faculty should consider how to attract more top grants (such as ERC) besides one unit (the Judicial Studies Institute), or even a single researcher. Some strategy or greater support to apply for such grants should exist there.

### 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

#### Qualitative assessment:

The faculty produces a significant amount of “applied research” in terms of legal commentaries, or reports commissioned by public authorities. Some of the publications that can be qualified as primary/basic/conceptual research have clear policy implications and were used in some high-ranking bodies (such as a report commissioned by Biden’s Presidential Commission on U.S. Supreme Court Reform in 2021). This is truly impressive.

One thing to note, however, is that the authors of the research results listed by the faculty: they are all (except for one co-author) male members of the academic staff of the faculty. In our view, this speaks to the wider culture at the faculty, which for some reason does not value the outputs by its female members equally.

What was surprising in this respect, the faculty states in the report that “none of the listed results was directly concerned with gender issues”. However, as is known to us, in 2020 Kateřina Šimáčková co-authored the book entitled *Male Law: Are Legal Rules Neutral?* (Kluwer 2020), which initiated an important, and for a long time overdue, debate on the gender dimension of law. It is therefore surprising not to see this publication among the top 10 results.

#### Recommendations:

- The faculty does very well as a unit in terms of its research results with existing or prospective impact on society. Where we see a significant room for improvement is the representation of such results, which appear embarrassingly male-dominated.

## 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]:**

**2 - Below average**

#### Qualitative assessment:

The faculty’s SER notes that “it has not yet utilized services provided by Technology Transfer Office MUNI” the reason being the “generally low suitability of transferring legal science research outputs into practice with the aim of monetary profit.” It states, rather ominously, that due to the “strict

regulation and threat of severe sanctions, cooperation with the corporate sector in the form foreseen in Section 3.5 is next to impossible for the faculty”.

We wondered, however, whether the faculty could not be more inventive in finding ways of profiting from (some) of its members’ activities in the private sector, where they benefit from their affiliation with the faculty (typically when they provide private consultancy as expert academics). The SER states that “while it is true that part of the academics has pursued legal jobs outside of the faculty (e.g. as judges, assistants to judges, barristers), most of their work at these positions for obvious reasons could not be “transferred” to the faculty in a commercial (monetized) manner.” However, we wonder whether the “obviousness” does not block imagination in this respect. As the first step (as already mentioned), the faculty should have a better knowledge of the ancillary activities of the faculty members, as there seemed to be rather little awareness of this.

#### Recommendations:

- The faculty should conduct an audit of its members’ ancillary activities and to what extent these benefited from their employment at the faculty, either directly (using its resources, such as student researchers or access to the library) or indirectly (e.g. consultancy contracts obtained thanks to their affiliation to the faculty and their other positions).

## 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]:

4 - Very good

#### Qualitative assessment:

We agree with the 2020 Report that the faculty does exceptionally well in this respect, although, as that Report noted that “if it was to have a higher grade it would have to also seek a more international impact in this regard”. There does not seem to be any improvement in this respect but given the nature of the faculty (in its self-presentation oriented predominantly towards the local environment) and its location, this is something that might be harder to do.

#### Recommendations:

- The faculty should continue in its outstanding outreach work; it may, however, consider how the digital world has made it possible to reach other-than-local environments. The international dimension of its activities could then push the assessment to “outstanding”.

## 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]:**

**3 - Average**

#### Qualitative assessment:

It is here that having the overall picture of MUNI has helped to form our perspective. In our assessment, particularly in comparison to other units we have reviewed, we observe a notable absence of direction from the faculty's leadership.

We acknowledge that there is a difference in our understanding of one set of criteria, concerning applied legal research (3.3 and 3.4). Specifically, we do not believe that having members of the academic staff as participants in legal practice (as judges and other members of the legal profession) counts as such. Therefore, while the 2020 Report stated that "The Faculty does exceptionally well in these regards and it the only recommendation we can make is to encourage the Faculty in developing ways of tracing and assessing these forms of impact", we believe that the faculty should do more in terms of research that critically reflects on legal practice or provides systemic knowledge based on solid theoretical foundations in the form of "doctrinal legal science".

Moreover, if many members of the faculty work at courts, awarding them (financially) for having their publications cited by the same courts where they work provides for perverse incentives with problematic implications for both legal practice and academic research.

Besides this (which the faculty cannot be blamed for, as it only followed the recommendation of the 2020 Report), there are a number of things that should have been worked on more:

- The faculty should have done more to extrapolate the Judicial Studies Institute's success to the rest of the faculty. Instead, and in contrast to the 2020 report, the other successful institute (The Institute of Law and Technology) appears much less prominently in the current SER. We therefore wonder what the faculty has done to make the former Institute a template and inspiration for other such research centres. This is most visible from the "recognition by the research community" (3.2), where the 2020 Report recommended "the Dean to help spread the good practices beyond the faculty's top researchers. It is important that this becomes general practice for all researchers and not only the most recognised researchers at the faculty". What the Faculty presented to us in their current SER suggests there is even a misunderstanding of what this criterion seeks to establish (see above).
- It seems to us there has been no effort made on the part of the faculty to get financial benefit from its members' private activities that directly relate to their employment at the faculty. This issue probably falls under "Transfer of results into practice". While the 2020 Report states that the faculty "will have to consider how it turns this body of work into publicly recognised contract research. We are aware this might entail changes in the culture of the faculty, but we nevertheless encourage the Dean's Office to look into this". It does not seem to us that this recommendation was taken sufficiently seriously.

#### Recommendations:

- The faculty should develop a concrete plan on how it wants to extrapolate the success of the faculty's excellent units to the other parts of the faculty, which do not produce equally outstanding results.

### 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                                                | <b>NOT RATED</b>         |
| 3.2 Recognition by the research community                                                                   | <b>4 - Very good</b>     |
| 3.3 Research projects                                                                                       | <b>5 - Outstanding</b>   |
| 3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society                                         | <b>4 - Very good</b>     |
| 3.5 Transfer of results into practice                                                                       | <b>2 - Below average</b> |
| 3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public | <b>4 - Very good</b>     |
| 3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module                                                         | <b>3 - Average</b>       |
| <b>Average rating [1–5]:</b>                                                                                | <b>4 - Very good</b>     |
| <b>Grade [A–D]:</b>                                                                                         | <b>B</b>                 |

#### Summary assessment:

The Faculty of Law certainly belongs among the best in the region. This is, however, thanks to only very few members of its staff: the challenge for the faculty should be to find ways of making them involved in the process of spreading their excellence among their colleagues, which at present does not seem to be the case.

Compared to the overall impression of MUNI and some of its outstanding units, we considered the Faculty of Law to be less interested (or pressured) to engage in systemic changes that could make a unit that helps to push the overall evaluation of MUNI up.

#### Summary recommendations:

- To develop a plan how to expand the range of researchers capable of attracting significant international (or national) grants.
- To develop a strategy (most likely) in cooperation with the central MUNI administration to improve the gender balance among researchers, especially at the associate professor level. The first step should be to inquire into the causes of such imbalance (as there seemed to be very little awareness of this among the faculty's leadership).

- To discuss what is “research excellence” in the field of law – and how research *of law* is different from researchers’ participation *in law*. The first step should be a much clearer knowledge of the academic staff’s ancillary activities and the possible use of the faculty’s resources for their private purposes that benefit them, with no gain for the faculty.

## EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

**NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Medicine, Masaryk University**

**FORD: 3 - Medical and health 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 Faculty of Medicine (MUNI MED) at Masaryk University is a leading biomedical institution in the Czech Republic, recognised for its excellence in medical education, research, and clinical integration. The faculty's research activities span the full spectrum of biomedicine, including cellular and molecular biology, oncology, cardiology, neuroscience, microbiology, reproductive medicine, tissue engineering, and stem cell research. These activities align with current diagnostics and therapeutics trends and are strongly oriented toward societal benefit through direct translation into clinical practice.

MUNI MED is embedded in the University Campus Bohunice, which it shares with the Faculty of Science, CEITEC, and the Faculty of Sports Studies, creating a natural space for collaboration between these faculties. The campus is directly connected to four major clinical institutions: University Hospital Brno, Trauma Hospital, St. Anne's University Hospital (including the International Clinical Research Centre), and the Masaryk Memorial Cancer Institute. This integration enables daily collaboration between pre-clinical and clinical departments.

MUNI MED comprises 75 departments and centres, including 16 pre-clinical and 54 clinical departments, the Centre of Excellence (CREATIC), and 29 research groups. It hosts national research infrastructures such as CZECRIN (the Czech node of the European Clinical Research Infrastructure Network). It is preparing to launch the MUNI BioPharma Hub in 2026, including a new Pre-clinical Centre for advanced translational research.

As of December 2023, the faculty employed over 1,000 academic staff (485 women), with a balanced age structure and a strong representation of early-career researchers. More than half of the staff are jointly appointed with clinical institutions. The faculty offers a wide range of study programs: 10 bachelor's, 5 follow-up master's, 1 five-year master's, and 15 doctoral programs in Czech and English. It also provides lifelong learning courses for healthcare professionals.

MUNI MED actively embraces its societal role, aiming to diagnose, prevent, and treat diseases through research-driven clinical innovation. It promotes sustainability-oriented research and responsible use of public funds, while engaging the public in health education and science communication.

## 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]:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 5 - Outstanding |
| <p><b>Qualitative assessment:<sup>1</sup></b></p> <p>MUNI MED has a strong and well-established reputation in the national and international biomedical research community. This recognition is reflected in multiple dimensions: Faculty members regularly serve on editorial boards of high-impact scientific journals (e.g., Annals of Haematology, Neuro-Oncology Practice, Journal of Wound Care), contributing to the peer-review process and shaping scientific discourse in fields such as oncology, haematology, neuroscience, and clinical diagnostics. MUNI MED researchers are active members of leading international professional societies, e.g., haematology, anaesthesiology, clinical research infrastructure, and molecular biology. Many hold elected or leadership positions, participate in working groups, and contribute to the development of clinical guidelines and research policy (EMBO, European Haematology Association, European Society of Anaesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine, and ECRIN-ERIC).</p> <p>Faculty members contribute to developing national and international clinical guidelines (e.g., ELN, ESMO) and serve as advisors to EU bodies and Czech ministries. MUNI MED regularly hosts globally renowned scientists, including Nobel laureates, through the Mendel Lectures series, and its researchers are frequently invited to lecture at top institutions (e.g., Mayo Clinic, NIH, Stanford). The faculty maintains an International Scientific Advisory Board (ISAB), composed of globally recognized experts, which provides strategic guidance and external validation of research quality and direction.</p> |                 |
| <p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue supporting faculty participation in international editorial boards, societies, and evaluation panels.</li> <li>• Establish internal mechanisms to recognize and reward service to the research community.</li> <li>• Promote visibility of international engagements through institutional communication.</li> <li>• Encourage early-career researchers to pursue active roles in professional organizations.</li> <li>• Use ISAB feedback strategically to guide research priorities and institutional development.</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                 |

## 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]:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | 5 - Outstanding |

<sup>1</sup> 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.

#### Qualitative assessment:

MUNI MED has demonstrated exceptional capacity in securing and implementing a diverse portfolio of research projects, ranging from frontier basic science to highly translational and applied research. The faculty's project portfolio is well-aligned with its mission to advance biomedical knowledge and improve clinical practice through innovation, interdisciplinarity, and societal relevance.

MUNI MED is host to several HE grants, which are among the most competitive and prestigious. An **ERC Starting Grant** focused on signalling dynamics in the microenvironment of chronic lymphocytic leukaemia (CLL). This project has generated novel insights into disease progression and resistance mechanisms, with direct implications for targeted therapies. Three advanced **ERC Consolidator Grants** dedicated to peptide-based antibacterial strategies are contributing to the development of next-generation antimicrobials in the context of rising antibiotic resistance. Further grants include studies on the dynamic assembly of RNA polymerase II CTD factors, advancing its role in cancer and neurodegeneration, and studies on phage infection of bacterial biofilms, offering a foundation for phage therapy as an alternative to antibiotics.

These projects are supported by state-of-the-art infrastructure and demonstrate the faculty's ability to compete at the highest level of European research.

MUNI MED plays a vital role in several large-scale, interdisciplinary consortia that address urgent health and societal challenges run on the national level including **SYRI – Systemic Risk Institute**: A national initiative responding to crises such as pandemics, war, and climate change contributing expertise in epidemiology, health systems, and public health resilience; **NCRI – National Cancer Research Institute**, a strategic oncology platform focused on personalised medicine, translational research, and comprehensive cancer care. The faculty leads and coordinates clinical and molecular oncology research, and **SIRI – Strategic Innovations for a Resilient Society**, supporting research into antiviral and antibacterial therapies, vaccine development, and pandemic preparedness. MUNI MED contributes through its clinical trial infrastructure (CZECRIN), immunology labs, and translational research units.

These consortia exemplify the faculty's ability to mobilise interdisciplinary teams and infrastructure in response to national and global health challenges.

Between 2019 and 2023, MUNI MED conducted over 1,600 contract research activities, generating more than €10.4 million in revenue. It demonstrates the faculty's strong and increasing engagement with the R&I ecosystem and its ability to translate research into practice.

Many projects involve collaboration with other MUNI faculties (e.g., Science, Pharmacy, Informatics), CEITEC, and external partners such as hospitals and public health authorities. The faculty's infrastructure (e.g., CREATIC, CZECRIN, BioPharma Hub) supports interdisciplinary research and clinical translation.

#### Recommendations:

- Continue strategic support for ERC and Horizon Europe applications, including internal mentoring, proposal development, and administrative assistance.
- Strengthen interdisciplinary integration within university faculties and national and European consortia to address emerging health challenges.
- Expand support for early-career researchers in securing prestigious international grants, including MSCA and ERC Starting Grants.
- Develop structured mechanisms for tracking and communicating flagship projects' societal, clinical, and economic outcomes.

- Foster long-term partnerships with industry and public institutions to enhance the application potential of research outputs.

### 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### Qualitative assessment:

MUNI MED has produced a wide range of research results with direct and prospective societal impact, reflecting its mission to translate biomedical research into clinical practice and public health benefit. These results span diagnostics, therapeutics, medical devices, software tools, and validated methodologies, and are proportionate to the faculty's extensive R&D&I capacities.

The most significant outcomes in the evaluated period are: patents (national, EPO and WIPO for **Prognostic Method for Follicular Lymphoma** –a tool for personalized treatment planning in a disease with high relapse rates and **Diagnostic Method for Colorectal Cancer** contributing to early detection and improved outcomes in one of the most prevalent cancers in Europe.

**A prototype phase for Microfluidic Chip for Antibiotic Testing**, a rapid diagnostic tool for bacterial resistance, with potential to improve antimicrobial stewardship and reduce inappropriate antibiotic use, innovative **software: LYNX and 4D-GRAPHS/CHAINS** for NGS data analysis, supporting precision medicine and genomic diagnostics or **Pocket Analyzer for Antibody Detection**: a portable device for point-of-care immunodiagnostics, relevant for infectious disease monitoring and vaccine response assessment.

**The development of studies** (supported by ERC grants) resulted in a **Spin-off: Entrant s.r.o.** foundation, a company commercializing research in fatigue diagnostics and performance monitoring, with applications in sports medicine and occupational health.

The MUNI MED data infrastructure supports national health monitoring and pandemic response, including COVID-19 diagnostics and epidemiological modelling. These contributions have shaped public policy and emergency preparedness.

Sustainability is reflected in innovations that reduce healthcare costs, improve diagnostic efficiency, and support long-term health system resilience.

#### Recommendations:

- Establish a centralized repository for documenting societal impact, including clinical uptake, policy influence, and public engagement.
- Foster partnerships with public health authorities, hospitals, and NGOs to co-develop and implement research-based solutions.
- Promote visibility of applied results through open-access platforms, stakeholder briefings, and translational showcases.

- Encourage interdisciplinary teams to pursue application-oriented research, especially in diagnostics, digital health, and preventive medicine.
- Support early-stage commercialization through targeted funding, incubation, and mentorship.

## 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

#### Qualitative assessment:

MUNI MED demonstrates a growing but still uneven capacity for transferring research results into practice. Between 2019 and 2023, the faculty generated over €1.4 million in contract research revenue, with more than 1,600 activities conducted for 833 clients. These included pharmaceutical companies (e.g., BioMarin, Boehringer Ingelheim), biotech firms (e.g., CasInvent), public institutions (e.g., State Office for Nuclear Safety), and hospitals. The scope of services ranged from clinical trials and pharmacological studies to biomechanical analysis.

The faculty has launched several spin-offs, including **Enantis** (focused on protein stabilization technologies), **MilkyWay Be Well** (offering digital tools for mental health and well-being), and **Entrant s.r.o.** (commercializing fatigue diagnostics and performance monitoring).

These ventures reflect the faculty's translational potential, but the overall commercialization pipeline remains modest relative to the scale and quality of its research output. Licensing activities are emerging, but not yet systematic. The Technology Transfer Office (TTO MUNI) provides support, but its integration with biomedical researchers is still developing.

The faculty's infrastructure (e.g., CREATIC, CZECRIN, BioPharma Hub) offers strong potential for clinical translation and industrial collaboration, but these assets are not yet fully leveraged for commercialization. Internal incentives for entrepreneurship are limited, and early-career researchers often lack access to training and mentorship in innovation and business development.

#### Recommendations:

- Develop structured commercialization pathways for medical devices, diagnostics, and digital health tools, including proof-of-concept funding and regulatory support.
- Strengthen collaboration with regional innovation ecosystems, including JIC Brno, CEITEC, and industry clusters.
- Create internal incentive schemes for researchers engaging in commercialization, including recognition in career progression and performance evaluation.
- Provide targeted training and mentorship for PhD students and early-career researchers in intellectual property, business planning, and regulatory affairs.

- Improve integration between TTO MUNI and biomedical departments to ensure proactive identification and support of commercially viable results.

## 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### Qualitative assessment:

MUNI MED has demonstrated excellent commitment to public engagement and science communication, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic.

During the pandemic, MUNI MED rapidly mobilized its expertise to support national and regional health authorities. Faculty researchers and clinicians became regular contributors to national media, offering expert commentary on epidemiology, vaccination, mental health, and healthcare system resilience. This visibility was supported by the expansion of the Office for Communication and External Relations with a dedicated scientific editor and established a database of experts for rapid response to emerging topics.

The faculty launched the **STETOSKOP podcast**, which presents research findings, clinical insights, and faculty initiatives in an accessible format, or the **Research Breakfast** series, hosted monthly by the Vice Dean for Science, where researchers present their work to students, postdocs, and the public. These sessions are recorded and distributed via YouTube and Spotify, extending their reach beyond the university.

MUNI MED actively and regularly participates in national science outreach events such as **Researchers' Night**, **Open House Brno**, and **MjUNI (Children's University)**. The faculty also supports student-led initiatives such as the **Faculty Theatre Company**, which dramatizes legal and ethical dilemmas in medicine, and student competitions like **Ius et Societas**, which promote interdisciplinary dialogue.

Communication tools in MUNI MED are tailored to diverse audiences, including children, seniors, healthcare professionals, and policymakers.

Importantly, MUNI MED started to institutionalize science communication as a core academic activity. Early-stage researchers (ESRs) and students are encouraged to participate in outreach, and science communication is recognized in performance evaluations and grant applications. However, challenges remain in expanding English-language content, evaluating impact systematically, and integrating communication across disciplines.

#### Recommendations:

- Expand English-language outreach to engage international audiences, expatriate communities, and global partners.
- Develop thematic campaigns aligned with global health priorities (e.g., infectious diseases, mental health, aging, cancer prevention), targeting diverse societal groups.
- Implement robust tools for evaluating public engagement impact, including analytics, surveys, and stakeholder feedback.

- Foster interdisciplinary collaboration with communication professionals, educators, and social scientists to enhance message design and delivery.
- Support ESRs and students in developing science communication skills through workshops, mentorship, and participation in outreach programs.
- Leverage clinical and research expertise to co-create educational content with schools, NGOs, and local governments, particularly in areas of health literacy and disease prevention. Promote open-access dissemination of outreach materials and encourage reuse by educators and community organizations.

## 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

#### Qualitative assessment:

MUNI MED has made substantial progress in responding to the recommendations from the previous evaluation cycle. The improvements reflect a strategic commitment to institutional development, research quality, and societal relevance. However, some areas still require deeper structural integration and long-term planning.

One of the most notable achievements is the enhancement of **impact tracking mechanisms**. The faculty has begun to systematically monitor the societal and clinical uptake of its research outputs, including citations in clinical guidelines, integration into public health protocols, and media visibility. This marks a shift toward more outcome-oriented research evaluation, although the tools and processes remain in early stages of development.

The faculty has **reduced the number of PhD programs** to 15, and at the same time has expanded its **professional education offerings**, including the development of LLM programs tailored to legal and ethical aspects of healthcare. These programs respond to the growing demand for interdisciplinary expertise and contribute to the faculty's societal engagement mission.

In terms of **support for early-career researchers (ECRs)**, MUNI MED has introduced mentoring schemes, grant-writing workshops, and internal mobility support. ECRs are increasingly involved in international collaborations and encouraged to apply for prestigious grants such as MSCA and ERC Starting Grants. However, challenges remain in ensuring equitable access to resources and recognition for ECR contributions.

The faculty has launched **student advisory services**, including legal and psychological support, which were particularly valuable during the COVID-19 pandemic. These services demonstrate responsiveness to student needs and contribute to a supportive academic environment.

Strategically, MUNI MED has aligned its planning with national and EU research agendas, including Horizon Europe missions (e.g., cancer, health resilience) and Czech national priorities (e.g., NCRI, SYRI). The faculty actively participates in shaping policy through expert panels and advisory roles.

Despite these advances, some recommendations from the previous cycle—such as commercialization, interdisciplinary integration, and international outreach—have only been partially addressed.

For historical reasons, we understand that it may not be possible to merge the different departments across the hospitals affiliated with MUNI MED. However, we could propose a virtual cluster that combines thematically related departments. Such a cluster could jointly organise programs, events, or training activities. For example, it could establish a shared PhD program and host regular events to present new methods or recent publications.

The faculty has acknowledged these gaps and initiated planning processes to improve performance in these areas.

#### Recommendations:

- Continue efforts to integrate different departments located across MUNI MED by clustering them and strengthening cooperation and good practices exchange by creating a common platform for such activities.
- Continue developing and institutionalizing tools for responsible research evaluation, including societal impact metrics, stakeholder feedback, and longitudinal tracking.
- Strengthen support structures for early-career researchers, including dedicated funding, mentorship, and career development pathways.
- Expand interdisciplinary collaboration across university faculties to address complex health and societal challenges.
- Enhance international visibility through strategic partnerships, joint programs, and multilingual outreach.

### 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                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | <b>NOT RATED</b>       |
| 3.2 Recognition by the research community                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| 3.3 Research projects                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| 3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| 3.5 Transfer of results into practice                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <b>4 - Very good</b>   |
| 3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularisation of R&D&I and communication with the public                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| 3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | <b>4 - Very good</b>   |
| <b>Average rating [1–5]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| <b>Grade [A–D]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | <b>A</b>               |
| <b>Summary assessment:</b><br>The Faculty of Medicine at Masaryk University is a nationally and internationally recognized institution with a strong reputation for excellence in biomedical research, clinical integration, and societal engagement. Its research portfolio represents the full TRL spectrum—from basic science to clinical applications—and includes several prestigious European Research Council (ERC) grants, NIH-funded collaborations, and leadership in national consortia addressing cancer, infectious diseases, and systemic health risks. |                        |

The faculty's infrastructure, including the CREATIC Centre of Excellence, CZECRIN clinical trials platform, and the upcoming BioPharma Hub, supports high-level translational research and interdisciplinary collaboration. Its integration with clinical hospitals enables direct application of research findings in patient care and public health.

MUNI MED has made significant progresses in impact tracking, commercialization, and science communication. It has expanded its LL.M. programs, launched student advisory services, and supported ESR through mentoring and grant development.

Public engagement activities—especially during the COVID-19 pandemic—have positioned the faculty as a trusted source of health information and a model for bridging science, clinical care, and society.

Despite these achievements, challenges remain in scaling commercialization, deepening interdisciplinary integration across university faculties, and institutionalizing science communication and responsible research evaluation. The faculty is aware of these gaps and has initiated strategic planning to address them.

**Summary recommendations:**

- Strengthen interdisciplinary collaboration across university faculties to address complex health and societal challenges.
- Expand commercialization pathways for medical devices, diagnostics, and digital health, supported by dedicated funding and incubation.
- Enhance support for ESR through structured mentorship, training, mobility schemes, and recognition in career development.
- Expand English-language outreach and thematic campaigns aligned with global health priorities to engage international audiences and diverse societal groups.
- Foster long-term partnerships with public health authorities, hospitals, NGOs, and industry to co-develop and apply innovative education and research-based solutions.

## EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

**NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Science, Masaryk University**

**FORD: 1 - Natural 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 Faculty of Science aims to advance knowledge through high-quality education and research in biology, chemistry, environmental science, physics, mathematics, geology, geography, interdisciplinary studies, and teacher training. The faculty emphasises focusing on research addressing societal challenges as defined by the UN Sustainable Development Goals and the Czech national innovation strategy.

The faculty is structured into 13 departments and three specialised research centres: RECETOX; the National Centre for Biomolecular Research (NCBR); and the Institute of Physics of the Earth, employing 1,324 members of staff (incl. 97 professors and 135 associate professors) and educating 3,542 students in undergraduate and postgraduate programs. The faculty has competitive research infrastructure on the European level and strong R&D&I capabilities, as evidenced by securing substantial research funding and significant scientific outcomes.

### 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

#### Qualitative assessment:<sup>1</sup>

Several leading scientists from the faculty receive strong recognition from the international and national scientific communities. These include the EMBO membership for Jiří Fajkus (Biology), an honorary doctorate from Örebro University for Jana Klánová (RECETOX) and the Ignaz L. Lieben Prize of the Austrian Academy of Sciences for Norbert Werner (Physics), as well as several national prizes. While the report lists some invited lectures, it does not give the impression that the scientists are frequently invited to present plenary or keynote lectures at major conferences,

<sup>1</sup> 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.

thereby ensuring visibility for the faculty's research. More than 40 researchers serve on editorial boards or as editors. While the list is likely to be at the top nationally, internationally, the researchers do not seem to play a major role in steering international scientific publishing. Regarding participation in science evaluation, the faculty participates in various evaluation panels, including the prestigious ERC and EC Horizon panels (however, these seem to be limited to scientists affiliated with RECETOX). Finally, the faculty is working to increase its visibility and international standing by inviting successful international scientists to various seminars and lecture series. Another way in which the faculty increases its international visibility is by participating in large international projects such as CETOCOEN of RECETOX and LIFE in Salt Marshes (Biology).

The panel noted the low proportion of female academics at the associate and full professor levels. This suggests a loss of talent due to the faculty's limited success in attracting accomplished women and retaining and promoting talent within the faculty.

#### Recommendations:

The panel recommends increasing visibility through a continuous effort to attract the best national and international academics. The faculty has already had success with the ERA Chair Programme, which provides funding to attract high-profile researchers. Such efforts should continue. For current staff, greater involvement in international collaborations through MSCA doctoral networks and related activities is recommended. Building visibility is a long-term project that can best be achieved by hosting prominent scientists who would be given more space at conferences, scientific journals and international academies. It may also be worth considering attractive openings for guest professorships lasting 6–12 months, which would enable foreign scientists to spend their sabbatical leave at the faculty. Given the excellent infrastructure, this could increase visibility and collaboration potential. Finally, fostering a more inclusive and welcoming environment could broaden the recruitment pool and ultimately enhance the faculty's international visibility. The percentage of female professors (10%) and female associate professors (17%) is low. A system of mentoring and internal checks should be implemented.

## 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### Qualitative assessment:

The selected 10 best projects include 1 ERC StG and EU-LIFE (both in biology), Horizon Europe grant CETOCOEN and ERA Chair (both RECETOX), 3 EXPRO GACR projects (2x biology, 1x physics), a list of research infrastructure projects, an involvement in a national project in health research EXCELES, and the Czech Antarctic Research Programme. The tables contain many projects, but the overwhelming part seems to be in biology and environmental sciences. The contract research activities show more projects from the chemistry and earth sciences.

The listed projects are of high quality and show that the faculty host research groups doing research at the international level. The list also emphasizes that the faculty sees its important role in supporting and enabling research via infrastructures. However, the list does not clearly cover the whole breath of the faculty and leaves the impression of differences between the institutes and centers. The panel had the same impression during the interview. Hence, part of the faculty certainly executes excellent projects and has a strong vision and drive in research funding and organization, while other parts of the faculty are weaker. The overall rating is outstanding but it should be noted that the level is not maintained across all parts of the faculty.

#### Recommendations:

The panel recommends evaluating faculty members at departmental level and creating a plan to strengthen cohesion. A clear plan for activating the weaker departments should be created. The panel lacked a vision and strategy for hiring new assistant-, associate- and full professors. A clear strategy for new hires should support the weaker parts of the faculty. Support for the already excellent parts of the faculty should continue.

Future relocations within the faculty/university should allow the physics departments to be placed in the same location.

The panel also recommended establishing a mentoring system for young scientists to help them develop clear research objectives and secure adequate funding. In this respect, the panel noted Prof. Klanova's international standing, but raised a question: Who will be the next Klanova? The answer is not obvious, nor is it clear whether there is a proper career and mentoring plan in place to develop the next generation of Klanova-level researchers.

### 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]:

4 - Very good

#### Qualitative assessment:

The faculty is involved in research that has a direct impact on society. They conduct research into technology and medicine applications. They also contribute to large-scale environmental monitoring campaigns. The list of the most prominent activities includes several patents, but it is unclear whether these have been licensed and the technologies implemented, whether they will lead to start-ups, or if they are merely patents. The activities are aligned with the sustainability goals. However, the gender dimension is missing as no activities with such potential impact are performed.

The panel considers the level of societal engagement through the campaigns to be exceptionally good. Collaborations with industry in the fields of physics and chemistry also seem to be very successful, with the potential to have a large societal impact.

#### Recommendations:

The panel recommends continuing in the current activities.

Regarding patents, the panel recommends licensing them because stand-alone patents have no impact. The faculty should encourage start-up activities.

## 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

#### Qualitative assessment:

We observed that the faculty fosters an environment that facilitates contact with commercial and industrial partners. The faculty co-established the spin-off company Casinvent, which conducts pharmaceutical research based on faculty patents and additional research commissioned by the faculty. In 2006, the faculty established Enantis, a MUNI spin-off company focusing on the application of patented research in the medicinal and cosmetic industries. The faculty also receives licence fees and royalties from several patented technologies. The faculty fosters an environment that facilitates contact with commercial and industrial partners.

The two spin-off companies associated with the faculty are a major success and an outstanding example of the transfer of results into practice. However, for a faculty of this size, one would expect many more licensed patents and higher revenues. There is also no mention of possible start-up companies.

#### Recommendations:

The panel recommends analyzing the possibilities for creating start-up companies and encouraging a more entrepreneurial attitude among faculty members.

## 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### Qualitative assessment:

The faculty plays an active role in popularising R&D&I and science communication. It targets various audiences, including school pupils, university applicants, members of the public and policy stakeholders. The faculty systematically organises and participates in national and regional outreach events, such as Science and Technology Week, Researchers' Night and the Science Fair. It also engages in school visits, popular science lectures and mentoring activities. It also maintains several permanent exhibitions and public facilities, including the Botanical Garden, the Geological Pavilion

and the Brno Planetarium. Prominent research results are communicated to stakeholders and the public. Overall, the faculty's science communication is excellent.

**Recommendations:**

The panel recommends continuing with the popularization and communication strategy as it is.

## 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]:**

**3 - Average**

**Qualitative assessment:**

Recommendation → Implementation

1. Transfer of practices in (research, patenting) from RECETOX and CEPLANT to other parts of the faculty

Implementation: As CEPLANT was not discussed during the interview or mentioned in the self-evaluation, it will not be addressed further. However, RECETOX differs distinctly from the other parts of the faculty in terms of the number of EU grants received. The report also suggests that they excel in applied research. Nevertheless, other departments within the faculty are also active, including the aforementioned successful technology projects and spin-off companies working on patented research. It is most likely that there has been an improvement.

2. Better collaboration with TTO

Implementation: Successful licensing in collaboration with the Technology Transfer Office (TTO) is evidence of improved collaboration.

3. Increase international recognition by stronger internationalization

Implementation: There is no evidence to suggest that the faculty would engage in stronger internationalisation. This issue is not addressed in the report. The self-evaluation lists three major awards for leading faculty scientists (see above). However, these awards are from 2021 (2x) and 2023. While commendable, they do not result from the general recommendation to increase the faculty's internationalisation.

4. Improve outreach in online media

Implementation: The outreach seems to be very effective. Although the online outreach through social media is not discussed in detail, it is standard nowadays and should be incorporated.

**Recommendations:**

1. The panel strongly recommends taking concrete and immediate steps to advance the internationalization of the faculty, meaning the academic staff rather than the Ph.D. candidates or postdoctoral researchers. In discussions with Ph.D. students, there was a clear and repeated desire for more courses and communication in English. At the same time, the university leadership expressed their ambition to be recognized as a leading European research university. However, the current level of internationalization of the

faculty falls short of what is needed to realize this vision. This issue was raised in the previous evaluation but was largely disregarded; the current self-assessment does not acknowledge its significance. To move forward, we urge the faculty to shift away from relying on a regional recruitment base and actively invest in building a truly international academic environment.

## 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                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | <b>NOT RATED</b>       |
| 3.2 Recognition by the research community                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | <b>4 - Very good</b>   |
| 3.3 Research projects                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| 3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <b>4 - Very good</b>   |
| 3.5 Transfer of results into practice                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | <b>4 - Very good</b>   |
| 3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| 3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <b>3 - Average</b>     |
| <b>Average rating [1–5]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | <b>4 - Very good</b>   |
| <b>Grade [A–D]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <b>B</b>               |
| <b>Summary assessment:</b><br><p>The panel ranked the Faculty of Science at Masaryk University as a strong, competitive research institution with notable achievements and well-developed infrastructure. The faculty hosts numerous internationally recognized researchers and has demonstrated success in securing prestigious grants, such as those from the European Research Council (ERC) and Horizon Europe. However, its research community's visibility on the international stage could be improved, particularly through increased participation in major conferences and editorial roles.</p> <p>The panel praised the faculty's research portfolio, which includes exceptional projects, particularly in biology and environmental sciences. These projects reflect a high level of ambition and alignment with the faculty's strategic goals. The panel also noted disparities in performance across departments, calling for clearer hiring and development strategies to strengthen weaker units and foster institutional cohesion. The mentoring of young researchers was identified as a critical need, and concerns were raised about succession planning for leading scientists.</p> <p>Regarding societal impact, the faculty is engaged in projects with clear practical relevance, including patents and environmental monitoring. Nevertheless, the panel questioned the extent to which these patents are being commercialized and encouraged further efforts in licensing and start-up formation.</p> <p>There have been successes in the transfer of research into practice, notably through the establishment of two spin-off companies. Yet, given its size, the panel expected broader entrepreneurial output from the faculty. Similarly, while science communication and public</p> |                        |

engagement were commended as exemplary, implementation of previous recommendations, particularly those regarding internationalization, was deemed insufficient.

The panel noted unequal paths for female and male academics. While some departments have good representation of female principal investigators (PIs), the panel was shocked that, overall, only ~10% of professors are female, which is less than in 2019 (12%). Among associate professors, 17% are female (compared to 15% in 2019), and among assistant professors, 33% are female (compared to 30% in 2019). The current agenda to improve the situation only focuses on helping women with issues around maternity leave and childcare, which is a good start but overall not enough. The panel suggested to implement clear career plans and a mentoring scheme to insure that female academics' career paths are the same as those of male academics. The panel emphasized the need to strategically support underperforming departments, actively pursue internationalization at the academic staff level, and strengthen mentoring and innovation pathways to sustain long-term excellence.

Overall, the panel would like to have evaluated the faculty with a high rating, an "A" grade, because of the outstanding performance in the research projects, which is the most critical evaluation criterion. However, as the mark is a plain mathematical average, the final scores are 4 out of 5, and the grade is B.

#### **Summary recommendations:**

##### **Recognition by the Research Community**

1. Increase international visibility by attracting top national and international academics.
2. Continue participation in programs like the ERA Chair.
3. Enhance involvement of current staff in international collaborations (e.g., MSCA networks).
4. Consider establishing guest professorships (6–12 months) to attract foreign sabbatical visitors.
5. Increase the number of female academics at senior professor levels.

##### **Research Projects**

1. Evaluate staff at the departmental level to identify and support weaker units.
2. Develop a clear hiring strategy for assistant, associate, and full professors to support underperforming areas.
3. Support strong-performing departments while improving cohesion across the faculty.
4. Relocate physics departments into a single location for better integration.
5. Establish a mentoring system for young scientists to cultivate future leaders.

##### **Research Results with Societal Impact & Transfer of Results into Practice**

1. License patents to maximize impact.
2. Analyze opportunities for creating more start-ups.
3. Foster a stronger entrepreneurial culture among staff.

## EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

**NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University**

**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 Faculty of the Humanities and Arts is a large faculty, which acts as an umbrella for a somewhat disparate group of departments (20) and in addition to three departments from social sciences. Their activity and stated mission are divided between education and research. The SER gives a convincing and well-supported statement of a thriving research environment and supported by good examples of projects of high international and local value and those with significant practical and societal impact.

In terms of student numbers, this is the largest faculty at Masaryk University. Over the census period, approximately 330 research-active staff (less than half female) catered to over 17.000 overwhelmingly female students. The students can choose from an impressive menu of postgraduate, undergraduate, and lifelong learning programmes (61 UG, 75 MA, 58 PG, 38 LLL).

Similar to the other MUNI faculties, the Faculty of Humanities and Arts suffers the effect of the 'leaky pipeline' – identified in M4 - a gender imbalance when it comes to promoting senior staff, where male staff outnumber female by a wide margin at the assistant professor and professor level. In addition to gender, there is also a notable age imbalance with a distinctly lower number of researchers over 50.

This faculty is in a very different place from that described in the previous international evaluation with an active research culture including a large number of impressive grants in the field of 'basic research' (as stated in the SER), as well as impactful digital humanities projects, experimental research and research focused on societal risks. The evaluators noted a good balance of local, national and internationally relevant research.

### 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

### Qualitative assessment:<sup>1</sup>

The unit's position in the R&D&I community is robust and internationally competitive, with sustained recognition across research leadership, project funding, scholarly output, and institutional visibility. The faculty has been able both to foster and attract outstanding researchers. The awards and roles held by both senior and early-career researchers demonstrate not only prestige but also a strong pipeline of emerging talent, positioning the Faculty of Arts for continued excellence and growth. Within the unit, there are recipients of some of the **most prestigious national scientific awards**, such as:

- The **Czech Head Award**, often referred to as the "Czech Nobel Prize", awarded to Jiří Macháček. His leadership of a 17 million EUR project underscores major national and international significance.
- The **Silver Commemorative Medal of Charles University** awarded to Jiří Kroupa for major academic contributions.
- Awards to **early-career researchers** like Martin Lang (International Association for the Psychology of Religion) and Marcin Wągiel (E.W. Beth Dissertation Prize), both of whom have since secured prestigious funding and contributed significantly to their fields.

Faculty members serve on editorial boards of **WOS/Scopus-indexed journals**, indicating academic credibility and influence. Academics were invited to lecture at institutions ranked highly in **QS World University Rankings**, suggesting strong international integration and recognition by elite academic circles. Numerous faculty members serve as **panel members or reviewers for leading international funding bodies**, including the ERC, Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions, and national agencies (e.g., Denmark's DFF, Poland's NSC), which further highlights the **depth and continuity of involvement in the global research funding ecosystem**.

### Recommendations:

- Develop targeted communication strategies to promote recent award wins and ongoing high-profile projects to international audiences.
- Use award-winning individuals as institutional ambassadors
- Create structured mentoring and grant-writing workshops
- Develop a small-grant structure for the preparation of the ERC grants.
- Encourage more academics to apply for leadership roles in international grant panels or editorial boards by offering institutional incentives.
- Invite international scholars for short stays or visiting professorships in connection with flagship projects,

<sup>1</sup> 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### Qualitative assessment:

The faculty has a good number of impressive research outputs in the period of the census especially in the field of historical studies (art history and archaeology should be singled out) which fulfils one of the core research strategies defined as the investigation, interpretation and protection of cultural heritage. There is a degree of interdisciplinarity and a good balance between projects focused on local heritage and broader international themes and horizons. Digital humanities offer a promising strand of research that is both applicable and socially engaged. Several 'labs' offer an experimental ground for further research, although it is not entirely clear how this is manifesting itself in future collaborative grant applications.

Many of the highlighted projects engage research partners within the Masaryk University (this is notable within digital humanities) as well as external partners, especially Charles University, with which there exists a long-standing and fruitful partnership across several Arts and Humanities disciplines.

The income from grants, where the faculty is the main beneficiary, is relatively stable (though not showing a particularly strong upward trajectory), however it does demonstrate a good range of both government-based and EU funding. The faculty demonstrates significant leadership in this area across the faculties of MUNI.

#### Recommendations:

The evaluators encourage the faculty to build on its current successes and to maintain the momentum of grant applications, especially of the international (EU) calibre. It would be good to see the recent successes amplified across other fields of the humanities in the faculty. This could be achieved through better use of sabbaticals, targeted managerial support, and more sharing of experience of successful grant applications in different disciplinary areas.

With its high number of students and internationally recognised scholars, the faculty should continue to build a research environment which will make it an international destination for innovative and socially impactful research and a subject leader nationally as well as locally.

The fragmented, multidepartmental nature of the faculty is striking, but could be turned into an advantage through increased cross-disciplinarity. This will also help the faculty to increase its visibility within MUNI and create a potential for further partnerships.

### 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

**Qualitative assessment:** The faculty has a convincing and broad portfolio of applied results, of which some have found their way to a large group of users. The portfolio is fully in line with the mission and vision of the faculty, responding to societal challenges. Some of the more appealing results contribute to support groups with special needs; in other cases, this is not relevant. Sustainability seems to be well taken into account. We are impressed by this result both in terms of the creativity it shows and the required collaboration with other units.

**Recommendations:** We recommend that the faculty continues these efforts and suggests that they may be further enhanced by using the expertise of the TTO-unit of the university.

## 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

**Qualitative assessment:** It is impressive to see that some of the research results have been brought to a point where they can be profited from by a large audience. There are some good examples such as Oopravidlo, an on-line proofreader and CzechME a language learning app. Both can be considered real successes which gives us the evaluation committee the impression that a faculty of this scale could harbour more such initiatives.

**Recommendations:** Given the described successes under 3.4, it is somewhat surprising to learn that the faculty does not consider the commercialisation of its results relevant. We believe that some of the results under 3.4 prove otherwise and that some of these results lend themselves to a more commercial approach. We understand that not all staff members feel the need to contribute to the faculty results in this way; that does not mean it is not relevant for all researchers. Students themselves might be interested in developing their own business growing out of some result that they have worked on during (the final stages of) their studies. We recommend that the faculty starts taking seriously the commercialization of some of its research results by, e.g., creating some faculty lab or start-up courses in cooperation with TTO to allow students and staff to learn about the commercialization of their research.

Further recommendation is for the faculty to get adequate support from the university in pursuing this as a way of building the Masaryk brand.

## 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]:

4 - Very good

#### Qualitative assessment:

The Faculty of Arts demonstrates a strong and evolving commitment to the popularization of research, development, and innovation (R&D&I), particularly through culturally resonant public programming, frequent media engagement, and accessible digital resources. The most significant are:

**Humanities Week** is a long-standing public event organized annually since 2014 to celebrate UNESCO World Philosophy Day. Initially local to Masaryk University, it has grown into a nationwide event (as of 2023) under the auspices of the Association of Deans of Philosophical Faculties of the Czech Republic. All events are free and open to the public, exemplifying a commitment to inclusive access to academic knowledge. Past themes have reflected engagement with societal issues encouraging interdisciplinary and public reflection on timely matters.

**Frequent Media Engagement** of over 200 media appearances (TV, radio, print) have been documented in the assessment period. Academics from the Faculty of Arts appear regularly on **Czech Television**, a national broadcaster, ensuring high public reach and promoting critical reflection and historical context in the public sphere.

Importantly, the Faculty maintains multiple public research websites that translate academic outputs into accessible formats, especially [Digitalia MUNI ARTS](#): Digitizing cultural and historical resources, [Opravidlo](#): A public-oriented proofreading and language tool, [SYRI](#): Communicating systemic risks and disease impacts, with clear societal relevance and the resources of the [Centre for the Digital Research of Religion](#): Public scholarship on religion in society. These digital platforms act as bridges between scholarly research and public understanding, extending access to non-specialist audiences.

#### Recommendations:

Establish resources (training, funding, time allocation) for staff to engage in communication and outreach in the following ways:

- encourage research projects to include public engagement components.
- partner with communication professionals to train researchers in storytelling, media interaction, and digital content creation.
- pair early-career researchers with experienced public communicators within or outside the faculty.
- run “How I communicated my research” sessions led by faculty members who successfully engaged the public.

## 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### Qualitative assessment:

The faculty has demonstrated that it has taken on board many of the recommendations of the previous evaluation, especially in the following areas.

1. The recommendation to increase the number of grants; above all, international funding has led to a number of measures such as improvement of the competence of the grant office, inductions in grant writing, and financial incentives for applicants when their grants reach certain stages. The faculty has demonstrated that this has resulted in an increased number of successful grants (including two ERC grants).
2. The faculty has presented evidence of increased income from contract researchers who can also be part-funded by the faculty in the field of applied research.
3. The recommendation to deepen and extend society-oriented research and projects has been especially developed by the department of languages and of education.
4. The student and research body are becoming more internationally integrated through a number of schemes for stays abroad (supported internally and by Erasmus+), as well as the increased use of English and a preference for publications in internationally recognised journals and publishing houses.
5. The high dropout rate of PhDs noted across MUNI is being addressed by the national reform of PhD studies and the introduction of 'minimum income requirement' starting in September of 2025. A more rigorous system of monitoring the quality of PhD projects and a better funding system have been put into place. It is hoped that this will have an immediate and beneficial effect on student retention.
6. The criticism of the size of the faculty has been addressed by fostering interdepartmental collaborations, which could lead to meaningful, internally-generated mergers. A contraction of PhD programmes has already taken place in the department of languages.

#### Recommendations:

- The panel recommends that the faculty should continue to build on these improvements.
- The size of the faculty remains an issue and has been recognised by this evaluation panel as well as the previous. There are some noted overlaps with other faculties in areas such as Education and Psychology. In our discussion, the management demonstrated their awareness of the suboptimal size of the faculty but they are not yet in a position to overcome concerns over a potential restructure. The panel is sympathetic to their

concerns as well as the imperative that any restructure should be beneficial and meaningful to the staff and students of the faculty.

- The evaluators recommend a more systematic search for the commonalities and for the ways to develop them institutionally within the faculty. This can be achieved in a number of ways, including by further fostering and incentivising shared projects and best practices between departments.
- To continue to monitor the retention of PhD students in light of recent reforms.
- To take more proactive measures than those highlighted in the SER with regard to gender and age imbalance, and to address the lack of support for women in senior academic roles.
- To use sabbaticals and mentoring to enhance the success rate of promotion to the senior academic positions (assistant professor and professor).

## 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                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | <b>NOT RATED</b>       |
| 3.2 Recognition by the research community                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| 3.3 Research projects                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| 3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | <b>4 - Very good</b>   |
| 3.5 Transfer of results into practice                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | <b>4 - Very good</b>   |
| 3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | <b>4 - Very good</b>   |
| 3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| <b>Average rating [1–5]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| <b>Grade [A–D]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | <b>A</b>               |
| <p><b>Summary assessment:</b></p> <p>The Faculty of the Humanities and Arts is a large and thriving community of students and researchers. The SER gives a convincing picture of this research environment, supported by good examples of projects of international and local value and those with significant practical and societal impact.</p> <p>The faculty suffers from the effect of the ‘leaky pipeline’ – identified in M4 - a gender imbalance when it comes to promoting senior staff, where male staff outnumber female by a wide margin at the assistant professor and professor level.</p> <p>This faculty has made a big leap forward compared to the previous international evaluation with an active research culture including a large number of impressive grants in the field of ‘basic research’, as well as impactful digital humanities projects, experimental research and research focused on societal risks.</p> <p>The unit's position in the R&amp;D&amp;I community is robust and internationally competitive, with sustained recognition across research leadership, project funding, scholarly output, and</p> |                        |

institutional visibility. The faculty has been able to both foster and attract outstanding researchers. The awards and roles held by both senior and early-career researchers demonstrate not only prestige but also a strong pipeline of emerging talent, positioning the Faculty of Arts for continued excellence and growth.

The faculty has a good number of impressive research outputs in the period of the census. There is a degree of interdisciplinarity and a good balance between projects focused on local heritage and broader international themes and horizons. Digital humanities offer a promising strand of applicable and socially engaged research. Several 'labs' offer an experimental ground for further research, although it is not entirely clear how this is manifesting itself in future collaborative grant applications.

There are several impressive examples of research results that have been brought to a point where they can be profited from by a large audience.

The Faculty of Arts demonstrates a strong and evolving commitment to the popularization of research, development, and innovation (R&D&I), particularly through culturally resonant public programming, frequent media engagement, and accessible digital resources.

The faculty has demonstrated that it has taken on board many of the recommendations of the previous evaluation especially in the areas mentioned above.

#### **Summary recommendations:**

The best summary of the evaluation panel's recommendations is to continue to work in the direction that the faculty has taken. To continue to build on an internationally visible research environment in which interdisciplinary research may flourish as a result of the rich and diverse breeding ground; to find ways to safeguard for the future methods which brought about successes of the past and to reinforce internal structure which helped to achieve them; to make use of expertise from within other faculties at MUNI and of the supporting services in order to form strong coalitions in larger grant applications. Finally, to establish resources (training, funding, time allocation) for staff to engage in communication and outreach.

## EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

**NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Education, Masaryk University**

**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 Faculty of Education includes two research institutes and twenty departments through which basic and applied research is conducted. The self-evaluation report described lively and far-reaching research and teaching activities. Particularly noteworthy is their effort in relation to development projects and results that can be transferred into practice and as such have a social impact. The nearly 400 staff (including non-academic staff and 270 academics), over half of whom are women, serve a mainly female student body of nearly 5000 students. The students avail of just short of 30 bachelor's degree programmes, a five-year master's program, 25 follow-up master's programs, and eight doctoral programs.

In relation to academic progression, the faculty team ranges from lecturers to full professors. While early-career researchers are supported via the Postdoctoral School, senior researchers are reinforced in their progression with initiatives such as international internships, support for habilitation, and encouragement for professorial appointments.

Recommendations from the 2020 evaluation largely were enacted commensurate with staffing levels and expertise. There clearly is an enhanced emphasis on the development of internationally relevant as well as interdisciplinary research. Furthermore, there is an intense focus on research that is socially important and impactful for education and social sciences more generally. New and innovative didactic methods are being developed mainly in relation of systems, curricula and teaching methods. PED projects are supported by a large variety of funders. These developments are a clear and well-planned response to previous feedback in 2020 and again the internal review in 2022.

### 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

### Qualitative assessment:<sup>1</sup>

The Faculty of Education plays a key role in research topics related to pedagogy and didactics in the local and national community. These efforts are rewarded internally and externally by numerous awards to individual members of staff, including MUNI Scientist Awards for Outstanding Research Results, MUNI Innovation Awards, as well as awards from the Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sports, the Czech Association for Educational Research. Of particular note in relation to social impact, are various Rector's Awards for the Development of Society, for Research Artistic Achievement. These were bestowed on staff for volunteering and for their active contributions to societal development. Consequently, a lively atmosphere of rewarding achievements seems to prevail that has led to a good working environment.

International impact is evidenced by publications in national and international journals with high impact factors as well as regular invitations of staff onto editorial boards of professional and scientific journals in a range of educational areas. Most of the journals targeted for PED publications are indexed in Scopus and/or Web of Science (WoS).

Further evidence of national as well as international social and scientific impact is the fact that staff are significantly involved in national and international (mainly European) professional associations, such as the Czech Association for Educational Research, Czech Pedagogical Society, as well as European Narratology Network, Bioethics Commission RVVI, European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, European Educational Research Association (EERA), European Association for Research on Learning and Instruction (EARLI).

### Recommendations:

Internationalisation and interdisciplinarity has clearly improved since the last evaluation. Again, the focus now needs to be on maintenance as well as generalisation of these important developments and further broaden of these past EU boundaries.

It is good to see leadership positions are taken up by PED colleagues nationally and across Europe. The focus now should be on broadening these roles to other international contexts, e.g., outside of Europe by establishing leadership within professional societies and journals editorships.

Further focus should be on support for early career scientists for writing funding applications as well as journal papers, e.g., internal mentor system, internal peer-review should be enhanced.

The use of sabbaticals should be encouraged more proactively. The requirement to spend significant amounts of time abroad during sabbaticals should be reconsidered and be made flexible based on individual circumstances. There should not be any salary reduction during sabbatical.

Training in Higher Education teaching skills for academic staff at Masaryk (especially those newly appointed) should be made mandatory. The training should be similar to a Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education Teaching (PGCET) offered at some international universities (e.g., <https://www.qub.ac.uk/directorates/AcademicStudentAffairs/Publications/DASAPoliciesandProceduresManual/filestore/Filetoupload,128165,en.pdf>). For existing staff, a system of evidencing Higher Education teaching skills should be set up (e.g., through submission of portfolio or reflection).

<sup>1</sup> 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

#### Qualitative assessment:

The Faculty of Education focusses on four main areas of research:

1. Basic research projects focus mainly on changing social and cultural contexts, in particular in relation to social and school inclusion, education quality, and teaching innovations. Importantly, this area covers topics related to evidence-based responses to social inequalities and crises (e.g., COVID-19; integration of Ukrainian students and staff), and other kinds of challenges (e.g., digitalization).
2. Applied research projects primarily are developmental and focus on creating useful outputs, such as educational programs, textbooks, methodological guides, teaching materials, instructional experiments, and digital learning applications. Importantly, these projects commonly use an iterative process of design, testing, revision, and implementation into practice and policy impact. Noteworthy in this context in particular, is the work of the Institute of Special Education.
3. In addition to the applied work, there is more specific practice-oriented research that aims to support educational professionals within research and theoretical contexts. The methodologies used in this area are mainly action research, experimentation, and reflection to ensure that findings directly impact educational processes. This functions to improve or develop innovative pedagogies in initial teacher training as well as post-qualifying continuous professional development.
4. Artistic research primarily is conducted through visual art and music pedagogy. This area of research aims to generate new knowledge as well as art creation, reflection, art mediation, and collaboration with galleries and otherwise engaging in the visual arts.

There also is a good collaboration with industrial partners that leads to improved impact on social impact and even commercialisation of some research findings that are utilized by state institutions, schools, and non-profit organizations.

#### Recommendations:

It is encouraging to see the increased focus on practical and application of projects and research. The main recommendation relates to the maintenance of some outputs post-project, i.e., it is important to ensure that the impact of research and grant project outputs are maintained.

Significant grant income is created to-date, although most of this funding is provided by funders that are either internal (MUNI), local (Czech), or have a more educational focus (Erasmus+).

It is recommended that a clearer focus should be put on seeking even more ambitious research funders, including ERC and Horizon. For this to be successful, all available support mechanisms should be utilised by researchers, including sabbaticals, return to work grants, peer-mentoring, and internal, national, and international interdisciplinary collaborations.

Attention should be given to the potential to publish in Q1 journals. While it is understood that much of the work in PED has a strong focus on immediate local/national social impact, it is important that findings are communicated to and analysed within international contexts, which would ensure that the work is interesting and impactful for the international community (academic as well as public).

The existing unique emphasis on special educational needs (SEN) should be encouraged and extended. Due to historical structural issues there appears to be a gap in relation to post-primary pupils with SEN. Research in this area should be encouraged in line with restructuring recommendations (see 3.5).

### 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### Qualitative assessment:

PED's research programme and outcomes significantly contribute to the development of education, inclusion, and educational policies. Consequently, the work impacts on individuals, groups, and society more generally. Particularly encouraging is the social impact on students and their families (particularly those with special educational needs), as well as schools and teachers. Furthermore, there is a clear emphasis on practical applications to support pedagogical practice as well as developing educational concepts, curricula, teaching, and learning.

An important factor for educational research is the focus on improving the quality and accessibility to quality education, as well as supporting diversity, equality, and inclusion. Improvements are achieved through projects that develop new methods and teaching tools, including digital tools and technologies. Some very notable examples were mentioned in the Self-Evaluation Report.

#### Recommendations:

While there clearly is an impact on society in the short-term (e.g., during each of the project) and there are some efforts to encourage long-term impact (particularly in the arts and special education department/institute), the outreach to the community locally, nationally, and internationally should be enhanced. The development of a 'clinical school' is encouraging, and it will be important that the impact of this is felt in the community.

It should be recognised that it is impossible to retain this high-level of social and societal impact while at the same time producing very high-level academic publications. Consequently, successes in relation to social impact should be valued more clearly and recognised and rewarded more fully within the university system (i.e., rewards, such as points in promotion exercises, should be given equivalently to Q1 publications).

## 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### Qualitative assessment:

This section of the self-report focuses on a description of the Technology Transfer Office (TTO MUNI). It explained that while over the past 20 years, the university has established this integral unit to encourage and support practical application of University's research results. Yet, the report states that PED has not utilised TTO MUNI to-date. The report explained that to some degree this is due to the nature of research in pedagogy and education that results in the development and evaluation of findings and materials that generally are shared openly and therefore free to the end user, not focussed on commercialisation (i.e., open science).

However, despite lack of use of TTO MUNI, there are many examples of transfer of results into practice, especially in the arts, special needs education (particularly for autistic pupils), and other areas of pedagogy.

#### Recommendations:

Given the recommendation under Section 3.3 regarding the long-term impact of PED research and projects on society locally, it is important to remain vigilant and ensure long-term impact of important findings and outputs also is ensured nationally and internationally.

PED should explore the potential use of TTO MUNI, for example for specific teaching materials (e.g., books series; online resources) and methodologies (e.g., telehealth, behavioural interventions to support pupils with developmental disabilities and their families) that are developed within PED and that could have the potential for commercialisation, without losing societal impact or the very commendable open science philosophy. Having said this, the IEP understands and supports the philosophy of open science that is free to the users. As such, an exploration of the potential of TTO MUNI involvement is recommended, however, a decision not to commercialise would be readily acceptable.

Another important consideration is as follows:

The historical situation is that the education of teachers is divided between PED (for primary educators for 6-14-year-olds) and other Faculties/Department of Education (for teachers of 13-18-year-olds). This seems a curious situation and needs to be addressed.

While presently there appears to be some cross-over in terms of teaching, all teacher training should be moved into PED (with expertise in pedagogy), with subject specific teaching (e.g., chemistry for teachers of chemistry) conducted in collaboration with colleagues from other Faculties/departments. This shift will avoid duplication and ensure that teacher training benefits from the valuable expertise in pedagogy etc. that has accumulated in PED over decades.

With an increase in the diversity of pupils in mainstream classrooms (e.g., more ethnically diverse newcomer children; more children with SEN) the need for teachers to be skilled in terms of equality and inclusion is rising. The recommended restructuring will make teacher training more efficient and effective. Ultimately it will benefit society by providing teachers that are not only highly skilled in their subject area but also experts in pedagogy, classroom management, SEN, inclusion and diversity. It also would encourage more focused, important and impactful research into pedagogy for all age groups, including 13–18-year-olds, where there seems to be a significant lack of research focus under the present arrangements.

## 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### Qualitative assessment:

PED actively engages in research popularization of R&D&I and public communication through a number of important and impactful activities that make scientific knowledge accessible to a broader audience and to raise awareness of its research activities in several different areas.

PED actively participates in public discussions on educational policy through expert commentary, analyses, and recommendations. Experts appear on public media (e.g., television and radio) and social media, responding to contemporary challenges and current issues in education with a focus on teaching quality, inclusion, digital transformation, and teacher professional development.

Popularization also is ensured via lectures, workshops, seminars, events and festivals for the professional community as well as the general public. Students are actively involved in student-led initiatives. For example, PED students initiated Otevřeno, now a nationwide student organization that focusses on modernising teacher training and organises educational events. Another initiative is the “Night of Education”, an annual event that inspires future and early-career teachers. Another good example is the annual Europe-wide “Czech European Research Night”, that has developed into a popular science event that facilitates access to scientists for the general public.

Diversity, culture, and informal education are supported in the “Festival of Inclusive Culture” (launched in 2023), a multi-day community cultural event based on inclusive developments in the socio-cultural field. The “Science Festival” and “Brno Art Week” are further examples of R&D&I activities that aim to communicate with the public, including videos about the graffiti scene in Brno, featuring fashion designers, guided walks through art in the public space of the city, and monument care and demolition, or sensitive reconstructions of historically valuable buildings.

With regards to establishing creative learning environments, PED engages in a range of activities, such as the “Open Art Studio” through which inclusion is activated in artistic and art-based education, especially for children, adolescents, and adults with differences (i.e., Outsider Art, Disability Art, or Art for Therapy). Mjuni (Masaryk University Junior University) is designed to introduce children and youth (aged 9–18) to academia and raise their interest in future study. The Summer School is a volunteer program organised to alleviate educational gaps for students from socially disadvantaged backgrounds.

Furthermore, PED publishes popular books in Czech and English, in particular related to art and sculptures (e.g., Masaryk University Press; the Komenský Journal). In addition to publishing their own new books, PED is engaged in translating international books that previously were not available to Czech speakers (i.e., a key US-authored textbook “Applied Behavioural Analysis” and the German-authored “Myths – Fallacies – Untruths”). Furthermore, PED organises competitions for pupils and students, including “Geography Olympiads” for 16 to 19-year-old geography students from all over the world.

#### **Recommendations:**

There are substantial and notable activities to ensure R&D&I and communication with the public. These activities should be supported and where possible to be extended in the future. In addition, an expansion of these innovative activities into further national and international contexts is encouraged.

There should be a clear and explicit strategy plan for the faculty as a whole, as well as individual Departments, that maps onto the University Strategy.

## **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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### **Qualitative assessment:**

Recommendations from the previous evaluation appear to have been taken on board seriously. For example, a more intense focus on socially relevant and applied and practical research has developed over the period. Additionally, an increased emphasis was put on research that supports innovative education methods and responds to the demands of the changing environment. The need for further cooperation with non-academic sectors, highlighted in the previous review, also is noteworthy.

A common theme in the recommendations was the need to strengthen the focus on collaborative (national and international) research with social relevance. PED has responded to these recommendations in a pro-active way by acquiring 12 new basic research projects and 15 new applied research projects. These projects are embedded in a collaborative environment between different scientific areas within PED and external partners (e.g., public institutions, schools, and non-profit organizations). Efforts to engage in internationally relevant and interdisciplinarity in research is evident.

PED established a pillar within the Strategy for Supporting Publication and Research to support the preparation of grant applications. They also introduced a grant scheme to support authors in creating popularization outputs. As a consequence, a good number of the outputs/staff have been awarded internal recognition (e.g., MUNI Dean's Award).

The long-term development goals of PED include building a “Clinical School” as a space for intensive collaboration for the education of future teachers and research (e.g., within the project OP JAK MUNI 4 PREGRAD). This will benefit pre-service teacher education and contribute to strengthening initial training in accordance with the approved Teacher Education Reform in the Czech Republic, including the subject-specific competence framework and the national competence framework.

#### Recommendations:

While there are clear signs of progress in terms of implementing the recommendations from the previous evaluation, some of the implementation still is aspirational rather than practical. The research environment clearly has been enhanced since the last evaluation. This is conducive and supportive and encourages internationalisation, interdisciplinarity, and applied/practice application. This development should continue to be encouraged and reinforced.

### 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                                                | <b>NOT RATED</b>       |
| 3.2 Recognition by the research community                                                                   | <b>4 - Very good</b>   |
| 3.3 Research projects                                                                                       | <b>4 - Very good</b>   |
| 3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society                                         | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| 3.5 Transfer of results into practice                                                                       | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| 3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| 3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module                                                         | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| <b>Average rating [1–5]:</b>                                                                                | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| <b>Grade [A–D]:</b>                                                                                         | <b>A</b>               |

#### Summary assessment:

Overall, the progress the PED has made since the last evaluation is substantial and significant. We commend the leadership and the team of PED for creating a positive working environment that facilitates bringing out the best in the whole Faculty team.

This positive working environment has clear positive consequences for students as well as research. In particular, it is apparent that PED has a significant social impact locally in Brno and nationally, across the region, and internationally across Europe.

#### Summary recommendations:

In the main, PED should continue their positive and upwards trajectory and their positive and intense focus on socially relevant teaching and research.

PED clearly concentrates on teacher training for primary school age children, and this works very well. However, with regards to training teachers for post-primary school settings there should be a frank discussion about the potential of restructuring. As it stands, these teachers are trained via subject specific Faculties (e.g., Chemistry teachers are training the Department of Chemistry). While there seems to be some collaboration between PED and these other Departments/Faculties, an honest and open assessment of the workflow is necessary. We suggest restructuring that should be established on a collaborative basis, with central university management support.

It is suggested that all teacher training (primary and post-primary) and education research more generally should be located clearly within PED. This new structure should be delivered in collaboration with the other faculties with regard to the subjects teachers will specialise in. Reasons for the historical separation of teacher training should be critically evaluated, and new structures should be put in place, ensuring a modern and integrated approach to teacher training. This will benefit all teachers and pupils, including post-primary pupils and those with special educational needs.

The main recommendations for future developments in research relate to further expansion, in particular towards more significant high-quality publications to ensure that PED research is adequately recognised and disseminated. Research that is conducted with local/national contexts should be framed and analysed within international, rather than purely/mainly within local/national contexts. In other words, PED should avoid inward looking “self-marginalisation” and work on much more general applicability of their work and data within international contexts. This means that data collected locally/nationally are framed within an international context, either theoretically and/or practically.

Equally, PED should expand on the outreach to international collaborations by intensifying their outreach to international partners, in particular by involving international partner institutions in funding applications. While this is done very successfully in relation to EU funding, this should be expanded to and maintained with other international funders. Some possible examples: Fulbright; US Embassy Grants in Czech Republic; Global Research Council.

## EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

**NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Pharmacy, Masaryk University**

**FORD: 3 - Medical and health 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 Faculty of Pharmacy at MUNI is a research-intensive academic institution focused on pharmaceutical sciences. Its mission is to improve human and animal health. The faculty's mission encompasses education, scientific and professional activities, and societal engagement. The faculty emphasizes integration with medicine to advance personalized pharmacotherapy.

After transitioning from the University of Veterinary and Pharmaceutical Sciences in 2020, the faculty joined MU's biomedical ecosystem, gaining access to clinical settings and interdisciplinary research. The faculty offers one bachelor's program, two master's programs, and eight doctoral programs. Of the 1,172 students enrolled, 85% are women. The leadership of the faculty expressed a wish to grow in the number of students to about 2000 in the future.

The faculty is organized into six departments, five of which conduct laboratory-based research and one of which focuses on applied pharmacy. The faculty employs 113 academic staff with, according to the self-evaluation, a "remarkably balanced" gender profile and active involvement of early-career researchers. However, the panel noted that the percentage of female professors and associate professors has not changed since 2020, remaining at 0% and 29%, respectively, while the percentage of female assistant professors has declined from 67% in 2020 to 62%. The dean and all but one vice deans are male. Therefore, there is a serious problem with advancing female academics and their representation in faculty leadership. The self-evaluation does not seem to recognize this problem.

Research is predominantly in basic medical sciences (77.2%), with additional contributions from chemical and biological sciences. Activities include basic, applied, and contract research, often in collaboration with academic and industrial partners. The faculty engages in translational projects and preclinical development, taking advantage of the technical infrastructure and interdisciplinary links within MU.

## RECOGNITION BY THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY

| <b>3.2 Recognition by the research community</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                          |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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).                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                          |
| <b>Rating [1–5]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | <b>2 - Below average</b> |
| <p><b>Qualitative assessment:<sup>1</sup></b></p> <p>Recognition by the research community is limited. The self-evaluation report lists several national and local awards. Most importantly, Doc. Kolar received the Eduard Skarnitzl Medal for his lifetime contributions to pharmacy. Regarding the involvement of academic staff as editors and on editorial boards, the most notable activity is that of Doc. Kubova, who is the editor-in-chief of Czech and Slovak Pharmacy. Several other faculty members served on the editorial boards of low-ranked journals. Several faculty members were invited to seminars at foreign universities, and the evaluation lists several invited lectures at conferences. However, this list does not suggest that faculty members are prominent, internationally recognized scientists. The faculty deserves commendation for organizing seminars with international speakers, which should increase their visibility in the future. Their involvement in research evaluations is limited to a specialized program (no EU panels or GACR panels).</p> |                          |
| <p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <p>The faculty requires significant reform.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. They should move to the MUNI campus to take full advantage of its infrastructure and potential collaborations.</li> <li>2. Given the expected growth in student numbers, the faculty should strategically hire senior and junior academic staff. To this end, there should be a clear vision for research and education. The panel recommends establishing an advisory board to oversee the development of this vision and the new hires. The board should meet annually and maintain close ties with the faculty to ensure the development of a competitive MUNI faculty.</li> <li>3. The faculty should work to internationalize the academic staff. The panel recognizes the need for the Czech language in certain subjects of study. However, many subjects and the postgraduate program can be taught in English. Therefore, the need for the Czech language should not be used as an excuse against internationalization.</li> </ol>                             |                          |

## RESEARCH PROJECTS

| <b>3.3 Research projects</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 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. |                    |
| <b>Rating [1–5]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | <b>3 - Average</b> |

<sup>1</sup> 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.

#### Qualitative assessment:

Faculty members conduct basic and applied research in collaboration with industry. Researchers from all six departments participate, and funding comes from national agencies, regional development programs, and MU internal grants. Faculty roles range from principal investigator to co-investigator and subcontractor. However, the list of awards, research grants, and other indicators suggests that the pool of research questions is limited and focused on a few PIs. However, the panel noted the effort over the last five years to increase grant funding, which signals a change in attitude toward working on urgent research topics. The panel commended the intention to attract an international research leader through the ERA Chair Project to initiate new research directions. Unfortunately, this effort was unsuccessful. In comparison with other faculties, the financing level from research projects is very low.

#### Recommendations:

1. Each department should have a clear structure for senior and junior PIs. Each research group led by a PI must be able to secure grant support.
2. There should be greater involvement in international programs (MCSA doctoral networks and EU programs). Young academics should be encouraged to apply for these grants. The university has a well-developed grant application support system. Faculty should take advantage of it.
3. The ERA Chair Program is an excellent tool for attracting internationally visible senior scientists. The panel encourages continuing to apply for this program. Hires should align with the faculty's research strategy.
4. Grant support has been increasing. However, compared to other faculties, it is still below average. All young academics should apply for various national grants. Encourage small, independent projects to develop the habit of thinking about projects and raising the necessary funds to pursue them.

### 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]:

4 - Very good

#### Qualitative assessment:

The Faculty of Pharmacy lists several research outputs with societal relevance, which can be summarized as follows: 1) Detection tubes for detecting nerve agents; 2) Medicated feed pellets for fish; 3) Probiotic feed pellets for fish; 4) Wound dressings.

All of these results have clear practical relevance to human and animal health. However, the scope of societal impact is somewhat narrow. Though not explicitly stated, most results appear to have emerged from a single department, Pharmaceutical Technology, and are concentrated in applied formulation and device development.

The gender dimension is acknowledged only to clarify its inapplicability to aquatic animals. No effort is made to integrate gender-aware perspectives into research intended for human healthcare. The

aquaculture feed innovations address sustainability more substantively, but not systematically across all results.

**Recommendations:**

Pharmaceutical research is almost always relevant to society. The faculty should develop a strategy to encourage researchers in all departments to consider the practical applications of their research. The faculty should organize meetings between academics and representatives from pharmaceutical and public health companies. Other faculties have set precedents for enabling more contact with the industrial and public sectors, and these can serve as inspiration.

## 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]:**

**3 - Average**

**Qualitative assessment:**

Successful examples of transferring R&D&I results into practice partially overlap with the previous category of results that are relevant to society. In particular, the faculty has a long-term collaboration with Oritest, s.r.o., for developing detection systems (e.g., tubes that detect nerve agents and phosgene). Other ongoing contracts are with Paul Hartmann AG for wound healing projects and Oncomed Manufacturing a.s. for contract services.

The identified problems are:

- 1) Transfer activity is concentrated in a single department, while other units show limited involvement in commercialization or practical impact.
- 2) While patents and contract research are well documented, other mechanisms, such as licensing, startup formation, or integration into public-sector use, are not mentioned.
- 3) Although some projects have industrial funding, the financial data suggests that such income is modest relative to the overall R&D&I capacity. Engaging more broadly and consistently with industry or other non-public funders would strengthen long-term sustainability.

**Recommendations:**

1. The patents should be licensed. It is unclear if the listed patents will be licensed in the future.
2. The faculty should encourage the creation of start-up companies. Major inventions similar to those mentioned in sensors (e.g., detection tubes) or material development (e.g., wound healing) could be a good starting point for a startup company.
3. There should be more engagement with the industrial sector.

## POPULARIZATION OF VAVAI

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                        |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&amp;D&amp;I and communication with the public</b><br>Evaluate how active and successful the evaluated unit is in the field of popularisation of R&D&I and communication with the public.                           |                        |
| <b>Rating [1–5]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| <b>Qualitative assessment:</b><br>The faculty participates in all PR activities organized throughout the university, engages with the activities for schools and for seniors. Their academics also participate in various podcast programs. Overall, the level of activity seems excellent. |                        |
| <b>Recommendations:</b><br>Continue with your activities.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                        |

## IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                          |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <b>3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module 3</b><br>Evaluate how the evaluated unit has reflected the recommendations from the previous evaluation of the IEP, if applicable.<br>If the evaluated unit has not been evaluated before, the indicator will be marked as N/A – Not Applicable.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |                          |
| <b>Rating [1–5]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | <b>2 - Below average</b> |
| <b>Qualitative assessment:</b><br>Summary of the previous recommendations and their implementation: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop a clear and coordinated research strategy across departments with defined priorities and institutional leadership.</li> </ol> Neither the self-evaluation nor the interview addressed this point. The organizational structure and the independence and promotion of young academics were not addressed. Research seems to be associated with only a handful of scientists. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Strengthen internal collaboration among departments to promote interdisciplinary research and reduce fragmentation.</li> </ol> There is no evidence of interdisciplinary research between departments. This point was not addressed in the evaluation. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Improve the transfer of research results into practice by establishing formal mechanisms for commercialization and industry collaboration.</li> </ol> Several cases of transferring research results into practice were listed above. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. Enhance the societal relevance of research outputs by aligning projects with public health and pharmaceutical needs. Systematically track and assess the societal impact of research results, including developing tools or indicators to measure such impact.</li> </ol> Societal relevance seems to be limited to a few topics. A broader discussion throughout the faculty is needed to improve this. No tracking system seems to be in place. |                          |

5. Introduce structured support for popularization and outreach activities, including coordination and strategic communication with the public.

PR activities are at a good level.

6. Increase visibility and internationalization by participating in international networks and joint research projects.

Currently, there is little evidence of internationalization, which is mostly limited to inviting foreign scientists for seminars. There is ample room for improvement in the future.

7. Increase non-public, non-grant funding through stronger engagement with industry, technology transfer, and contract research.

There are industry contracts and contract research projects. However, revenues seem limited.

#### Recommendations:

Basically, all previous recommendations remain in effect. It is strongly recommended that an oversight international scientific board be established. This board should work with the faculty leadership to develop the faculty's vision and strategy for the next 10 years. Close collaboration, including frequent on-site visits and oversight of new hires, is also recommended.

### 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                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | <b>NOT RATED</b>         |
| 3.2 Recognition by the research community                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <b>2 - Below average</b> |
| 3.3 Research projects                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | <b>3 - Average</b>       |
| 3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | <b>4 - Very good</b>     |
| 3.5 Transfer of results into practice                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | <b>3 - Average</b>       |
| 3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | <b>5 - Outstanding</b>   |
| 3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | <b>2 - Below average</b> |
| <b>Average rating [1–5]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | <b>3 - Average</b>       |
| <b>Grade [A–D]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | <b>C</b>                 |
| <b>Summary assessment:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                          |
| <b>Summary recommendations:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                          |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop a faculty-wide research strategy that includes clear priorities, institutional leadership, and structured support (mentoring scheme) for young academics.</li> <li>2. Create an international scientific advisory board to guide long-term strategic planning, evaluate hiring decisions, and ensure accountability in implementing reforms.</li> </ol> |                          |

3. Internationalize the academic environment through recruitment, joint projects, and teaching in English when applicable.
4. Address the gender imbalance in senior positions by developing targeted measures to support the career progression of female faculty and ensure equitable representation in leadership positions.
5. Create a clear departmental structure with research groups led by independent PIs. Support their research through national and international grants, among other means. Encourage interdisciplinary research and collaboration among PIs.
6. Strengthen involvement in international grant programs, such as those offered by the EU and MCSA, especially for young researchers.
7. Encourage all PIs to consider the practical applications and societal needs of their research. Organize structured engagement with the industry and public sectors (e.g., regular meetings).
8. Expand societal impact monitoring to include the development of tools that track the relevance, uptake, and long-term effects of research outputs.
9. Expand and formalize commercialization mechanisms, including patent licensing and start-up formation, beyond current contract-based collaborations.

## EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

**NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Economics and Administration, Masaryk University**

**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:

ECON MUNI has the vision of 'delivering top-quality education producing desirable graduates and conducting high quality research that informs both the academic community and society at large.' (SER). There are further aims of uphold efficiency in resource management and quality in education and research. ECON MUNI conducts both basic and applied research standards, which, according to SER, is independent and of high quality and of relevance to global, national, and local levels. The research focuses on the following areas in particular: Transportation, Environmental, Labour and Health Economics, as well as Financial Risk Modelling and Regulation, and Public and Non-profit Sector Management.

ECON MUNI prides itself for fostering a stimulating and inclusive environment that allows its academic and research staff to explore ideas and collaborate with colleagues.

ECON MUNI is structured in five departments: Business Management, Finance, Economics, Public Economics, and Regional Economics. The faculty employs over 200 people, most of them (156) engaged in academic roles, who benefit from a structured career system to enable clear and transparent career systems, well-described in the SER. There are 2 681 students of which 1 702 are undergraduates, 928 master students and 51 engaged in PhD programs.

ECON MUNI reports to be able to recruit international faculty members from high quality research milieus and universities, which is a good sign for its future development.

Gender composition at the professorial level (and to some extent at the associate level, especially in the age group of 40-49) is something to be addressed by the management – at present there is still a visible dominance of male professors. In the SER, no mention is made on any steps to address this issue and faculty management do not even recognise it as an issue that they have control over.

## 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

#### Qualitative assessment:<sup>1</sup>

ECON MUNI does quite well in this respect, being well-embedded in the international research community through a range of activities organized in Brno, and also through a very active involvement of its members in international conferences, with invited lectures and participation in various editorial boards. Several faculty members have received prestigious international awards for their research.

#### Recommendations:

It is unclear to what degree international recognition is to be found in all departments, or whether there is significant variability between the departments. It should nevertheless be an explicit aim for ECON MUNI leadership to spread the activities among the wider faculty. It is not apparent from the SER whether there is some systemic effort in this regard.

## 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

#### Qualitative assessment:

ECON has engaged in an impressive mix of research projects, ranging from Horizon 2020 (with one coordinated by the faculty and another one as a participating institution), to research funded by international organisations (OECD), national authorities (e.g., the Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sports), and local ones (the city of Brno).

It is unclear to what extent all ECON MUNI departments have their fair share in these projects, or whether there is variability among the departments.

#### Recommendations:

<sup>1</sup> 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.

In the list of projects funded at ECON MUNI, we have, perhaps, missed the most prestigious ones funded by the ERC. The faculty should consider moving in this direction in the next period and develop strategies in cooperation with the successful MUNI faculties so that it can be excellent next time.

If there is significant variability among the ECON MUNI departments when it comes to research funding, strategies should be developed to enhance the research capacities of those with less success.

### 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

#### Qualitative assessment:

Similarly to 3.3 (and in fact, some projects are mentioned in the SER under this section as well as under 3.3), ECON MUNI does quite well in this respect, especially when it comes to projects with national impact. Several projects have clear relevance for sustainability issues (projects on circular manufacturing and circular product service systems, public transport systems, waste management, and improvement of air quality in cities), whereas there are fewer projects addressing the gender dimension.

#### Recommendations:

Perhaps, what can be considered, are engaging in projects that would have an impact on society beyond the Czech Republic, especially given the ambition of the faculty and the range of international projects it has conducted in the last five years. The Horizon 2020 projects and the collaborative project with Norwegian universities are examples of research with more extensive relevance and impact.

## 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]:**

**3 - Average**

#### Qualitative assessment:

Compared to 3.4 there is relatively little reported here, so perhaps some room for improvement? Most of the project topics are of obvious relevance to both Czech and international/global society.

**Recommendations:**

It can only be because there is the Technology Transfer Office of Masaryk University (TTO MUNI), which is responsible for such transfers – so possibly just a better way to communicate how some of the excellent research mentioned above ad 3.4 got transferred into practice?

## 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

**Qualitative assessment:**

The faculty does really well (as the whole MUNI does), the only thing to consider would be perhaps a more international outreach – through social media or internet, which are not mentioned in the SER.

**Recommendations:**

ECON MUNI should develop a systematic strategy to expand the outreach activities beyond the local (mostly around the city of Brno) context – through social media (online YouTube public events, podcast series, etc). From a global perspective, many of the ECON MUNI research topics, among them circular economy systems, public transportation, waste management, and improvement of air quality, are highly relevant and topical.

## 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

**Qualitative assessment:**

We were very pleased by the steps taken by the faculty in response to the previous report.

**Recommendations:**

ECON-MUNI are encouraged to critically review the implementation of the above recommendations.

## EVALUATED UNIT RATING

| <b>Evaluation of unit</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                      |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 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                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | <b>NOT RATED</b>     |
| 3.2 Recognition by the research community                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | <b>4 - Very good</b> |
| 3.3 Research projects                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | <b>4 - Very good</b> |
| 3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <b>4 - Very good</b> |
| 3.5 Transfer of results into practice                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | <b>3 - Average</b>   |
| 3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | <b>4 - Very good</b> |
| 3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <b>4 - Very good</b> |
| <b>Average rating [1–5]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | <b>4 - Very good</b> |
| <b>Grade [A–D]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <b>B</b>             |
| <b>Summary assessment:</b><br><br>ECON MUNI constitutes a strong and diverse research community covering both basic and applied research topics of significant relevance to local, national, and global society. Improvements can be made in the further internationalization of research projects and in communication significant findings in the social media. It has been difficult to assess the research quality in the various departments.                  |                      |
| <b>Summary recommendations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emphasize further engagement in international research fund applications.</li> <li>• Develop a systematic strategy for disseminating and communication research findings internationally in social media.</li> <li>• Evaluate the research quality of the various departments and, if relevant, develop systematic strategies on strengthening the weaker research departments.</li> </ul> |                      |

## EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

**NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Informatics, Masaryk University**

**FORD: 1 - Natural 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 Faculty of Informatics was the first computer science faculty in the Czech Republic; however, it is one of the smaller faculties at MUNI, with roughly 20 + 26 + 17 assistant + associate + full professors. Their student body contains roughly 1400 undergraduate, 850 graduate, and 100 doctoral students.

The committee feels that there is enthusiasm and a plan and appreciates the presented ideas.

A few minor things -- The vision could be clearer, esp. part (1) "being the top educational institution that is comparable with the renowned institutions worldwide" is a bit ambiguous. Do you mean "top in CZ"? "comparable worldwide" -- you mean comparable with Harvard? Perhaps it would be good to be a bit less ambitious and a bit more realistic? (e.g., 'among the top-10 CS faculties in Europe' or 'one of the top institutions in cybersecurity worldwide'?)

Thank you for recognizing that there is a rather larger gender imbalance. We encourage you to build a culture that strengthens female researchers and that encourages and supports them in all phases of their careers.

The faculty-to-student ratio of 1:40 is a bit on the high side. It should be clear that the faculty needs to grow in order to

- accommodate the increased interest of students
- The increased need for computer scientists' skills in our society
- to take on a bit more of a leadership role within the MUNI community in areas such as security or AI+Data Science

The committee appreciates the joint master's with the faculty of science as well as the interaction with arts and mathematics. Also, offering an English Bachelor's program should be well received by (ambitious) students.

## RECOGNITION BY THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY

| <b>3.2 Recognition by the research community</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |                      |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 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).                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                      |
| <b>Rating [1–5]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | <b>4 - Very good</b> |
| <b>Qualitative assessment:<sup>1</sup></b><br><p>There are a number (~5) highly visible researchers in your midst. However, within a group of 87 FTEs, it would be important to increase that number to a critical mass. The committee appreciates the changes that have occurred to increase research funding and believes the new leadership of the faculty is on the right path. Hiring new, internationally trained (tenure-track) researchers is the right path. Two new hires per year is perhaps on the low side.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                      |
| <b>Recommendations:</b><br><p>Support existing excellence and mentor young and early career researchers through encouragement and time to do good work, e.g., by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- not overloading them with committee work or teaching</li> <li>- Encouraging professors of all levels to do sabbaticals</li> <li>- supporting them with travel funds to visit high-impact research places (the Harvard's and ETH's of the world)</li> <li>- Seeking the support of the university management to organize conferences and clarify overheads: it was indicated that overheads on conference organization are overly burdensome and that there should be more transparency on overheads from grants.</li> </ul> |                      |

## RESEARCH PROJECTS

| <b>3.3 Research projects</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 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. |                    |
| <b>Rating [1–5]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | <b>3 - Average</b> |
| <b>Qualitative assessment:</b><br><p>Again, there is clear excellence in the faculty! However, the challenge will be to create a broad culture of research excellence. Considering yearly research funding of about 2,7 million EUR for 87 FTE, this would come to about 31k EUR per year on average. There is room to improve.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                    |
| <b>Recommendations:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                    |

<sup>1</sup> 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.

Further cultivate a culture of grant-driven research. Create incentives for researchers and a support structure. There are many ideas:

- Support grant writing through teaching releases
- Support grant writing through the TTO and, perhaps, local grant facilitators
- Develop networking opportunities with the local industry
- Facilitate collaboration/networking with other successful MU units, like CEITEC, the Faculty of Medicine, the Faculty of Science, etc.
- Establish an interdisciplinary "Data Science + AI" center to bring together math, stats, and CS to be approachable by others who need DS+AI expertise.

### 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### Qualitative assessment:

The impact and diversity of your projects are truly amazing: congratulations! We have not much to add other than ...

#### Recommendations:

A few projects state that "this project has no relevance to gender dimension and sustainability". However, we would argue that they all do to some degree. We would encourage you to work on this dimension. One approach might be a more interdisciplinary angle to your work, e.g., by working with folks from social science and STS programs. (However, this is a minor point.)

## 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

#### Qualitative assessment:

We believe that the efforts for commercialisation are admirable! In general, it is hard to commercialise research results, especially for academics at a publicly funded university who have actively chosen to do research with public money for the public good. However, there is room to grow.

#### Recommendations:

1. There is certainly room to work with industrial partners. Such work tends to be very applied, and its results typically find their way into a product much more quickly. Further, usually, there is funding for applied research and commercialization, and it opens the way for students to seamlessly continue their research work after graduation.
2. With the proper support by the university, a culture of startups can be cultivated by offering courses and startup camps, accessible to all students across MUNI. Interested students can then find (multi-disciplinary) teams of like-minded peers and could be taught the steps and pitfalls of starting up.

### 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]:

5 - Outstanding

#### Qualitative assessment:

Your efforts are outstanding! Considering that there is usually no credit attached to such outreach activities, such as working with high-school students, we find the number and diversity of activities to be exemplary.

#### Recommendations:

If you are looking for additional ideas, perhaps you can also offer

- specific mentorships for female (grade-school/high-school) students, such as [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Girls\\_Who\\_Code](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Girls_Who_Code)
- facilitate female organizations like "Women in AI" or "Women in Computer Science" and scholarships to attend Grace Hopper's conference [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grace\\_Hopper\\_Celebration\\_of\\_Women\\_in\\_Computing](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grace_Hopper_Celebration_of_Women_in_Computing)

It might be good to invest in professorships in Didactics (perhaps cross-appointed with the Faculty of Education).

### 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]:

4 - Very good

### Qualitative assessment:

Thank you -- you clearly took the suggestions from the last report seriously and are on a very good path to:

- Improve the publication culture
- Improve the communication and exchange of research topics within the faculty
- clarifying and strengthening your relationship with ICS
- improving the outreach within MUNI

However, clearly, things do not change "overnight" and take time. We would like to encourage you to work on

### Recommendations:

- establishing a collegial, friendly, and intellectually stimulating environment within your faculty
- improve the revenue stream through research grants
- broaden industrial collaboration
- further the internationalization of your programs at all levels (bachelor, master, and doctoral)
- improving research excellence (through publications)
- Steadily grow your faculty by hiring excellent, internationally trained researchers for tenure-track positions.

In addition, just like any other computer science faculty across the globe, explore the possibilities of generative AI tools and embrace them for the innovation of your curricula. Here, you could collaborate with other academics and take a leadership role at MUNI.

## 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                                                | <b>NOT RATED</b>       |
| 3.2 Recognition by the research community                                                                   | <b>4 - Very good</b>   |
| 3.3 Research projects                                                                                       | <b>3 - Average</b>     |
| 3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society                                         | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| 3.5 Transfer of results into practice                                                                       | <b>4 - Very good</b>   |
| 3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| 3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module                                                         | <b>4 - Very good</b>   |
| <b>Average rating [1–5]:</b>                                                                                | <b>4 - Very good</b>   |
| <b>Grade [A–D]:</b>                                                                                         | <b>B</b>               |

**Summary assessment:**

The committee was happy with your presentation, enthusiasm, and plan for the faculty. We hope that our recommendations will be a helpful guide on your path to achieve your vision.

**Summary recommendations:**

## EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

**NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Social Studies, Masaryk University**

**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 self-evaluation report of the Faculty of Social Studies — comprising seven departments and three research institutes — provided a comprehensive overview of its research, teaching, and outreach activities, as well as the organizational structure of the unit. According to the report, there are 18 full professors, 41 associate professors, 70 assistant professors, 5 assistants, and 35 researchers in other categories as of 2023. The research institutes represent a key asset of the Faculty of Social Studies and are closely integrated with the work of the seven departments. The provided materials were comprehensive, complete, and highly informative. The presentation by the faculty leadership was excellent.

Overall, the committee was pleased to note that the core objectives of the Faculty of Social Studies are centered on fostering excellence across all areas, with a particular emphasis on the internationalization of research and the generation of meaningful societal impact. The stated mission — *to empower societies by scientific excellence* — was convincingly conveyed both in the self-evaluation report and during the panel presentation. The committee found that this mission is pursued with great enthusiasm, determination, and clear strategic focus.

Also, important changes have been made, such as the reduction of the number of research institutes. The committee highlighted the fact that there is a formulated strategic plan, in line with the university's strategy. Obviously, the Faculty of Social Sciences is on the right track, and there is an upward trajectory.

### 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

**Qualitative assessment:<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> 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.

The Faculty of Social Studies is highly visible in the international research community. The scientific outputs, the reputation of its members who actively engage in international associations, workshops, and guest lectures, is outstanding. There are high-level collaborations on publications and research projects and the interdisciplinary nature of the projects done at the Faculty of Social Studies is a clear strength.

The researchers at the Faculty of Social Studies are highly active on the international stage. They participate in leading academic events and have received numerous national and international awards, including the “Distinguished Early Career Professional Contributions” award from the American Psychological Association. Their research is widely recognized for its quality and societal relevance.

The Faculty of Social Studies also publishes several academic journals, most notably *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace*, which is a diamond open access and has gained a strong reputation as an emerging leading outlet in this rapidly growing field — an impressive achievement. In addition, many faculty members serve on the editorial boards of prestigious international journals, further underscoring their visibility and influence within the academic community.

#### Recommendations:

The committee recommends that the Faculty of Social Studies continue to build on and further strengthen its international standing within the scientific community. While several successful and high-profile achievements were presented, it is essential that the faculty maintains and enhances this reputation over the next five years. To this end, the committee encourages deeper collaboration on leading topics and exchange with leading researchers worldwide. In particular, research visits abroad — such as through sabbaticals — should be more actively promoted and supported. Overall, the Faculty is on an excellent trajectory and there is clear progress as compared to the previous evaluation period.

## 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

#### Qualitative assessment:

The Faculty of Social Studies was very successful in securing funding for several high-profile funded projects, such as ySKILLS, EnTrust, Invenio, or MEDIADELCOM, just to name a few. These projects reflect the strategic commitment to academic excellence. There is also a great number of impactful applied projects, underlining the value of social science research for the society at large nationally and internationally. The committee was impressed by the scope, impact, and interdisciplinary nature of fundamental and applied projects. In addition, the projects generate a strong impact on society, as there are relevant – and communicated to – important stakeholders.

There is a system for research support in place. The collaboration with other units of Masaryk University is visible.

To date, no ERC grants have been obtained. However, the Faculty of Social Studies has implemented a comprehensive support strategy for prospective applicants, including teaching relief, technical assistance, mentoring, and performance-based incentives. Of particular note is the substantial budget increase offered by the faculty for successful ERC projects, which stands out as a strong and exceptional incentive. The committee was impressed by the faculty's high level of awareness regarding this objective and by its clear commitment and strong motivation to secure funding for high-impact, internationally competitive research.

#### **Recommendations:**

Although the projects spread nicely over several research areas of the Faculty of Social Studies, some areas seem to be more thriving than others, especially in terms of large-scale grants. This is not an imminent threat or problem, but the committee encourages the Faculty of Social Studies to make sure that all areas are highly active in their attempts to secure third party funding.

The topics for funding at the Horizon Europe should be closely monitored. Applications for Horizon Europe with Masaryk University as the Lead Institution would further strengthen the visibility and excellence of the unit.

Obviously, ERC applications should be a key ambition for the next five years. Although this is a highly competitive grant scheme, the Faculty of Social Studies has outstanding researchers among their ranks who are well equipped to submit proposals. Yet overall, the Faculty of Social Studies is very much aware of this and has initiated respective measures.

The collaboration with thematically related units of Masaryk University could perhaps be further strengthened. The standing of the social sciences within the university could be further strengthened, despite the excellent research reputation.

### **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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### **Qualitative assessment:**

The Faculty of Social Studies has made significant impact on society through a range of applied research projects addressing pressing social challenges. From shaping EU and national policies on children's online safety through the widely cited EU Kids Online study to enhancing cybersecurity, among other things, the faculty has demonstrated practical relevance and policy influence. Across all projects listed in the self-evaluation report, the committee was impressed by the interdisciplinary, evidence-based approach of the projects and the good stakeholder outreach.

#### **Recommendations:**

The Faculty of Social Studies does not extensively engage in the commercialization of research (e.g., working with industry partners), but rather generates impact by addressing topics of utmost relevant to society. The committee understands and supports this mission.

The commitment to reach stakeholders at the European level is certainly there but can be further strengthened.

The gender dimension as well as sustainability with respect to impact on society is there but can be further strengthened.

## 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

#### Qualitative assessment:

The Faculty of Social Studies has effectively translated its research into practice through close collaboration with the Technology Transfer Office at the university. The research has strong practical implications and findings are translated to practical use, for instance, to inform family, social, and cybersecurity policies. The Invenio diagnostic software and the DeePsy system is particularly noteworthy. These examples reflect the commitment of the Faculty of Social Studies to do top-notch research with real-world impact. Invenio stands out as a first commercialized output and the establishment of a spin-off company, which is an exceptional achievement for the social sciences is particularly noteworthy.

#### Recommendations:

Although there is room to improve the commercialization of science at the Faculty of Social Studies, this is not the main priority of social science research. However, high impact projects should be further pursued.

The mid- and long-term effectiveness of the transfer of results into practice can be more systematically tracked and evaluated.

The outreach to potential collaboration partners from the practice can be more systematically organized and communicated. The potential for outreach and practice collaborations is not maximized yet. However, the committee applauds the strategy of the Faculty of Social Studies to connect practice transfer with high quality academic research.

## 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]:**

**5 – Outstanding**

#### Qualitative assessment:

The Faculty of Social Studies actively promotes the popularization of science through international conferences, public debates, and various outreach initiatives such as the Scientists' Night and other key events, symposia, and gatherings. In particular, the "COVID-19: Psychological recommendations and advice for families with children, students and the public" website is an outstanding example, among many others. Research of the Faculty of Social Studies, as well as the research members of the faculty have generated tremendous media attention, nationally, and also, in part, internationally. The committee is particularly impressed by the fact that the Faculty of Social Studies has created guidelines for media appearances and also created a position to further intensify popularization. Also, social media appearances and impact are clearly evidenced. Overall, these activities reflect FSS's commitment to sharing research, engaging the public, and addressing current social issues.

#### **Recommendations:**

International popularisation of R&D&I and communication with the public can be further strengthened and more systematically organized.

Faculty members may more actively outreach to international media. Importantly, a common strategy for all departments and research institutes needs to be further strengthened to ensure that popularization takes place across the entire Faculty of Social Studies, although a strong imbalance cannot be observed. Overall, these are only minor things to further improve.

## **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]:**

**4 - Very good**

#### **Qualitative assessment:**

The Faculty of Social Studies has taken up the suggestions of the last evaluation round, and important progress has been made. The Faculty of Social Studies stresses that research is well supported across all units through close collaboration between Departments and research institutes. The organizational structure of the faculty seems to be effective and widely accepted. The research institutes are clearly the flagship areas, but also the departments are active in research.

Also, the link to the private sector has been strengthened, for instance, with Invenio, among other things. In addition to that, the faculty has intensified collaboration within Masaryk University as well as international partners.

Importantly, a new and impressive motivation and support program was introduced to support researchers in applying for competitive international grants such as ERC.

There is a growing awareness for gender equality and some first progress, as evidenced by increasing female representation among promoted staff, although this development is still rather slow. However, the Faculty has increased gender balance for important roles within the Faculty of Social Studies.

#### **Recommendations:**

The committee noted significant progress when it comes to the implementation of the recommendations from the previous evaluation. However, the initiated actions have not yet fully crystallized. The successful acquisition of an ERC grant is certainly the next step. Also, gender balances at the higher ranks has not been fully secured. Important steps have been initiated, and this development should be continued, strengthened, and more actively encouraged.

## 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                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 5 - Outstanding |
| 3.3 Research projects                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 4 - Very good   |
| 3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 5 - Outstanding |
| 3.5 Transfer of results into practice                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 5 - Outstanding |
| 3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 4 - Very good   |
| 3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 5 - Outstanding |
| Average rating [1–5]:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | 5 - Outstanding |
| Grade [A–D]:                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | A               |
| <b>Summary assessment:</b><br><p>The committee commends the Faculty of Social Studies for its strong organizational structure, high-quality research, international visibility, and impactful societal engagement. The committee recognized the well-functioning organization in research institutes and departments. In particular, the committee was pleased to see the faculty's strategic focus on excellence and internationalization, and its successful acquisition of high-profile projects. The interdisciplinary nature of the research is seen as a major strength. While ERC grants have not yet been secured, the faculty has implemented a robust support system to address this and shows clear motivation for improvement. The committee concluded that the Faculty of Social Studies is on a promising upward trajectory, with clear strategic goals and the potential for increasing impact.</p> |                 |
| <b>Summary recommendations:</b><br><p>The committee recommends continuing and strengthening the path that has been taken. Special attention should be paid to securing large-scale grants such as ERC, increasing collaboration within Masaryk University as well as reducing the gender imbalance among faculty members.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                 |

## EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

**NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Sports Studies (FSpS), Masaryk University**

**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:

FSpS is among the smaller MUNI faculties, counting 74.1 FTE and with 1,054 undergraduate students, 454 master's students, and 48 doctoral candidates (2023) with a mission of contributing '...to the development of elite sports performance, support public health through physical activity, and foster interdisciplinary research in sports sciences.' The vision is '... be recognized as a center of excellence in sports research and education, bridging the gap between science and practice.'

The mission reflects main goals of the sports sciences of developing scientific knowledge of relevance to sports (performance) and society (public health). The vision of fostering interdisciplinary research to bridge the science-practice gap is relevant in most applied research programs and well worth aiming for.

FSpS is organized into three departments with commendable R&D&I capacities. If interfaculty collaboration and partnerships with CEITEC can be effectively leveraged on the experimental side, these capacities could be elevated to an excellent level. The departmental structure aligns with the international thematic organization of sport sciences and appropriately supports FSpS's mission and vision, as does its research strategy.

The FSpS research strategy is well-developed; however, the number of subtopics may be somewhat excessive, requiring significant research efforts. The strategy could benefit from greater clarity regarding its alignment with the overarching MUNI research strategy. Given the importance of social impact, a stronger focus on research into physical education as a school subject could be anticipated, as schools provide an opportunity to engage with the entire youth population.

The FSpS faculty profile is notable for its substantial number of younger assistant and associate professors, with a commendable gender balance. The panel highlights the importance of establishing clear career development plans and providing adequate research support. FSpS faces a unique staffing situation, with four full professors who are all over 70 years old. If these senior academics can act as experienced research mentors, this arrangement could be advantageous. If this is not the case, it would be advisable to implement respectful processes to facilitate their transition into retirement and/or emeritus/emerita positions. The resulting vacancies should be advertised internationally and targeted toward fields requiring complementary expertise to advance the FSpS mission and vision. One possible focus, as previously mentioned, could be research into the potential welfare and public health benefits of physical education as a school subject.

## 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]:**

**3 - Average**

#### Qualitative assessment:<sup>1</sup>

In the self-evaluation report (SER), a range of contributions to the research community is highlighted. These contributions are primarily national in scope (e.g., awards, journal reviews, and editorial roles) and/or limited to the local European region at the international level. Nationally, FSpS holds a leading role. The panel recognizes and commends the faculty's efforts to engage with international scholars through guest lectures, seminars, and consultancy. While participation in international research grants remains limited, it is on the rise (as noted during the presentation during the visit) and is expected to improve further, thanks to FSpS's ongoing efforts and strategic initiatives.

#### Recommendations:

- The most direct path to international recognition is through publishing in high-quality international journals within the faculty's academic field. This should be actively encouraged, potentially through increased funding for travel grants and conference participation.
- For younger scholars, in particular, attending conferences and spending time in strong academic environments will enhance opportunities to build academic networks and foster collaboration. A sabbatical program should be developed to facilitate extended visits to leading academic institutions. Such initiatives would also increase the likelihood of participation in international grant applications.
- The strong MUNI grant application support system should be further leveraged to this end. Collectively, these measures will play a crucial role in strengthening the FSpS research culture and advancing its international aspirations.

## 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:

<sup>1</sup> 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.

The five research projects listed in the SER reflect several key topics outlined in the research strategy. These projects are applied in nature and have noteworthy social impacts on various segments of the population, including toddlers and young people, members of the special forces, oncology patients, and women learning to cope with stress via self-defence techniques. However, Table 3.1.1 highlights limited access to international funding sources, which represents an area for further development at FSpS.

The degree of interdisciplinarity in these projects appears somewhat constrained, as they are primarily grounded in quantitative approaches with limited contributions from qualitative social sciences, pedagogy, and the humanities. There is the potential for fostering greater collaboration both within FSpS departments and with other faculties at MUNI, among them the faculties of Science, Medicine, and Education. The emphasis should be on the relevance and opportunity of FSpS collaboration for other faculties, as sport (understood broadly) represents an interesting empirical field for a series of scholarly approaches. Further inter-faculty collaborations could enrich the research and promote a more interdisciplinary approach.

#### Recommendations:

- The collaborative research efforts between FSpS departments could be increased, for example, by introducing financial incentives in the allocation of research funding for inter-departmental projects.
- This approach could also serve as a strategic measure to encourage inter-faculty research collaborations and strengthen the overall research culture.
- For additional recommendations on enhancing the internationalization of research, please refer to the comments under section 3.2.

### 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

#### Qualitative assessment:

The FSpS has developed a series of innovative programs and technologies with direct application in practice. The discussion in SER indicates a significant potential. Several projects have a clear social policy dimension and are aimed at special and vulnerable populations, among them toddlers, children and youth, oncology patients, and athletes with disabilities.

#### Recommendations:

- The faculty should be encouraged to further develop applied knowledge and technologies, actively leveraging MUNI's Technology Transfer Office (TTO) for potential commercialization.
- Such efforts should align with the core competencies and research strategies of FSpS. In the long term, if successful, these projects could enhance the faculty's potential for securing research funding and improve its overall financial position.

## 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

#### Qualitative assessment:

See the comments above. All the listed projects have clear, applied aims and are in line with the stated FSpS mission and vision. Commercialization of results has not yet been made. However, FSpS states clear ambitions in this respect.

#### Recommendations:

See comments above.

## 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

#### Qualitative assessment:

The FSpS has been involved in a range of activities aimed at popularizing and disseminating their research to segments of the public. These efforts have placed particular emphasis on children, young people, and families. Given the context of demographic changes, one might have expected more activities targeting the adult and elderly populations.

#### Recommendations:

- Based on the mission and vision statements, the FSpS should develop a systematic priority plan for the popularization of R&D&I.
- Public communication should be expanded to encompass all topics outlined in the FSpS research strategy, including projects aimed at the adult and elderly populations.

## IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

| <b>3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module 3</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                        |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 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.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |                        |
| <b>Rating [1–5]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| <b>Qualitative assessment:</b><br><p>The implementation of recommendations from previous evaluations is truly impressive. The FSpS leadership has admirably established an incubator structure (2019), limited the number and restructured the departments, and reformed the PhD program (2023). Additionally, they have introduced clearer norms for expected teaching and research contributions from the faculty. The increase in research output highlights the effectiveness of these measures.</p> |                        |
| <b>Recommendations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep up the great work!</li> <li>Transitional leadership can be challenging. At the central level of MUNI, there should be support resources available for leadership training and assistance specifically focused on transitional leadership.</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                 |                        |

## EVALUATED UNIT RATING

| <b>Evaluation of unit</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                        |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 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                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | <b>NOT RATED</b>       |
| 3.2 Recognition by the research community                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | <b>3 - Average</b>     |
| 3.3 Research projects                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | <b>3 - Average</b>     |
| 3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | <b>4 - Very good</b>   |
| 3.5 Transfer of results into practice                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | <b>4 - Very good</b>   |
| 3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | <b>4 - Very good</b>   |
| 3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| <b>Average rating [1–5]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | <b>4 - Very good</b>   |
| <b>Grade [A–D]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | <b>B</b>               |
| <b>Summary assessment:</b><br><p>The FSpS is undergoing positive development, with well-defined R&amp;D&amp;I plans and strategies. An increase in research output in high-quality publications and international research grants is anticipated in the coming years. However, there appears to be a gap in research focusing on the</p> |                        |

pedagogical and didactic aspects of physical education as a school subject. This is a research line found in most sports science research institutions.

**Summary recommendations:**

- The FSpS is encouraged to stabilize its relatively new departmental organization and focus on fostering a robust research culture, with a particular emphasis on increasing international publications in high-quality outlets. High quality publications are “the hard currency” of international recognition.
- Steps to achieve this could include the strategic allocation of resources to encourage presentations at international conferences, greater engagement with leading research environments through initiatives such as sabbaticals, and, with this, intensified efforts to become partners in international grant applications.
- There is also a significant potential in further collaboration with other MUNI faculties, among them those of Science, Medicine, and Education. FSpS offers valuable opportunities for inter-faculty projects as FSpS possesses significant and specific research competence and represents an interesting empirical field for applying and testing a series of scholarly approaches.
- Furthermore, the FSpS should consider enhancing research that integrates pedagogical and didactic perspectives in physical education. A strategic approach to utilizing the four full professor positions that will soon become available could significantly contribute to advancing the faculty’s mission and goals.

## EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

**NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Institute of Computer Science, Masaryk University**

**FORD: 1 - Natural 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.

ICS is largely a service unit, “responsible for the management and development of most of the ICT infrastructure and services at MU, contributions to the development and operations of national and international e-Infrastructures.” The institute employs 188 staff (mostly IT professionals) of whom 56 are women. It includes a single professor and ca. 30 researchers (non-professorial). There is a significant involvement in grants and leadership across the Czech Republic, in particular, in research efforts comprising large-scale compute infrastructure and cybersecurity.

#### Commentary:

The mission is clear, but the vision is not formulated. The evaluation panel appreciates the huge service role that the institute is doing for the university and acknowledges the need for it. Further, the large-scale infrastructure the institute is running requires special skills and expertise. However, the evaluation panel is not convinced that the institute is the optimal environment for researchers to thrive. We see two ways forward for the development of the institute.

1. If it brings together research and service within a non-teaching unit of the university, then it should be compared to the only other institute of MUNI -- CEITEC. CEITEC really shines through its research excellence (multiple ERC grants, 255 researchers of whom 40% are foreign nationals, and 180 PhD students). If this is the model, then we are missing the vision and the strategy to achieve such a status.

2. A service-oriented unit that is open to research collaboration with any unit across campus; however, the researchers should be located at the other research units, and the PhD student should be getting degrees from these units and should be integrated into these units. That seems the case right now, as the two PhD students we got to meet were getting their scientific supervision from FI and the Faculty of Science, respectively. However, in such a scenario, the researchers should be affiliated with faculties and should be provided a fair path through the ranks (asst. / assoc / full professor) just like other researchers in such faculties.

We would like to state that the current setup was observed five years ago, the same arguments were provided five years ago, and we, again, would recommend that the setup be changed in one of these two ways. The committee believes that the second path is the realistic one.

## RECOGNITION BY THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY

| <b>3.2 Recognition by the research community</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |                          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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).                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                          |
| <b>Rating [1–5]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | <b>2 - Below average</b> |
| <p><b>Qualitative assessment:<sup>1</sup></b></p> <p>Although the scientific output of the unit is secondary, there are still several good results to show. If we view ICS as a research institute, the comparison to CEITEC is of interest. CEITEC is operating on a vastly different level. However, from the report, there isn't really any visibility in the international research community. ICS is valued as a project partner, and MUNI is well advised to continue to support this infrastructure, but we believe that the research needs to be embedded at a faculty with international visibility and the primary goal to achieve such, like the Faculty of Informatics or the Faculty of Science, or similar.</p> <p>E.g., you write "In the period of 2019-2023, we have (co-)authored 68 journal papers (18x D1, 18x Q1, 23x Q2) and 77 papers in proceedings of conferences where the majority has a CORE rank B or higher". And, further, "with roughly 30 people with direct R&amp;D orientation," -- having on average 4 papers in 5 years in not-so-top journals and conferences is performing below international standards or even standards across MUNI.</p> |                          |
| <p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <p>To make a strategic decision as to path 1 (to aggressively build up the research component) or 2 (separate research from the service component) as described above. The recommendation of the evaluation panel would be, as of now, to prefer the 2nd path. We would like to emphasize that we don't see this as a "downgrading", but rather as a strengthening of the service component, which is so important and highly valued at MUNI as well as campuses all over.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                          |

## RESEARCH PROJECTS

| <b>3.3 Research projects</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| 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. |                    |
| <b>Rating [1–5]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | <b>3 - Average</b> |
| <p><b>Qualitative assessment:</b></p> <p>First, ICS should be commented on by the number of research projects that have been acquired. There is clearly some expertise that should be continued to be supported by MUNI. However, as mentioned above, the level is far from a research unit. However, the evaluation panel appreciates</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                    |

<sup>1</sup> 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.

the effort to engage and collaborate with different units across campus, such as FI, Science, and Law!

Recommendations: We would recommend

- strengthening the collaboration across MUNI,
- continue your leadership across Czechia in terms of EOSC and similar projects,
- have your research affiliated with faculties where they can best develop their research careers.

### 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]:

4 - Very good

#### Qualitative assessment:

ICS clearly has an impact across campus and in society, in Czechia and beyond! However, we would like to restate an observation from our report five years ago: "While we appreciate your substantial involvement in H2020 projects (please keep up the great work) the visibility through the international scientific community should be documented through papers, editorships, and the like. The challenge of every grant funding (at an academic unit) is to turn that funding into novel and exciting research results. This is still not documented and, hence, we cannot change the score."

#### Recommendations:

We believe that there is an opportunity to work more with industrial partners and therefore extend the reach and impact of the work done. It would be nice to develop possible collaborations. To be successful, the development of areas of strength and focus (perhaps a vision statement) would be opportunistic.

## 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:

We see and value a clear attempt at the commercialisation of some of the results. However, this has not been successful. E.g., five years ago, we said "There is an ongoing commercialization effort through CaverDock: this is great. The impact, as of yet, is unclear, however." The current report

states "... the licensing income is marginal (hundreds to thousands of EUR)." Hence, the strategy should be re-evaluated.

**Recommendations:**

Similar to our recommendation to the FI, it might be worth to brainstorm to invest into incubator programs, to bring students from different parts of the campus together to brainstorm about startup ideas and to develop pitches.

## 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

**Qualitative assessment:**

We believe that your efforts here are commendable; please continue your efforts.

**Recommendations:**

If you are looking for additional ideas, perhaps you can also offer

- specific mentorships for female (grade-school/high-school) students, such as [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Girls\\_Who\\_Code](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Girls_Who_Code)
- facilitate female organizations like "Women in AI" or "Women in Computer Science" and scholarships to attend Grace Hopper's conference [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grace\\_Hopper\\_Celebration\\_of\\_Women\\_in\\_Computing](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grace_Hopper_Celebration_of_Women_in_Computing)

## 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]:**

**1 - Inadequate**

**Qualitative assessment:**

Overall, the evaluation committee is not convinced and doesn't see new/different arguments for maintaining the status quo from five years ago. You allude to developing new KPIs, but it would be good to have them available now to provide feedback.

**Recommendations:**

Just as five years ago, we recommend a restructuring. As outlined above, we see two options: A. a commitment to build a research-strong service unit, or B. to separate service from research. Again, if you would like our feedback – focusing on building a strong, agile, service-oriented unit for all

stakeholders on campus (students, researchers, staff) would be most valuable and makes MUNI (even more) attractive as a place to work and study.

## EVALUATED UNIT RATING

| <b>Evaluation of unit</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                          |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <b>NOT RATED</b>         |
| 3.2 Recognition by the research community                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | <b>2 - Below average</b> |
| 3.3 Research projects                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | <b>3 - Average</b>       |
| 3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | <b>4 - Very good</b>     |
| 3.5 Transfer of results into practice                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | <b>1 - Inadequate</b>    |
| 3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | <b>4 - Very good</b>     |
| 3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | <b>1 - Inadequate</b>    |
| <b>Average rating [1–5]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | <b>3 - Average</b>       |
| <b>Grade [A–D]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | <b>C</b>                 |
| <b>Summary assessment:</b><br><p>The work done at ICS is valuable and needs to be supported! However, we believe that the research component is inadequate at this point and needs to be restructured either by massively investing in it or by finding a way to restructure the collaboration with the other research units across campus.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                          |
| <b>Summary recommendations:</b><br><p>The evaluation panel believes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>that the current structure is not successful in terms of research</li> <li>that ICS does an important duty for the campus community to provide IT services</li> <li>that a restructuring would be required that could go into one of two directions:</li> </ul> <p>A. (massively) strengthen the research capacity + quality</p> <p>Here, CEITEC should be a model. This could be done, e.g., by hiring top-notch researchers in Cybersecurity and/or Large-Scale computing. Making ICS a world-renowned research center for such topics, where they show promise (e.g., cybersecurity) could lead to ERC grants and international recognition. Here it will be crucial to focus, among other things, on internationalisation. The current practice of hiring BSc/MSc students from MUNI will not lead to international recognition.</p> <p>B. Strengthen ICS's role as a service facility by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>strengthening the research component through collaboration with research faculty, like Informatics, Law, Science and NOT through creating their own research department.</li> </ul> |                          |

- strengthening / building a design division, i.e., people that have experience in user-centered design (interaction design, graphic design, accessibility, user experience)
- not splitting service duties to multiple units, i.e., specifically also moving the service of the "student information system" into ICS.
- to develop a 'digitalisation strategy' for (the services) of MUNI: while Open Science (EOSC) and large scale computing are important endeavours, develop systems and services needed by students, faculty, and the administration to improve their workflows and that make work, research, and studying more effective and *fun*?

## EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

**NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Central European Institute of Technology, Masaryk University**

**FORD: 3 - Medical and health 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:

CEITEC is an outstanding research institution with extraordinary infrastructure serving as a technical platform for many cooperations and as a core facility for the entire Masaryk University. The excellence of CEITEC is shown by the hosting of 5 ERC grant holders and publications just in the last year in Nature and Science. Also, through the core facility with their high technical standards, they serve as a catalyst for live science projects throughout the university and beyond. Therefore, it seems of particular importance that CEITEC, based on additional funding, can offer the core facility service at 15 to 30% of the full costs for internal use for all scientists of MUNI. CEITEC's leadership has established an exemplary and highly effective internal communication strategy that promotes scientific and social interaction at all levels—between postdocs, PhD students, group leaders, and among the entire community.

### 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### Qualitative assessment:<sup>1</sup>

CEITEC MUNI demonstrates strong international scientific standing, evidenced by the award of seven ERC grants—five during the evaluation period—and above-average success rates in national GACR funding schemes (33% in 2022, 37% in 2023). The institute maintains high publication standards, with over 10% of papers in top-tier journals and 17 identified as highly cited between 2019 and 2023.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

Strategic collaborations with leading institutions, including EMBL and IOCB CAS, support joint research through Horizon Europe and other EU programmes. CEITEC MUNI is also an active member of prominent alliances such as EU-LIFE and Alliance4Life, the latter coordinated by CEITEC itself. The scientific excellence of its researchers is further underscored by the election of seven members to EMBO.

CEITEC serves as a hub for international exchange, regularly hosting high-profile events. Upcoming highlights include the 2025 CTLS Congress and EU-LIFE meeting, reinforcing CEITEC's role in shaping European research policy and practice.

The high recognition of CEITEC by the research community can also be seen by the fact that only in 2023, it supported 804 users from 25 different countries, including 77 external academic institutions (45 foreign) and 10 companies. This can clearly be seen as a quality approval.

#### **Recommendations:**

To further strengthen CEITEC MUNI's already high international recognition, we recommend continuing to invest in visibility through strategic alliances, leadership in European networks, and by hosting international scientific events. Promoting the visibility of Core Facility excellence, for example, through user success stories and benchmarking, could additionally reinforce CEITEC's reputation as a world-class research hub.

## **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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### **Qualitative assessment:**

The high quality of CEITEC members becomes immediately visible as 5 ERC grant holders are among the employees. Five of these grants were awarded during the evaluation period. Also, the high success rate of 37% (in 2023) compared to the national average of 20% at standard GACR grants emphasises the high quality of applications.

CEITEC MUNI's research activities are predominantly supported by external funding, with over 70% of the institute's budget derived from national and international grants. A strategic focus lies in fostering individual excellence through competitive schemes such as ERC, ERC-CZ, and GACR EXPRO. During the evaluation period, CEITEC MUNI implemented five ERC, three ERC-CZ, and six EXPRO grants, enhancing both scientific quality and institutional visibility.

Several high-profile ERC projects advanced fundamental understanding in areas such as viral structure, RNA transcription, leukemia biology, and antimicrobial peptide design. These interdisciplinary efforts, often combining structural biology, bioinformatics, and advanced imaging, address major societal challenges including antibiotic resistance and cancer. Ongoing ERC projects further explore innovative approaches to Alzheimer's diagnostics and phage therapy.

Beyond individual grants, CEITEC MUNI coordinates impactful consortium projects. The Horizon 2020 INTEG-RNA initiative fostered interdisciplinary RNA biology collaboration. The A4L\_ACTIONS project enhanced institutional development across Central and Eastern Europe, while the Alzheimer's Innovation Hub under Horizon Europe strengthens translational research ecosystems in the Czech and Slovak Republics. The national project "Analysis of Czech Genomes" laid groundwork for personalized medicine through the development of a national genomic database.

Strategic investments in infrastructure are another institutional priority. Projects such as the CIISB upgrade have modernized CEITEC's Core Facilities, ensuring researchers have access to cutting-edge technologies and internationally competitive platforms. Both investment and operational grants continue to support open-access science and excellence in shared research services.

#### **Recommendations:**

Given CEITEC MUNI's impressive success in securing competitive grants, we recommend continuing and consolidating the strong institutional support for excellent individual researchers, particularly through sustained investment in infrastructure and targeted measures that help promising early-stage ideas mature into competitive proposals.

### **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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### **Qualitative assessment:**

The projects with impact on society achieved by CEITEC during the evaluation period is impressive. A method has been established for quantification of miR-31 as a diagnostic marker for follicular lymphoma and further developed to a diagnostic kit (Patent: Method of prognosis in patients with follicular lymphoma). Similarly, the research unit of Ondrej Slaby generated the knowledge leading to a patent for a method of diagnosis of colorectal cancer and a license agreement has been signed with BioVendor with the goal to develop a diagnostic kit for common colorectal cancer with a major impact on the society. Several highly relevant software packages have been generated that were licensed to a spin-off company, Alffinity. A bioinformatics tool with a user interface for next-generation sequence data analysis has been generated, and a licensing agreement with EuroClonality is currently being negotiated for a broader implementation into clinical practice. Highly impressive is the development of a pocket analyser for the determination of antibodies in a liquid sample for self-testing kits. A functional sample has been generated. A spin-off company is expected to be established in 2025, aiming to bring accessible and reliable diagnostic tools directly to users, contributing to public health by enabling early detection and treatment. A method was developed to improve cryo-electron microscopy in cooperation with Thermo Fisher Scientific. Moreover, projects generated stable cell lines enabling high throughput screening for drug discovery.

Taken together, CEITEC contributes to a high extend to projects with already existing impact and others with high prospective impact on society.

#### **Recommendations:**

Given the remarkable societal relevance of CEITEC MUNI's translational research and innovation activities, we strongly recommend the continued strategic support of such high-impact projects. Sustained commitment in this area will further enhance CEITEC's contribution to public health, diagnostics, and biomedical innovation.

## 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### Qualitative assessment:

As described already in 3.4, the projects with prospective impact on society are very strong and this is mainly due to the advanced stage of several of these projects. This, in turn, is based on the already advanced stage in the transfer into practice. This is demonstrated by the filling of the licences and the establishment of spin-off companies, donated to the follow-up and implementations of the projects. The efficiency toward the commercialization of results is impressive and appears to be the result of a very structured approach of technology transfer at CEITEC with a very early involvement of the TTO MUNI. During the onsite visit, it was already very clear that the active project evaluation with regard to potential patentable results is very active at CEITEC.

#### Recommendations:

It is recommended that CEITEC continued with the very successful scouting program for early identification of potential patentable projects.

## 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### Qualitative assessment:

During the evaluation period, CEITEC MUNI actively promoted public engagement with science through a comprehensive and strategic outreach program aimed at popularizing research, development and innovation. The institute increased its visibility via frequent press releases, social media content, and collaborations with science communication platforms. A wide range of public-facing activities, including open labs, lectures, school collaborations, and popular science events like the Researchers' Night, Festival of Science, and Electron Microscopy Days, helped demystify complex scientific topics and make them accessible to all age groups.

CEITEC MUNI also embraced visual storytelling, virtual lab tours, and media appearances, such as in Hyde Park Civilizace and Fokus Václava Moravce, to humanize research and link it to real-world issues. Participation in international forums and exhibitions (e.g. Dubai Expo, ICRI) further expanded its global outreach. Through educational programs, internships, and hands-on experiments, CEITEC fostered future scientific talent while highlighting the societal relevance of science, including health and sustainability. These multifaceted efforts positioned CEITEC MUNI as a leading research institution committed not only to excellence but also to public understanding and trust in science.

#### Recommendations:

It is recommended that CEITEC MUNI maintains its strong commitment to public science communication and, where feasible, explores national media channels such as television and radio to further enhance public understanding of science and engage broader, including less traditionally engaged, segments of society.

## 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]:

**5 - Outstanding**

#### Qualitative assessment:

CEITEC had already performed at a very high level during the previous evaluation period and has not only succeeded in maintaining these high standards but has demonstrably further improved. In particular, the recommendation to explore new approaches to IP commercialisation has been effectively implemented, and the institution's excellent scouting system appears to function with notable efficiency.

#### Recommendations:

To this point there are no recommendations.

## 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        | <b>NOT RATED</b>       |
| 3.2 Recognition by the research community                           | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| 3.3 Research projects                                               | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| 3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| 3.5 Transfer of results into practice                               | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| 3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| <b>Average rating [1–5]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| <b>Grade [A–D]:</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | <b>A</b>               |
| <p><b>Summary assessment:</b></p> <p>CEITEC MUNI demonstrates exceptional performance across all evaluated dimensions. The unit has established itself as a leading research centre of international standing, with strong scientific output, an outstanding track record in competitive funding (including ERC grants), and significant contributions to societal impact through translational research and innovation. Its open-access Core Facilities, strategic partnerships, and effective science communication further amplify its role as a national and regional research hub. The unit's responsiveness to prior recommendations and its dynamic, forward-looking leadership underline a strong institutional culture of excellence and continuous improvement.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                        |
| <p><b>Summary recommendations:</b></p> <p>To maintain CEITEC's long-term competitiveness and technological leadership, it is essential to continuously renew and diversify the expertise within its research teams. Rapid advances in emerging scientific fields require flexible mechanisms to integrate fresh perspectives and specialised know-how. Attracting outstanding early-career researchers with expertise in novel technologies not only strengthens CEITEC's scientific profile but also fosters innovation, international collaboration, and talent development.</p> <p>To this end, we recommend the introduction of a system of time-limited, competitively selected positions aimed at recruiting exceptional young international researchers in strategically identified technological fields. These positions should be complemented by an attractive startup package and embedded within CEITEC's high-performing research environment, providing optimal conditions for scientific excellence and career development.</p> <p>Each position would be limited to a maximum of six years. During this period, the researcher would be expected to contribute significantly to CEITEC's research agenda and be encouraged to apply for a long-term academic position at Masaryk University or elsewhere. However, to ensure regular renewal and continued influx of new expertise, the CEITEC-specific appointment would be non-renewable.</p> <p>If implemented on an annual basis, this scheme would require a total of six concurrent positions to support the continuous recruitment of one new high-potential researcher each year.</p> <p>Such a model would not only support CEITEC's continued scientific excellence but also position the centre as a dynamic, future-oriented institution that actively shapes the next generation of research leaders in Europe.</p> |                        |

## 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] |
|------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Faculty of Law                           | B           |
| Faculty of Medicine                      | A           |
| Faculty of Science                       | B           |
| Faculty of Arts                          | A           |
| Faculty of Education                     | A           |
| Faculty of Pharmacy                      | C           |
| Faculty of Economics and Administration  | B           |
| Faculty of Informatics                   | B           |
| Faculty of Social Studies                | A           |
| Faculty of Sports Studies                | B           |
| Institute of Computer Science            | C           |
| Central European Institute of Technology | A           |
| <b>Summary grade</b>                     | <b>A</b>    |

#### Summary quality assessment:

The panel ranked the MUNI as a strong, competitive research institution with notable achievements and well-developed infrastructure. MUNI is engaged in projects with clear practical relevance, including patents and other IPR tools. There have been successes in the transfer of research into practice, including through the establishment of companies.

Most of the faculties have made a big leap forward compared to the previous international evaluation. MUNI has developed an active research culture including a large number of impressive grants as well as impactful humanities projects, experimental research and research focused on societal risks.

It is apparent that MUNI has a significant social impact locally in Brno and nationally, across the region, and internationally across Europe. The committee commends MUNI for its strong organizational structure, high-quality research, international visibility, and impactful societal engagement. The committee was pleased to see MUNI strategic focus on excellence and internationalization, and its successful acquisition of high-profile projects. The interdisciplinary nature of the research is seen as a major strength.

**Summary recommendation:**

1. Increase international visibility by attracting top national and international academics. Enhance involvement of current staff in international collaborations. Consider establishing guest professorships (6–12 months) to attract foreign sabbatical visitors.
2. Emphasize further engagement in international research fund applications. Develop a plan how to expand the range of researchers capable of attracting significant international (or national) grants. Special attention should be paid to securing large-scale grants such as ERC.
3. Develop a strategy to improve the gender balance among researchers. Increase the number of female academics at senior professor levels.
4. Develop a clear hiring strategy for assistant, associate, and full professors to support underperforming areas.
5. We recommend a discussion on the potential of restructuring of training teachers for post-primary school settings.
6. Establish a mentoring system for young scientists to cultivate future leaders.
7. Support strong-performing departments while improving cohesion across the faculty.
8. Foster a stronger entrepreneurial culture among staff. Expand commercialization pathways, supported by dedicated funding and incubation.
9. Strengthen interdisciplinary collaboration across university faculties to address complex issues like health and societal challenges.
10. Develop a systematic strategy for disseminating and communication research findings internationally in social media.

## EVALUATION REPORT FOR MODULES 4 & 5

**HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION NAME: Masaryk University**

**COMPANY REGISTRATION NUMBER (CRN): 00216224**

### 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

##### Qualitative assessment:<sup>1</sup>

Masaryk University is a middle-sized research university with 2,400 FTE staff and over 32 000 students. Ten faculties, two research institutes (RI). Faculties and RIs (OUs) are quite autonomous in HR and financial issues, thus enjoying independence in strategic development decisions. All in all, there are 200 research units (departments, research centres, clinics, institutes...). Therefore, the role of central R&D&I management (from the Rector's Office) is limited to performance-based financing (reflecting – quantitatively - the publication and grant performance of the OUs). This creates some difficulties for the central management to influence the strategic developments of the University (for example, to prioritize certain research areas or find proper balance between fundamental/basic and applied research).

Overall, the organisational structure and setup of the R&D&I management system very well corresponds to the type of the university and its mission and vision. The university managers and the rector's team have been doing very well indeed. However, they will eventually change over the years, which creates a need for good succession planning.

##### Recommendations:

The panel recommends a clear strategy for succession planning to ensure the continuity and sustainability of the positive developments achieved since the last review. The University should work on increasing internationalization and on creating equal chances for female academics to rise on the academic ladder.

<sup>1</sup> 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### Qualitative assessment:

The system of support for a quality R&D&I environment and incentive measures for quality science has been very well described in Paragraph 4.2. The system of support for a quality R&D&I environment and incentive measures for quality science includes numerous activities, which clearly help to maintain and further develop the appropriate R&D&I environment at the University. Its central part is the Grant Office, which serves as a methodological support unit, a consultancy service, and a training centre for all OUs. One obvious result of its success is the fact that MUNI is the most successful Czech institution in Horizon Europe, with 6 ERC grants, 18 MSCA-PF/ERA Fellowships, and 7 Widening projects coordinated. In addition, there is a decentralised network of grant offices at the OUs.

An important component of the environment for research is the governance of research infrastructures (RI), which is supported by a dedicated RI officer at the central level.

The Centre for Scientometric Support and Evaluation and the Technology Transfer Office, the Grant Agency of MUNI, etc., are parts of a complex structure for R&D&I support.

At MUNI, there are several research ethics committees, which makes it difficult for researchers to decide which committee to turn to. The development of a one-stop shop for research ethics approvals would be a good idea. Also, issues of ethics in Artificial Intelligence would need more attention.

#### Recommendations:

The panel recommends a systematic review of the ethics committees' structure to simplify their use by researchers. In that framework, the issues of ethics in Artificial Intelligence would also need more attention.

### 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### Qualitative assessment:

Internal research and doctoral studies evaluation are performed at the level of each department and doctoral degree programme in five-year cycle. The model focuses on research quality criteria, societal impact, doctoral studies and institutional strategy and is based on informed peer-review of self-evaluation reports and on-site visits of international expert panels.

The second layer of internal assessment are regular annual evaluations of the faculties and research institutes. This analysis reflects activity, visibility (journals), citation impact, and collaboration.

For external quality control, since 2015 there is an International Scientific Advisory Board of Masaryk University (ISAB MUNI, 5 world-known scientists).

More examples: Internal Research and Doctoral studies Evaluation (IRDE) at MUNI in 2022; International evaluation of research at CEITEC; Council for Strategic Research Projects of the Masaryk University (RSVP, internal); MUNI Internal Evaluation Board. External evaluations organised by the university itself are highly commended.

#### **Recommendations:**

The panel recommends continuing with targeted external evaluations. Also, conducting a regular Gender Audit is recommended.

#### **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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### **Qualitative assessment:**

The width and depth of different MUNI policies for keeping sustainability and resilience of its R&D&I are impressive and worth of commendation.

Masaryk University has approved several key strategic documents that address the issue of sustainable development in R&D&I, linked them with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and started their implementation with regular monitoring. Also, Masaryk University approved several key strategic documents that address the issue of social responsibility and started their implementation with regular monitoring. Social responsibility is one of the four pillars of sustainability at MUNI.

Since 2005, the Technology Transfer Office (TTO MUNI) has been an integral part of MUNI. TTO MUNI is an independent institutional unit providing support and conditions for the practical application of the university's research results. It offers services in technology/knowledge transfer (TT) to all MUNI departments.

In addition to its primary roles, education and scientific research, Masaryk University actively engages with society.

Masaryk University adopted a Research Data Strategy in 2022, together with the university-wide MUNI Open Science Strategy 2022-2028, establishing the basic services and support. A more detailed Research Data Management (RDM) Strategy and Policy is being developed, which aims to establish clear guidelines for data collection, access, sharing, and long-term preservation in line with FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable) principles.

Ethical issues in research are safeguarded by a dedicated university committee and a specific committee for medical research at the Faculty of Medicine. Masaryk University has a well-established system for protecting intellectual property (IP), managed by its Technology Transfer Office (TTO).

MUNI has a comprehensive Open Science Strategy for 2022–2028, supported by Action Plans for 2022–2024 and 2025–2028 (under development), which outline key steps for implementing Open Science practices across the institution.

MUNI provides comprehensive training in intellectual property and related fields, including technology and knowledge transfer, project management, ethics, and entrepreneurship education.

There is a strong push toward applied research (as opposed to basic research) and a push toward commercialisation. This is understandable and makes sense. However, there might be some advantages to re-evaluate this division and consider three tiers that are based on the dimensions of Pasteur's Quadrant: Considerations of use vs. quest for understanding. Both dimensions are of importance, and they lead to (a) basic research, (b) use-inspired research, and (c) (pure) applied research. Arguably, universities should excel in (a) and (b), but there could be room for (c). Perhaps Units like ICS could excel in (c). Units that excel in (a) ought to be celebrated, but their output in commercialisation might not be strong. Bridging research in (b) (and perhaps in c as well) could be supported by the university through incubator programs.

More flexible temporary structures to enhance more inter-faculty collaboration on issues embracing different research areas (like data security, migration, teacher training) could be introduced. New problems require new approaches.

During the process of preparing Self-Evaluation Reports (SERs) it is very important that all the staff is enabled to participate in the process. In some faculties this was not the case – even some people interviewed by the panel were not familiar with it.

#### **Recommendations:**

For the future planning of research priorities, consider three tiers that are based on the dimensions of Pasteur's Quadrant.

The panel also recommends bringing more flexibility into the structural buildup of the University, allowing temporary inter-faculty structures to address collaborative interdisciplinary and global tasks.

## **PERSONEL 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

#### **Qualitative assessment:**

The gender composition of staff at MUNI still demonstrates the widespread principle of the “leaky pipeline”, with the gender ratio progressively deteriorating with the career stage. There appears to be a lack of awareness and debate of Diversity, Equality, and Inclusion (DEI) issues across the University as a whole. While gender issues and internationalisation seem to dominate the agenda across all Faculties, the lack of active engagement with issues related to disability, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and agism etc. is apparent and requires urgent redress. As a starting point, there needs to be an explicit DEI policy and a structured implementation strategy to ensure that a comprehensive

commitment to DEI is seen as a driver of change and not just an afterthought in a few lectures or student groups.

MUNI has a Support Centre for Students with Special Needs, but its remit appears rather limited.

There seem to be occasional lectures or student groups, but a much greater emphasis needs to be placed on all sorts of DEI issues.

The age structure in several faculties is not optimal. Incentives for retirement, which are respectful towards older and meritorious colleagues would need development, together with university pension schemes in the future.

The Deans are very central to governance and management power. It would be useful to support their leadership training and vision.

#### **Recommendations:**

A culture of awareness of the issue and the advantage of diversity has to be fostered to change the status quo. The panel recommends formulating an explicit DEI policy and a structured implementation strategy across the whole university, including corresponding faculty strategies.

The panel also recommends establishing a system for training the (future) Deans for their important role in the University.

#### **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]:**

**4 - Very good**

#### **Qualitative assessment:**

The MUNI Career Code and its contents are currently being enriched with the elements reflecting the new European Charter for Researchers and the Competence Framework for Researchers issued by the EC (Researchcomp). The Career Code is expected to be published by the end of 2025.

At the central level, there are two ruling documents which cover career related topics.

All ten faculties and two MUNI institutes have received the "HR Excellence in Research" award from the European Commission.

MUNI's management has set an increasing trend in the number of foreign academic, scientific, and non-academic staff as the university's Strategic goal for 2021-2028.

The induction of new employees is well covered in all units.

The share of time between teaching, research, and service to the society/administration would need more clarity, so the staff clearly knows what to expect. Although it has been fixed at the level of (some) faculties, a university-level agreement would be welcome. For example, a general rule of 40%-40%-20% (for teaching-research-service) with allowed exemptions for flexibility would adopt an international standard.

#### Recommendations:

Design an agreement on the time share of academic staff between research, teaching and admin/services, making it understandable to everybody, but also allowing enough flexibility needed.

The panel recommends the development of structured training in Higher Education Teaching for academic colleagues. This should be considered standard staff training, especially for newly appointed academic colleagues.

#### 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 new MUNI Selection Procedure Regulations were implemented in all organizational parts of MUNI in 2023. These procedures are compatible with the principles of the Open, Transparent, and Merit-based Recruitment, gender balance, and anti-discriminatory principles, and an equal and correct approach during recruitment and selection is assured. In the years 2022-2024, MUNI implemented the Gender Equality Plan 2022–2024 (GEP MUNI), and a new Gender Equality Plan for 2025-2028 was developed based on gender audits conducted at MUNI from April to September 2024.

Although the share of women in leadership positions, different professional bodies, and many other spheres of university life has somewhat increased over the last evaluation period, the gender imbalance across the university is still a major topic that requires attention and action. We appreciate the effort the rectorate has put into it, and the "Career Restart" program was positively mentioned many times by different leaders. However, there are several units that do not even recognise it as an issue that they have control over (negative outliers are the Faculty of Law and the Faculty of Business and Administration). We heard from too many faculty leaderships that the problem is out of their control. It should be mentioned that the lack of women in academia is not only connected to parenting; during the analysis of academic staff at various faculties, it became evident that also women at higher age categories do not have the same career paths as their male colleagues.

#### Recommendations:

The existing plans for improving gender balance should be implemented systematically. There are several actions that could be taken in the future:

- \* faculty positions open for women-only
- \* promoting women into leadership roles
- \* establishing a female mentoring program across campus to help women to understand how to move up in ranks.
- \* establishing mentorship programs within academic units to help understand the obstacles to female (and other diversity candidates) and to create actions to remove such obstacles.

#### 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

##### Qualitative assessment:

Masaryk University participates in a large number of international collaboration agreements. In agreement with the MUNI strategic Plan, several measures are in use to promote the international mobility of the staff and doctoral students. In the evaluated period, MUNI has been part of 47 MSCA projects worth almost 10 million EUR.

Barriers to the international mobility have been identified as imposter syndrome, low language self-confidence and work-life balance priorities.

The inter-sectoral mobility has not been addressed extensively, apart from concrete projects like PRORISK or InterTAU – both of the MSCA projects.

MUNI has established rules for Sabbatical leave in a Directive, and as a part of the Strategic plan of Masaryk University for 2021 – 2028, there is a need for growing the proportion of academic, research, and non-academic staff with work experience outside MUNI, especially acquired abroad. However, by and large, the culture of taking a sabbatical seems to be lacking across MUNI. If MUNI would like to do research on an international level, a culture of sabbaticals is one instrument, but a crucial one. It serves to achieve a number of different goals: (a) to focus on (get focused time for) research, (b) to get to know a different academic environment, (c) to prepare a larger research grant. The definition of 'sabbatical' and its design could be more flexible (shorter time periods, fixed tasks).

##### Recommendations:

The most cited reasons for not taking sabbaticals were "Czech people don't like to travel"; "I cannot afford the reduction in salary" as well as "I am not able to be away from my grants." All of these should be addressed systematically at the university level. There are many different approaches on how to address them, and we don't want to prescribe any single one, but they could include:

- helping people with travel grants
- making people aware that taking a 'sabbatical' is not to be equated with 'traveling'
- unravel the supplemental teaching income.

## 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

##### Qualitative assessment:

Masaryk University hosts 15 large research infrastructures (LRI) nationally funded – 8 in Health and Food, 2 in Environmental Sciences, 2 in Physical Sciences and Engineering, 2 in Social Science and Humanities, and 1 in e-Infrastructures. In 5 LRI, MUNI is the coordinator (CEPLANT, CIISB, CZECRIN, GGP-CZ, RECETOX-RI). Also, it is involved in 12 ESFRI projects.

Yearly spendings for RI (Table 4.9.1) have been up to 20 M EUR (including related non-investment and personnel costs, but excluding the infrastructures linked to Czech LRI roadmap).

Moreover, MUNI will coordinate Research Infrastructures for the “Future of Ukraine: Roadmap for Sustained Growth and Recovery” (RIFF) project.

CEITEC has a long tradition of sharing the LRIs, but the actions from other LRIs are less well described. There is a Research Infrastructure Coordinator at the level of Rector’s office and Council for Strategic Research Projects (RSVP), but their roles seem to be in acquiring the new equipment rather than efficient use of the existing ones.

Ultimately, it is very important to keep the state of the art and invest into modern research techniques.

#### Recommendations:

Sustainability of research infrastructures, their running costs and costs of renewal is an issue, which should be systematically addressed. Also, the “new” issues like espionage, sabotage etc. and possible risks of private research financing should be evaluated.

The panel recommends a common MUNI database for LRIs, where researchers from different units can book access, and which could be nationally connected with other Czech research-intensive organisations.

## 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### Qualitative assessment:

Masaryk University remains the most successful Czech institution in Horizon Europe (HE), as it was in Horizon 2020, both in terms of number of participation and contracted EU contribution. Around 14% of total R&D&I financing came from outside (almost all HE). This is a very good achievement, although there are also challenges like low number of coordinated projects focused on research and innovation (RIA and IA actions). The work of the university in attracting foreign research investments is highly commended.

It was somewhat surprising to see that CEITEC had 16% share of public funding from abroad, which is only slightly higher than MUNI as a whole (14%).

#### Recommendations:

Continue with different initiatives at all levels to attract foreign research investments.

#### 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

##### Qualitative assessment:

The strategy and rules for using Long-term conceptual development of a research organisation (LCDRO) support are very well planned and implemented. MUNI was the first Czech university, which cut the direct link between the national and institutional budgeting system, which translated publication points to money and therefore limited the institutional strategies. This cut has not only a practical, but also a symbolic effect, along with other methods of evaluation resulting in the focus on quality and strategies.

The share of each OU in the performance component is determined by a formula comprised of altogether 11 indicators with different weightings and relevance for two areas of research – Science, Technology and Medicine (STM) and Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH).

##### Recommendations:

No recommendations.

## 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]:**

**4 - Very good**

##### Qualitative assessment:

National collaborations: MUNI is a leader of RUA – Research Universities Association (7 Czech universities). Excellent research network in areas of public interest in the area of health (the EXCELES programme) – MUNI is a coordinator of one institute (SYRI) and involved in all other EXCELES centres. Coordinator of RES-HEUM (Ready for the Future: Understanding the Long-Term Resilience of Human Culture). MUNI hosts 15 LRIs (Large Research Infrastructures) and coordinates 5 of them.

International collaborations: 2 Teaming projects: Central European Advanced Therapy and Immunotherapy Centre (CREATIC) and CETOCOEN Excellence (focused on environment effects on human health).

2 Excellence Hubs: Cyber-Security Excellence Hub in Estonia and South Moravia (CHESS) and Alzheimer's Disease Diagnostics Innovation and Translation to Clinical Practice in Central Europe (ADDIT-CE).

Coordinator of 3 HE projects.

Environmental Exposure Assessment Research Infrastructure (EIRENE) under the coordination of RECETOX has made it to the roadmap of European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructures (ESFRI) in its 2021 update.

Collaboration across the university needs more attention. There are good examples in some cases (e.g. CEITEC and the Faculty of Science), but it seems actively rejected in others (e.g., the Faculty of Education vs. the Department of Education). One of the challenges of the university administration is to foster "team spirit" and collaboration across campus. While it is understood that the faculties compete for the same "pot" of money, it would be important to understand that together one is stronger in the international competition for grants, talents, and relevance/impact. All of the big challenges we face in our society and worldwide cannot be solved through mono-disciplinary approaches but require a multi-disciplinary approach.

#### Recommendations:

Although MUNI is already active in coordinating some international research collaborative projects, more attention to take the role of coordinator in various EU projects (like RIA and IA actions in Horizon Europe) is recommended.

Collaboration between different faculties/institutes needs attention.

## 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]:

5 - Outstanding

#### Qualitative assessment:

Several important developments in the area of doctoral studies have taken place over the period of evaluation. In September 2025, a new national law will be introduced, which foresees better conditions for successful doctoral studies. The doctoral programs have been recently modernized, making them more interdisciplinary, efficient, and aligned with international best practices. The number of PhD students is increasing, although not much the number of foreign PhD students. Right now (at the time of writing the SER), there are 101 doctoral study programmes (DSP) in the Czech language, 69 in English, and 2 in German. 67% of PhD students are Czech, 18% Slovak, and 15% from other countries.

The number of PhD programs has been cut, and this tendency continues. The panel finds that one should be careful about what is being optimized. Simply reducing the number of PhD programs might not be the best strategy. Overall, we agree that the number of PhD programs seems excessive. However, we recommend clarifying and articulating the overall goals. One goal should be that the requirements for all PhD students are comparable (and transparent); this is the argument for fewer PhD programs. Another goal would be that students collaborate and are aware of the essential methods in their field: this could lead to a number of different "doctoral schools" that are aligned along the lines of scientific methods and publication cultures (e.g., journal clubs). However, this could lead to several different PhD programs also within one faculty. One shouldn't allow the methodological boundaries to be too narrow, i.e., "PhD schools" should have a certain minimal size to allow for the development of social identity. All of these are different constraints, and we suggest articulating them clearly and allowing some flexibility for the different faculties and departments.

Only 24% of PhD students finish their studies in 5 years and 54% do not complete their studies at all. In the SER, some activities to change the situation have been described (pp. 68-71). However, it is not clear, which would be the targeted rate of finishing PhD students – it can hardly be 100%.

The requirement to have one Q1 article for getting the PhD degree seems sub-standard in several research fields. The flexibility of languages allowed in reporting the results could be welcomed in some areas.

**Recommendations:**

Clarify and articulate the overall goals of reducing the number of PhD programs.

When reforming the number and content of PhD programs, allow some flexibility for different faculties and departments.

Ex-post evaluation and monitoring of the changes, which will be introduced by the new law with appropriate streamlining, are recommended.

Co-supervision of PhD students (committee) to help monitor and support their progress, and a female-to-female mentoring system is recommended.

## 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

**Qualitative assessment:**

MUNI has addressed all the recommendations from the previous evaluation (13 altogether). Many of them have found solutions, others are “in progress”. Hence, some recommendations would be carried on also to the next five-year period. Generally, the panel was satisfied to see very many recommendations followed.

**Recommendations:**

No 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                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | 5 - Outstanding        |
| 4.2 System of support for a quality R&D&I environment and incentive measures for quality science                                                                                                                                                                  | 5 - Outstanding        |
| 4.3 Quality control system for R&D&I environment                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 5 - Outstanding        |
| 4.4 Sustainability and resilience of R&D&I                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | 5 - Outstanding        |
| 4.5 Structure of human resources                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 4 - Very good          |
| 4.6 Academic and Research Careers                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | 4 - Very good          |
| 4.7 Gender equality measures                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 3 - Average            |
| 4.8 Mobility of academic and research staff (including sectoral and inter-sectoral mobility)                                                                                                                                                                      | 4 - Very good          |
| 4.9 Research infrastructure                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | 5 - Outstanding        |
| 4.10 Budget and structure of financial resources                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | 5 - Outstanding        |
| 4.11 Rules for the use of institutional support for the LCDRO                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 5 - Outstanding        |
| 4.12 Important collaborations in R&D&I                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | 4 - Very good          |
| 4.13 Doctoral studies                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | 5 - Outstanding        |
| 4.14 Implementation of recommendations in Module 4                                                                                                                                                                                                                | 5 - Outstanding        |
| <b>AVERAGE RATING</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| <b>GRADE [A–D]</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | <b>A</b>               |
| <b>Summary assessment:</b><br>Masaryk University is internationally competitive in various areas of research; it is an institution with strong innovation potential and excellent applied results. Masaryk University excellently fulfils its mission in society. |                        |
| <b>Summary recommendations:</b><br>See recommendations in pp. 4.1 to 4.13.                                                                                                                                                                                        |                        |

## 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### Qualitative assessment:

The mission of MUNI, as described in the Strategic Plan 2021-2028 is to contribute through its scientific activities, student education and social activities to the high quality and healthy life of all generations and to a free, cohesive and secure society. Its values are respect, freedom and responsibility. Its vision is composed of eight paragraphs covering all important areas of university activities, both inside and outside of the university. Six strategic goals with sub-goals have been defined covering teaching and education; research and doctoral studies; internal culture and social contribution activities; HR management and staff development; information systems and IT support; institution management and infrastructure.

The strategy of MUNI is well connected with important international documents like UN Sustainable Development Goals and Strategic Agenda of the EU 2024-2029. It also is well aligned with national strategies (National R&D&I Policy of the Czech Republic 2021+; Smart Specialisation Strategy 2021-2027).

We highly appreciate the Strategic Plan, both its form and content. The defined mission is very well linked to reality. Both the mission and vision have been fulfilled in the past five-year period and the vision for the next period (up to 2028) has been adequately set and is achievable.

#### Recommendations:

We recommend paying attention to more inclusive harmony of university vision and mission with those of faculties and institutions. Each unit should demonstrate, how they share and participate in realisation of the vision and mission of the whole university.

### 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

#### Qualitative assessment:

There are five strategic goals towards achieving the vision 2021-2028 formulated in SER, which cover basic and applied science, excellence and internationalisation of research, interdisciplinarity, standards for PhD education and the socio-economic status of the PhD students. These goals are realistically established for the Masaryk University and are achievable in the timeframe proposed.

The BioPharma Hub, MASH grant schemes, streamlining of PhD programmes and numerous other activities have helped to make major advances and innovations to fulfil the four major goals identified after the previous evaluation in 2020. MUNI has implemented a performance part of the

budget for research to foster high quality of research in faculties and institutes, supported interdisciplinary collaboration through strategic project “Innovations for Healthy and Secure Society” and others. All faculties and institutes have been fully engaged in HR award implementation and important steps have been made to increase the efficiency and quality of doctoral programs, including internal evaluation in 2022.

**Recommendations:**

The panel identified certain variability in the abilities of different faculties to describe their strengths, strategy and plans. We recommend turning more attention to the ones who lag behind.

**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]:**

**4 - Very good**

**Qualitative assessment:**

Table 5.3.1 presents a long list of institutional tools and measures for the implementation of the research and development strategy. Many of them are implemented or implemented partially. Also, several specific actions have been described, which are to implement the final stage of the Strategic Plan. We commend the use of many tools for supporting the high-quality R&D&I, excellent science, and commercialisation of research results.

Although the measures for development of human potential have also been described (GAMU MASH, incentives to seek MSCA COFUND support) we find that MUNI is not visible enough to the international scientific community, and it needs a more comprehensive plan to attract foreign professors and researchers. The number of foreign nationals among hires is still comparatively low, especially for senior ones. The rectorate demonstrated strong awareness of the issue and proposed concrete measures, while also noting general constraints. The panel acknowledges the efforts being made to enhance the internationalization of staff, also with respect to preparing MUNI scholars for research stays abroad. In some areas, the research environment seems to be more welcoming to international scholars, resulting in a significantly higher share of foreign nationals. Other areas still need to catch up. The panel recommends considering additional measures, particularly in relation to hiring policies, fostering an inclusive research environment, and providing support for international staff.

We commend also the active program of new university buildings, developments in rewarding system and responsible research assessment (CoARA Action Plan).

**Recommendations:**

The panel recommends working out a comprehensive plan for further developing the international visibility of the university and its more active involvement in the international scientific community. Part of this plan would be measures to attract more foreign professors and researchers.

#### 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]:**

**5 - Outstanding**

**Qualitative assessment:**

Recommendations from the previous evaluation have been in large part reflected and fulfilled.

**Recommendations:**

No 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                                               | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| 5.2 Research and development objectives                                                                    | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| 5.3 Institutional instruments and measures for the implementation of the research and development strategy | <b>4 - Very good</b>   |
| 5.4 Implementation of recommendations in Module 5                                                          | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| <b>AVERAGE RATING</b>                                                                                      | <b>5 - Outstanding</b> |
| <b>GRADE [A–D]</b>                                                                                         | <b>A</b>               |

**Summary assessment:**

Masaryk University is a leading university in the Czech Republic, owning the largest life science campus in Central Europe, receiving numerous grants from Horizon Europe and other international sources, and employing several excellent researchers. Its R&D&I strategy at the university level is well planned and realistic. Both the mission and vision described in the Strategic Plan are being actively followed, and the vision for the next period (up to 2028) has been adequately set and is achievable. Its R&D&I objectives are realistically established for the Masaryk University and are achievable.

In comparison with other Central European universities its performance is excellent and, in many areas, meets the best international standards.

The panel appreciated the open attitude of the university management and their willingness to learn and to improve. At the same time, they are also proud of what they have achieved, all nicely balanced.

**Summary recommendations:**

The panel recommends paying attention to a more inclusive harmony of the university vision and mission with those of the faculties and institutions. We also recommend working out a comprehensive plan for further developing the international visibility of the university and its more active involvement in the international scientific community. The panel finds that some faculties/institutes need more support in strategic planning and linking it with the vision of the whole university.

## 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 %          | A                    |
| MODULE 3                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 30 %          | A                    |
| MODULE 4                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 10 %          | A                    |
| MODULE 5                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      | 10 %          | A                    |
| <b>OVERALL RATING</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |               | <b>A – Excellent</b> |
| <b>Qualitative assessment:</b><br><br>Masaryk University is a leading university in the Czech Republic, owning the largest life science campus in Central Europe, receiving numerous grants from Horizon Europe and other international sources, and employing several excellent researchers. Its R&D&I strategy at the university level is well planned and realistic. Both the mission and vision described in the Strategic Plan are being actively followed, and the vision for the next period (up to 2028) has been adequately set and is achievable. Its R&D&I objectives are realistically established for the Masaryk University and are achievable. |               |                      |
| <b>Recommendations:</b><br><br>We recommend that the MUNI management continue on the chosen course, developing both the university as a whole and individual faculties. Specific recommendations that we recommend following are provided in the M3/M4/M5 reports.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |               |                      |