

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

HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION NAME: Pan-European University

COMPANY REGISTRATION NUMBER (CRN): 04130081

THE LIST OF EVALUATION UNITS IN MODULE 3:

Faculty of Entrepreneurship and Law

Faculty of Business

CHAIRPERSON OF INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION PANEL

Name and surname: prof. Gabriele Santoro

Phone number: [REDACTED]

E-mail: [REDACTED]

LIST OF INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION PANEL MEMBERS		
Name and surname	Position in IEP	Current position
Gabriele Santoro	Chairperson of IEP	Professor
Sabeen Hussain Bhatti	Member of IEP	Professor
Christina Theodoraki	Member of IEP	Professor
Francesco Domenico Sandulli	Member of IEP	Professor
Yuriy Bilan	Member of IEP	Professor
Tomas Baležentis	Member of IEP	Professor
Judit Oláh	Member of IEP	Professor

PROVIDERS METHODOLOGIST

Name and surname: Mgr. Damir Solak

Phone number: [REDACTED]

E-mail: [REDACTED]

Date of on-site visit of higher education institution: June 16, 2025

In Turin, October 10, 2025

Signature



(IEP chairperson)

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Entrepreneurship and Law

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 is a comprehensive and institutionally developed part of the university, with a core in economics, business, and law, further complemented by social science disciplines such as psychology and media and communication. This composition enables the creation of interdisciplinary linkages and supports the development of research capacities with a higher degree of institutionalisation. An important element is the existence of doctoral studies, which provides a framework for the long-term development of research teams, including systematic work with early-career researchers.

A notable feature of the faculty is its balance between applied and basic research. On the one hand, it responds to the needs of practice and the public sector, while on the other it maintains a theoretical foundation essential for academic continuity and development. Its organizational structure creates an environment in which teaching, research, and application are combined, with an emphasis on international visibility and professional orientation.

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:¹

The faculty demonstrates a high level of recognition within the research community, which matches and in many respects exceeds the expectations for a professionally oriented higher education institution of this type. Its visibility is supported by a broad range of activities: from editorial and review roles in established journals, through participation in grant panels of both national and European agencies, to invitations for plenary lectures and expert contributions at foreign universities. These facts show that the faculty not only publishes and contributes to scholarly debate, but also co-shapes it and is actively invited to do so by the international community.

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

Recognition is built on both individual achievements – such as awards and academic positions of key personalities – and on the systematic reputation-building of the faculty through long-term engagement in disciplinary structures, international organisations, and networking. This combination strengthens institutional credibility, creates a resilient foundation beyond individual performance, and ensures that outputs are perceived as relevant in the international context.

Recommendations:

Looking ahead, the faculty is encouraged to further consolidate this institutional recognition and develop it in a systematic way. A particular priority should be to ensure that younger researchers and doctoral students also benefit from this standing – for example through their active involvement in international projects, networks, and scholarly fora where senior staff are already engaged.

It will also be important to continue embedding this culture of recognition within the institutional identity, so that it is progressively strengthened across the academic community. This can be supported by encouraging broader participation of academics in international evaluation processes, by involving younger researchers in editorial and review activities, and by integrating international engagement more systematically into the faculty's development strategies.

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's project portfolio demonstrates its capacity to focus on topics of high societal relevance with clear impact on users. It combines national competitive schemes (e.g., TA CR), international programmes (Interreg, Visegrad, NAWA/NCN), and contract research in a way appropriate to its scale and profile, thereby supporting financial resilience. Projects typically lead to methodological tools and recommendations for public institutions and regional partners, while also advancing analytical approaches applicable more broadly.

The portfolio is well aligned with the declared mission – public administration, regional development, SMEs – and brings together teams across disciplines. The faculty addresses interdisciplinary themes (e.g., combining economics, law, and data analytics in public policy projects) and collaborates with other parts of the institution, including joint projects that strengthen the overall expertise. During the on-site visit, the panel reviewed selected projects and their uptake; these confirmed the applied orientation as well as links to teaching and publication activity. Overall, the portfolio is proportionate to the faculty's capacity, effective, and internally coherent.

Recommendations:

The faculty is encouraged to monitor and evaluate project impacts not only at completion but also over the longer term, so that outputs bring lasting benefits and contribute to decision-making and teaching. Strengthening interdisciplinary integration – particularly across economics, law, regional studies, and data analytics – will support innovative, user-oriented solutions.

Another priority should be the involvement of younger researchers and doctoral students from the project design stage onwards, ensuring skill development and international exposure. This approach will help cultivate the next generation of academics while broadening the faculty's capacity for participation in international consortia and collaborative projects.

3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society

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

Rating [1–5]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:

The faculty's research results form a consistent body of outputs that correspond to its professionally oriented profile. Many results have been directly applied in shaping public policies and institutional management, with methodologies and recommendations adopted by state administration, regional authorities, and sectoral institutions.

A notable strength is the diversity of outputs: beyond scientific publications, results include legislative inputs, methodological manuals, and recommendations for regional service adaptation. This reflects the faculty's orientation toward applied outcomes and its ability to connect academic expertise with societal needs. The impacts also span different levels: local and regional projects, national methodologies, and outputs relevant in European contexts, often in collaboration with international and interdisciplinary partners. Evidence from the on-site visit illustrated these impacts, confirming the applied orientation and links to both teaching and publication activity. This balance across local, national, and international levels enhances the faculty's credibility and reach.

Recommendations:

The faculty should establish systematic procedures for documenting the long-term use of results and their effects among end users, such as the adoption of legislative proposals or the implementation of methodologies. Regular feedback from stakeholders would help to track how outputs are applied in practice. Developing a methodology for capturing "impact stories" could also serve to illustrate concrete changes achieved.

In addition, more explicit integration of gender and sustainability aspects in project design and reporting is advisable. Expanding dissemination through international channels – for example through policy papers or European platforms – will further strengthen the visibility and long-term relevance of impacts.

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:

The transfer of research results into practice forms a consistent part of the faculty's activities and reflects its mission and profile. Outputs target public administration, the business sector, and non-profit organizations, and are delivered in the form of methodological materials, expert studies, consultancy, and training. This corresponds to the disciplinary orientation of the faculty and demonstrates the practical orientation of research activities.

The faculty acts as a partner in the formulation of public policies and the preparation of regional strategies. Examples include contributions for the Ministry of Justice, budgetary recommendations during the CZ PRES, and the Adapt!!! project, which connected academic expertise with regional stakeholders. During the on-site visit, the panel reviewed selected cases illustrating how research results were taken up in practice; these confirmed the applied profile and its links to broader teaching and research activities. Through such initiatives, results are incorporated into decision-making processes and reach a wide user base, supported by competitive projects and international collaborations.

Recommendations:

The faculty should strengthen the systematic collection of user feedback and consistently document how outputs are applied and what long-term effects they generate. This applies equally to methodological materials for ministries, recommendations for regions, and expert analyses for corporate partners. Publishing regular summaries of applications and impacts would improve transparency for external stakeholders.

While maintaining strong links with public administration and regional actors, the faculty could also expand the visibility of its impacts in international arenas. Building on its established continuity and complementing it with more systematic documentation would further reinforce the faculty's mission and strategic relevance.

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 presents a broad and continuous portfolio of popularisation activities that correspond well to its profile and size. These include media appearances and expert commentary, public lectures

and workshops, participation in professional and international conferences, student recruitment and outreach events (such as fairs), and systematic use of social media and digital platforms. Communication with the public is clearly embedded in the faculty's activities and linked to both research and education.

Documented examples include regular media outputs (radio programmes, print and online articles), popularisation publications (e.g., a monograph series on architectural heritage), public events with applied relevance (case-study-based conferences), open days, and a wide range of lifelong learning activities (such as the University of the Third Age or the 2019–2021 Lifelong Learning Centre project). Student involvement is also visible – for example, the Competitiveness Barometer and the activities of the student agency Hešteť, which was also highlighted in the self-evaluation report. As part of the on-site visit, the panel was presented with student participation in incubation programmes such as Green Light and the Social Impact Award, which connect student projects with wider professional and community audiences. Social media and fairs (e.g., Gaudeamus) are used to present research results to both professional communities and the general public.

The main limitation lies in the absence of systematic impact measurement and management. The submitted materials do not define quantified objectives or KPIs (e.g., reach, engagement, audience targeting), and there is no regular monitoring of effectiveness across channels. Nor is there an editorial plan or comprehensive system for recording outputs. Introducing such elements would allow the faculty to better demonstrate the effectiveness of its activities and to plan their further development.

Recommendations:

The faculty should adopt a more systematic approach to managing and documenting its popularisation activities. This includes setting measurable goals (such as reach, audience engagement, and effectiveness of communication channels) and regularly monitoring progress. Establishing a clear editorial plan and processes for recording outputs would strengthen both internal management and external visibility. In this way, the faculty can show not only the breadth of its activities but also their tangible societal benefits.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module 3

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

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

Rating [1–5]:

N/A - Not Applicable

Qualitative assessment:

Not applicable.

The unit is being evaluated for the first time; no recommendations from a previous evaluation exist and therefore could not have been implemented.

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	NOT RATED
3.2 Recognition by the research community	5 - Outstanding
3.3 Research projects	5 - Outstanding
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 3	N/A - Not Applicable
Average rating [1–5]:	5 - Outstanding
Grade [A–D]:	A
Summary assessment: The faculty presents a coherent and convincing picture of its research activity, closely aligned with its profile and strategic ambitions. Key strengths lie in the combination of professional credibility, visibility within the research community, and a well-structured project portfolio delivering results with clear societal benefits. Outputs extend beyond the academic sphere and translate into methodologies, recommendations, and tools directly applicable in practice, supported by a systematic approach to knowledge transfer into public administration, the business sector, and the non-profit domain. The balance between ambition and capacity is positive: projects are selected realistically in areas of long-standing expertise. The interconnection between projects, results, and transfer creates a stable foundation for sustainability and enhances institutional reputation. Popularisation and communication activities are broad and appropriate to the faculty's profile, though their impact would be demonstrated more convincingly with systematic planning and evaluation.	
Summary recommendations: For the coming period, the faculty is encouraged to further strengthen the established link between research projects, outputs, and practical impacts. Maintaining proportionality between ambitions and capacities will remain essential for stability and reputation. At the same time, greater emphasis should be placed on the systematic management of popularisation and communication activities – including the definition of indicators, regular assessment of impact, and transparent documentation of outcomes. Strengthening these elements will help to make the societal benefits of research more visible and further enhance external credibility.	

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Business

FORD: 5 - Social sciences

SOCIAL CONTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATED UNIT

3.1 Introductory information about the unit under evaluation

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

Commentary:

The faculty represents a smaller, clearly profiled institution with a focus on tourism, aviation, and related social and economic disciplines. Its compact size and resource base lead to a narrower specialisation and to a close integration of research activities with teaching. A distinctive feature is its professional orientation: knowledge and outputs are from the outset directed towards practical application and the needs of the professional environment. This framework provides the faculty with a stable position within its core disciplines and underlines its identity as a professionally focused higher education institution.

Another characteristic is the close cooperation with industry partners and the systematic transfer of research findings into educational programmes. This not only strengthens the attractiveness of study programmes but also creates opportunities for student involvement in research and innovation. The institutional positioning shows that the faculty does not aim to develop a broad research portfolio; instead, it emphasises depth and practical impact in fields where it has built a long-standing reputation and professional credibility.

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:¹

The faculty is well established within its profile fields and maintains an international presence proportionate to its focus and size. Editorial and review work in established journals in tourism and aviation significantly contribute to its reputation, demonstrating that experts from the faculty are not only publishing but also shaping research agendas. International lectures and the involvement of visiting professors further illustrate a two-way flow of knowledge that strengthens institutional visibility and embeds the faculty within international scholarly networks.

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

At the same time, recognition remains concentrated in specific subfields and is less evident in the evaluation processes of major grant agencies. The institution therefore stands on solid foundations within its core disciplines, while at the same time showing clear potential for systematic expansion through deeper participation in research consortia and European competitions, which would broaden its recognition beyond its traditional areas of specialisation.

Recommendations:

The faculty is encouraged to work systematically on expanding its international visibility by supporting academics in engaging with grant panels, advisory bodies, and research consortia that extend beyond its traditional specialisations. This would strengthen institutional credibility and enable the faculty to contribute more actively to shaping research agendas in a broader European context.

It will also be important to ensure that international reputation is not concentrated among a few individuals but progressively becomes shared institutional capital, accessible to younger researchers.

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 manages an application-oriented project portfolio in tourism, aviation, entrepreneurship, and public finance, combining competitive grants, international schemes (e.g., Visegrad), and contract research in a way that is proportionate to its size and allows for flexible responses to the needs of both the public and private sectors. Outputs are consistently user-oriented, ranging from methodologies and decision-making indicators to procedures directly implemented in operational practice, which illustrates that the results go beyond declarative contributions.

The portfolio shows strong internal coherence, with topics reinforcing one another and forming a clear institutional identity aligned with the mission of a professionally oriented higher education institution. Interdisciplinary overlaps are also evident—for instance, tourism linked with data analytics and environmental standards, aviation with human factors psychology and regulation, or UAVs with law and security. Collaboration with partners ensures that results are translated efficiently into practice and curricula, as confirmed by examples presented during the on-site visit, where users documented effective uptake. In this way, project activity reflects the faculty's vision, builds a consistent profile, and demonstrates measurable societal impact.

Recommendations:

For the coming period, the faculty should work on systematically transforming project results into long-term, demonstrable examples of impact – for instance through methodologies, implemented tools, or educational programmes. Expanding participation in international project networks and

consortia would further strengthen institutional visibility and ensure broader applicability of results beyond the national context.

It is also recommended to develop mechanisms for systematically sharing project management experience internally, so that knowledge and good practices are effectively transferred across teams.

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's research results have a clearly profiled impact in areas consistent with its focus – particularly tourism, aviation, and related applied fields. Outputs go beyond partial academic contributions and take the form of practical tools and processes directly applicable in public administration, industry, and education.

The faculty demonstrates the ability to generate innovations with immediate utility: from methodological standards for destinations and municipalities, through software solutions for enterprises, to curricula and manuals aligned with European regulations. The results also carry a systemic dimension, contributing to long-term improvements in destination management, aviation safety, and inclusivity in tourism. The international component is visible as well, including participation in V4 regional projects and the adaptation of European standards into national practice. During the on-site visit, selected examples of applied results were presented, confirming both their relevance and their use by external stakeholders.

Recommendations:

For the coming period, the faculty should systematically monitor how results are used over the long term and develop documented examples of their impact across different sectors. The international dimension of impacts should be reinforced by ensuring that results are more actively shared within European disciplinary and regulatory platforms. It will also be important to expand cooperation with enterprises and destinations on the basis of long-term partnerships, so that outputs are not perceived as one-off results but become part of strategic management. Greater emphasis should be placed on sustainability and inclusivity – for example, gender and environmental aspects – as a standard element in the description of research results.

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:

The transfer of results into practice is a consistent part of the faculty's mission and closely linked to its disciplinary priorities. Users of the results include businesses, professional organisations, and public administration, particularly in tourism, aviation, and management. Transfer takes place through methodologies, models, educational programmes, and contract-based projects. This approach corresponds to the faculty's profile and ensures coherence between research activities and their practical application.

The faculty makes effective use of cooperation with the application sphere, professional associations, and sectoral platforms, while also involving students through projects and internships. Contract research plays a significant role, providing immediate applicability and generating additional funding beyond public and grant schemes. In this way, research results are transferred directly into practice, reinforcing the faculty's position as a partner for the professional and business environment. Evidence presented during the on-site visit confirmed uptake by external stakeholders.

Recommendations:

In the coming period, the faculty should place greater emphasis on documenting the long-term use of research results, for example by tracking their influence on destination management, aviation regulation, or business processes over time. Strengthening communication with international partners would also be valuable, as it would make it possible to demonstrate that the impact of results extends beyond the domestic context. Regular monitoring and dissemination of evidence on user uptake could further enhance transparency and reinforce the faculty's reputation.

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 carries out a broad and continuous portfolio of popularisation activities appropriate to its profile and size. These include media appearances and expert commentary, public lectures and workshops, participation in professional and international conferences, student recruitment events, and the systematic use of social media and digital platforms. Communication with the public is thus embedded as an element linked to both research and teaching.

Examples of these activities illustrate the faculty's strong presence in national media and public events, as well as the active involvement of students in presenting applied projects and engaging with wider audiences. Digital communication channels further enhance the visibility of research activities and their relevance for society.

The main area for improvement lies in impact measurement and management. The submitted materials do not include quantified targets or KPIs (reach, engagement, target groups), and systematic monitoring and evaluation of effectiveness across channels is missing, as is a clearly defined editorial plan or system for recording outputs. Introducing these elements would allow the faculty to demonstrate effectiveness more convincingly and plan future development.

Overall, the faculty demonstrates a diverse set of activities that are proportionate to its profile and create visible links between research, teaching, and public communication. To fully realise their potential, these activities will benefit from more systematic planning, monitoring, and documentation.

Recommendations:

For the coming period, the faculty should strengthen the systematic management of its popularisation activities. This includes introducing clear effectiveness metrics (reach, interaction, segmentation of target groups), regular monitoring, and evaluation of impact. Transparent documentation of outputs would reinforce the ability to demonstrate their long-term significance and effect. In this way, the faculty will be able to show not only the breadth of its activities but also that popularisation has a strategic and sustainable character.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module 3

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

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

Rating [1–5]:

N/A - Not Applicable

Qualitative assessment:

Not applicable.

The unit is being evaluated for the first time; no recommendations from a previous evaluation exist and therefore could not have been implemented.

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	NOT RATED
3.2 Recognition by the research community	4 - Very good
3.3 Research projects	5 - Outstanding
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	N/A - Not Applicable
Average rating [1–5]:	5 - Outstanding
Grade [A–D]:	A
Summary assessment: The faculty delivers a clearly profiled and application-oriented research performance in its key fields, particularly tourism, aviation, and business. Its main strength lies in a coherent project portfolio, the results of which are translated into practice in the form of methodologies, models, curricula, and software solutions. Knowledge transfer to users in both the business and public sectors is an integral part of its activities, bringing societal benefits while also contributing to resource diversification. The balance between ambitions and capacities is positive: the faculty builds on areas where it has established expertise, thereby supporting sustainability and long-term development. Another significant strength is the ability to involve students and professional partners in research activities, which supports a two-way flow of knowledge and enhances the applied relevance of results. Areas for improvement remain in two domains. First, broadening recognition within the research community beyond the core sub-disciplines – through deeper participation in international consortia, evaluation bodies, and programme structures – would strengthen institutional capital and reputation. Second, research popularisation lacks firm procedural anchoring: clear KPIs, regular reporting, and systematic evaluation of effectiveness across channels are not yet in place.	
Summary recommendations: The faculty is encouraged to build on its strong applied orientation and continue to develop areas where it has demonstrable expertise – particularly tourism, aviation, and business. Since the results already generate practical outputs and support resource diversification, institutional capital should be further strengthened through greater involvement in international consortia and evaluation structures, enhancing recognition within the broader research community. It is also recommended to introduce clearer procedural and measurable elements in the field of popularisation and public communication – including the definition of objectives, setting of KPIs, and implementation of regular reporting – so that the faculty can systematically demonstrate the effectiveness of this area. By maintaining its applied profile while strengthening institutional reputation and systematising popularisation, the faculty can further consolidate its position and expand its influence in both academic and applied environments.	

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 Entrepreneurship and Law	A
Faculty of Business	A
Summary grade	A

Summary quality assessment:

The Faculty of Entrepreneurship & Law and the Faculty of Business together form a complementary and well-balanced whole. The larger unit in economics, business and law is effectively complemented by a smaller, professionally profiled unit focused on tourism and aviation. This combination enables interdisciplinarity and keeps the ambitions of the institution proportionate to its capacity. The project portfolios of both faculties are coherent and application-oriented, with results regularly translated into methodologies, indicators, curricula and tools that are used by public authorities, regional actors, professional bodies and enterprises. Knowledge transfer is embedded in the institutional culture and supported by systematic involvement of students and professional partners. This profile is closely aligned with the mission and vision of a professionally oriented HEI, and recent institutional steps – such as the development of doctoral studies, the establishment of support structures for research and internationalisation, and attention to ethics and gender issues – further reinforce the visibility and social relevance of the institution.

Summary recommendation:

The panel notes that the main recommendations regarding impact monitoring, user feedback mechanisms and communication have already been formulated for the individual units. At the level of the HEI as a whole, the panel underlines the importance of developing a more systematic and consistent approach to documenting societal impact and collecting feedback from users. The panel also highlights the need for clearer planning and evaluation of communication and popularisation activities, supported by measurable indicators. Finally, the panel encourages the institution to further strengthen its international visibility through participation in European networks and policy platforms, and to ensure that Open Science, gender and sustainability are consistently reflected when presenting societal relevance.

EVALUATION REPORT FOR MODULES 4 & 5

HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION NAME: Pan-European University

COMPANY REGISTRATION NUMBER (CRN): 04130081

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:¹

The university has systematically developed an environment that not only enables research but actively supports it as a driver of profiling, internationalisation, and societal relevance. Strategic leadership is central in this respect, with the Vice-Rector for Research, Development and International Affairs ensuring coordination across the institution and fostering a shared understanding of the purpose of research. The onsite visit, including meetings with senior management and researchers, confirmed the strong leadership role of the Vice-Rector in shaping and promoting the research agenda across the university. The Academic Council and the Internal Evaluation Board provide professional anchoring and constructive feedback, acting as active partners in defining quality standards and strategic priorities.

The organisational structure combines decentralisation and coherence. Two faculties benefit from disciplinary autonomy while remaining embedded in a unified institutional framework. Deans play both an executive and transformational role, connecting the external dynamics of their disciplines with the overall research strategy. Research is therefore not positioned as an isolated activity, but as an integral part of faculty identity.

A key institutional innovation is the establishment of the ECR Institute, which enables researchers to step outside routine teaching and operational duties and to focus on topics with interdisciplinary and international potential. Its existence demonstrates the university's ambition to consolidate its role as a research-oriented institution within the European space of applied higher education.

Support services, including HR, ICT, and financial administration, operate effectively as service units while at the same time contributing to team stability, infrastructure development, and the creation of favourable conditions for growth.

Recommendations:

For the coming period, it will be important to maintain the stability of the RDI governance framework and embed it as a routine institutional practice. At the same time, the framework should provide sufficient allowance for academic freedom, balancing institutional priorities with individual research initiatives. The university should also document the regular activities of the councils and

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

demonstrate how their work influences management decisions. Particular attention should be given to ensuring that the ECBR Institute continues to strengthen its position through interdisciplinary and international activities. In the next evaluation, the university will need to provide evidence that these mechanisms are not only formally in place but are systematically used and sustained across the institution.

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 university has established a functional system that connects research support with incentive mechanisms and reflects both its current capacities and long-term ambitions. The measures are proportionate to the size of the institution and make effective use of available resources. The system is well integrated and contributes to the development of teams, participation in international cooperation, and the achievement of high-quality outcomes.

The incentive scheme linked to revenues from external projects creates a transparent connection between performance and remuneration, while researchers also benefit from targeted language and administrative support. This is reflected in growing activity in programmes such as Horizon Europe, TA CR, and INTERREG, as well as in partial successes including the Seal of Excellence. Project support operates at several levels, with some teams managing projects independently in line with their scale and research profile.

The European Centre for Business Research (ECBR) provides a framework for focused research activity outside standard teaching duties and serves as an effective tool for building interdisciplinary teams and preparing larger projects. The forthcoming directive on internal grants is expected to complement this framework by supporting early-stage research and young researchers.

Additional measures such as mentoring, the involvement of doctoral students, and the formation of international networks are not yet fully systematised but are emerging within individual teams and projects. In combination with the targeted support mechanisms already in place, they contribute to the gradual strengthening of the research environment, which is developing in line with the university's profile and capacities.

Recommendations:

For the coming period, it will be important to further develop the current system of support and incentives and to complement it with more systematic elements targeted at the early stages of research—particularly internal grants, structured mentoring, and more coordinated involvement of doctoral students and early-career researchers in teams. The university should also ensure that the framework is sustainable in the long term, transparent, and applied consistently across teams, and that its impact on project success and internationalisation can be clearly demonstrated in the next evaluation.

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:

The university has put in place a multi-level system for evaluating the quality of the research environment, which is consistent with ESG requirements and reflects both the national legislative framework and international recommendations. Internal processes are coordinated by the Internal Evaluation Board and rely on regular Reports on the Evaluation of Creative Activities (ZHTČ), which analyse publication outputs, project activity, and student involvement.

The evaluation of these reports is conducted using the EFQM model, which provides not only a structured basis for self-assessment but also a tool for monitoring progress over time. This approach supports the identification of strengths and weaknesses and facilitates targeted improvements in research activities.

External evaluation is ensured through cooperation with international scientific boards of partner institutions and the oversight mechanisms of the National Accreditation Bureau. The results of these evaluations are published and contribute to strengthening transparency and accountability across the university.

In the area of research ethics, the university has established a comprehensive framework that includes a Code of Ethics, rules for the operation of the Ethics Committee, and an internal system for reporting misconduct. This framework is further reinforced by regular training for staff and students and by the publication of information on the activities of the Ethics Committee and the whistleblowing system.

Recommendations:

The continuity of this multi-level evaluation system should be maintained, with particular attention to ensuring ongoing transparency. The university should continue to publish the results of both internal and external evaluations on a regular basis and demonstrate how the conclusions are translated into the management of research activities and the support of teams. In the area of ethics, regular training for staff and students and the publication of information on the activities of the Ethics Committee and the whistleblowing system should be maintained as standard practice. In the next evaluation, it will be important to provide evidence of the long-term functionality of these mechanisms and their tangible contribution to the quality and integrity of the research environment. Building on the existing framework, the university is encouraged to give further attention to institutional monitoring of student progression and drop-out, as well as to the systematic tracking of graduate destinations, ensuring that the findings are used for enhancement at programme level. The wider student experience could also be benchmarked against recognised European good practice, with progress monitored through published indicators led by senior university and faculty leaders. Finally, quality assurance should continue to be primarily enhancement-led rather than compliance-driven, with mechanisms that clearly support improvement and innovation.

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]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:

The university has established a framework that addresses the key dimensions of sustainability and resilience and links them to its institutional profile. This includes development and social responsibility, regional partnerships and knowledge transfer, digital infrastructure, ethics, and data governance. Positive elements are the strategic embedding of sustainability (including planned ESG reporting), concrete examples of applied research and regional partnerships (such as the economic model of decarbonisation measures, involvement in the NECSTouR network, and cooperation with the City of Ostrava), as well as a well-developed ethical and data security framework (Code of Ethics, rules of the Ethics Committee with publication of anonymised findings, GDPR processes, and an appointed DPO) and advanced digital infrastructure, including the UIS and mobile application. Together, these components provide a solid basis for resilience and responsibility in RDI at the institutional level.

At the same time, limits remain in terms of institutionalisation in several important areas. Open Science and research data management are currently implemented mainly at project and team level; there is no dedicated institutional Open Science strategy or proprietary repository, with reliance primarily on national or external tools. Knowledge transfer is carried out largely through ECBR and individual teams, without a central TTO, and education in IP/TT is included only in selected curricula or delivered through consultations rather than as a comprehensive system for staff and students. Planned ESG reporting is still in preparation and has not yet become an established practice. As a result, while the framework is functional and proportionate to the size and profile of the university, some pillars of sustainability and resilience remain anchored at project or team level rather than institution-wide.

Recommendations:

For the coming period, the university should strengthen the institutionalisation of Open Science and research data management by adopting a university-wide strategy and developing appropriate tools for long-term storage and sharing. Knowledge transfer should be embedded more firmly at the institutional level and complemented by systematic education for staff and students in intellectual property protection and collaboration with the application sphere. Another important step will be to integrate ESG reporting into regular management and communication. In the next evaluation, it will be necessary to demonstrate that these areas have evolved from project-based approaches into stable institutional mechanisms.

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 university has a staffing structure that corresponds to its size and profile and provides a stable basis for the long-term development of RDI. The age composition shows a well-defined core of experienced staff in higher academic ranks, complemented by the gradual entry of younger academics, particularly at the level of assistants and assistant professors. This generational overlap creates scope for gradual renewal and the preservation of quality continuity.

The international dimension of the staff base remains limited, although data indicate a modest increase in the proportion of foreign academics. This suggests that the university is opening up to the international environment, while also pointing to the need for more systematic measures to consolidate this trend as part of personnel policy.

The gender structure is balanced at the lower academic levels, but at the ranks of associate professor and professor the well-known pattern of the Czech academic environment persists, with women advancing more slowly into senior positions. Nevertheless, upcoming habilitations are expected to bring progress in this respect.

The presence of administrative and technical support staff strengthens the functioning of research teams and creates an institutional framework that reduces dependence on the individual capacities of academics. This enhances stability and reduces vulnerability at system level. In this way, the university maintains a balanced and adaptable staffing structure: it has a stable core of research staff, gradually expands technical and administrative support, and is beginning to build stronger links with the international environment. At the same time, challenges remain in the relatively low degree of internationalisation and the persistent gender imbalance at higher academic levels.

Recommendations:

For the next period, the university should further strengthen the career progression of younger researchers and introduce more targeted recruitment of international academics. In the field of gender equality, emphasis should be placed on the gradual implementation of the institutional plan, in particular by supporting the advancement of women into higher academic ranks and governance bodies. In the next evaluation, it will be important to demonstrate that measures to support internationalisation, the professional development of younger academics, and the steps defined in the Gender Equality Plan have been implemented and have led to visible progress in the staffing structure.

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 university has established a transparent and proportionate system for the recruitment and career development of academic and research staff. Recruitment procedures are governed by internal regulations with an emphasis on equal treatment, and exceptions are allowed only when renewing an employment contract for the same position. The framework is complemented by regular staff appraisal, opportunities for targeted qualification support (including workload adjustments, research leave, or financial contributions), and a structured onboarding process with a mentor and HR support, which accelerates the integration of new academics into teaching and research. Workload allocation is also clearly regulated through transparent procedures (salary

regulations and an approval line from head to dean to rectorate), and the university does not rely on chains of short-term contracts. Rules for filling leadership roles, including those in RDI, are defined by statutes and internal regulations, while continuity of employment is ensured for staff working concurrently at external institutions.

Several elements, however, are still in development. International recruitment procedures are planned but have not yet been launched, as they are linked to forthcoming LCDRO funding, and their effectiveness therefore cannot be assessed. Sabbatical rules are not yet formalised and are currently handled individually. Mechanisms for returning from external institutions exist but have not yet been applied, and procedures for returns from parental leave are described but have not been tested, as no such cases occurred in the review period. These do not represent fundamental gaps in quality but indicate that part of the system remains to be institutionalised and demonstrated in practice. In its current form, the system is functional and transparent in the key processes of recruitment, performance evaluation, onboarding, mentoring, and employment stability, while the effectiveness of several additional measures can only be confirmed once they are fully implemented.

Recommendations:

For the coming period, the university should formalise sabbatical rules and ensure that they are clearly defined and accessible to academic staff. Conditions for the use of international recruitment procedures should be prepared as soon as the financial and institutional framework allows. It will also be important to systematically monitor and evaluate the functioning of return mechanisms from external institutions and from parental leave so that their practical use can be documented. In the next evaluation, the university should demonstrate that these mechanisms have been implemented and are effectively complementing the existing framework of recruitment and career development.

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]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:

The university has established and interconnected gender equality principles in recruitment and career development, which are embedded in the Gender Equality Plan (GEP). These include gender-sensitive advertising, transparent criteria, and selection committees with representation of both genders, supported by the Code of Ethics, the Statute of the Ethics Committee, and internal whistleblowing mechanisms. In 2024, the position of ombudsperson was created, further strengthening accessibility of support and oversight of GEP implementation. The institution also provides flexible and remote working arrangements and has introduced family-friendly measures, which were confirmed by staff during the on-site visit. Within the GEP, regular analyses of pay and remuneration are conducted with the aim of identifying hidden disparities. Taken together, these elements provide a solid basis consistent with requirements for equal treatment in recruitment, evaluation, and career progression.

Nevertheless, uneven representation persists at senior levels of governance. Both vice-rectors are men and both deans are women, while in the Academic and Scientific Councils the number of women has increased but they remain in the minority. This indicates partial progress but also highlights the limits of effectiveness at the highest levels of decision-making. While the GEP foresees mentoring and transparent procedures for career progression, quantifiable results and KPIs are not yet sufficiently developed—for example, published outcomes of pay-gap analyses or evidence of

impact on leadership appointments. In nominations to expert bodies, the university strives for balance but acknowledges the continuing predominance of men. The system is therefore well designed and includes most of the key elements (GEP, recruitment and evaluation processes, ethical and whistleblowing mechanisms, ombudsperson, flexible arrangements), but the effectiveness of these measures must be more clearly demonstrated through concrete results.

Recommendations:

For the coming period, the university should focus on the consistent implementation of the GEP and on demonstrating the practical application of its measures. Particular attention should be given to the regular evaluation of remuneration and the adoption of corrective measures where disparities are identified, to ensuring balanced representation in committees and governing or advisory bodies, and to targeted development activities such as mentoring and training for women aspiring to higher academic and leadership positions. The effective role of the ombudsperson as a contact point for addressing cases and preventing inappropriate behaviour should also be ensured. In the next evaluation, it will be essential to provide concrete evidence of the outcomes of these measures—through documentation such as committee compositions, training activities, remuneration analyses, and resolved cases—and to demonstrate that they contribute to a gradual, institutionally managed shift towards more balanced representation in leadership and expert bodies.

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]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:

The university has developed a mobility system that is well suited to its size and firmly embedded in the internationalisation strategy. Activities combine teaching and training stays at partner institutions holding the ECHE charter, participation in Blended Intensive Programmes, and systematic strengthening of language preparedness. Mobility is supported by continuous assistance from the International Office and by structured reflection at both management and departmental level.

The documentation confirms that the university achieves objectives consistent with its profile. Long-term partnerships and sustained participation in mobility schemes demonstrate continuity and tangible outcomes. Since 2022, opportunities for mobility have also been extended to doctoral candidates, representing a qualitative step forward in the internationalisation of the research environment and in preparing a new generation of academics.

The university also actively reduces barriers to mobility through structured orientation for incoming participants, advisory services, peer networks, and the provision of key institutional information in English. These measures enhance accessibility for both outgoing students and staff, as well as incoming international academics and doctoral candidates. The approach is pragmatic, proportionate to the size of the institution, and demonstrably effective in practice.

Recommendations:

For the coming period, the university should continue to expand and systematise mobility, particularly by strengthening opportunities in doctoral education and by involving international academics more actively in teaching and research. An important opportunity also lies in leveraging

participation in European consortia such as the Amber Road alliance, which has already brought recognition in the form of the Seal of Excellence and can contribute to the sustainability and expansion of international mobility in the future. In the next evaluation, it will be necessary to demonstrate not only quantitative indicators, such as the number of outgoing and incoming mobilities, but also the qualitative benefits of these activities – including new forms of cooperation, international research outputs, and the impact on the overall environment for international students and staff.

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:

The system for acquisition, optimisation, and renewal of research infrastructure is purposefully designed and functions effectively at the scale of the institution. The university relies on an IT-centred core that supports the needs of ongoing projects and doctoral studies, while allowing for incremental expansion of capacity as demand grows. The main pillars include a data and processing laboratory with high-performance workstations and an instructor facility, a modernised network backbone, and a central server with shared storage. Standardised software for analysis and simulation (e.g., MATLAB, SPSS) together with cloud-based collaboration tools create a consistent environment that effectively integrates teaching, research projects, and team cooperation.

Renewal and upgrades of equipment take place continuously, with the university ensuring a stable financial framework for modernisation. Sharing of instruments and devices is organised pragmatically within departments: high-performance workstations and specialised equipment are accessible across teams according to operational needs. The system's efficiency is supported by consolidation of resources, low administrative transaction costs, and ongoing renewal.

A major step is the construction of a new campus in Vysočany, which from 2025 will provide the university with modern facilities for research, teaching, and administration. This investment will strengthen capacities as well as the attractiveness of the environment for international students and academics, and will enable better integration of teaching and research activities. The new campus was also presented to the panel during the onsite visit, confirming institutional commitment to long-term infrastructure development. In this way, the system for acquisition, optimisation, renewal, and sharing of infrastructure meets the criteria of effectiveness and proportionality: it ensures research continuity, is financially predictable, and internally consistent.

Recommendations:

The university should continue the systematic renewal of IT and computational resources while also taking into account emerging technological trends, including the use of artificial intelligence tools where these support research, teaching, and the efficiency of support processes. For the next evaluation, it will be important to demonstrate that infrastructure development – including the new campus – has contributed not only to the technical support of research but also to the innovation of study programmes, internationalisation, and overall sustainability.

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]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:

The budget structure corresponds to the size and profile of the institution. The stable foundation consists of Czech public resources, complemented by a smaller but gradually increasing share of international public funding and flexibly used non-public sources, including own and contract research. Between 2020 and 2024, the budget grew modestly, mainly through success in structural funds and competitive schemes. The declared 50/50 ratio between basic and applied research, and the absence of experimental development, are consistent with the socio-economic orientation of the university.

The institution does not yet receive institutional funding (LCDRO), which is identified as a medium-term objective. Achieving this would further enhance predictability and stability of financing, while the current structure remains functional and diversified. The university has demonstrated the ability to attract competitive resources primarily at the national level, through the Technology Agency of the Czech Republic (as both main recipient and partner) and OP JAK for the development of doctoral programmes, and has complemented these with international grants such as NAWA, the International Visegrad Fund, and Erasmus+ KA2. Financial stability is further reinforced by contract research and innovation vouchers (OP TAK) with business partners.

Taken together, these funding lines show that the resource acquisition strategy is well designed and proportionate to the university's ambitions and scale. The framework is balanced: it relies on predictable domestic public funding, is gradually adding an international component, and makes meaningful use of non-public sources to reduce volatility. The next natural step is to secure institutional funding (LCDRO), which would increase long-term predictability, while there is also potential to expand participation in international competitive grants.

Recommendations:

For the coming period, the university should focus on strengthening the international component of financing through greater participation in prestigious European competitions, while also developing contract research to reinforce links with the application sphere. A key challenge will be to acquire institutional funding (LCDRO), which would provide greater stability and long-term budget predictability. It is also recommended that the university prepare a framework for the effective use of future institutional support, ensuring that part of the resources is systematically allocated to developmental tools such as internal grants, mobility, or infrastructure.

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]:	N/A - Not Applicable
Qualitative assessment: Not applicable. During the evaluation period (2020–2024), the university did not receive institutional support for LCDRO; without such funds it is impossible to submit rules governing their use.	
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]:	5 - Outstanding
Qualitative assessment: The university's collaboration portfolio is proportionate to its size and profile, purposefully linking academia with practice, regulators, and public administration. A common feature of these partnerships is the emphasis on practical applicability of results and on ensuring that research generates tangible value for its environment. The university demonstrates the ability to develop methodological and model tools applicable in decision-making processes, as well as procedures and validated methodologies that can be directly adopted in professional practice. An important part of the portfolio also consists of analyses and expert studies prepared for state and regional institutions, confirming the university's capacity to transfer knowledge into public policies and to contribute to territorial development and regional resilience. This collaboration framework extends beyond the national level, with the international dimension strengthened through participation in consortia and alliances, in particular StudyEU Amber Road. The Seal of Excellence awarded to this alliance confirms its qualitative level and, even though not yet accompanied by dedicated funding, provides a basis for future joint projects and enhances the university's preparedness to participate in larger international consortia. In terms of proportionality and appropriateness, the portfolio represents a balanced mix of national, regional, and international ties, and spans cooperation with both the public and private sectors. This approach is consistent with the university's socio-economic orientation and with its third mission, which emphasises delivering direct benefits to society and the economy.	
Recommendations: For the next period, the university should further develop and systematically profile its collaboration portfolio, ensuring that it is clearly demonstrated how each partnership contributes to the fulfilment of the university's strategic objectives. Particular emphasis should be placed on collaborations that have the potential to create long-term partnerships, generate joint research outputs, and	

strengthen the international dimension. At the next evaluation, it will be important to provide evidence not only of maintaining a diverse range of partnerships but also of their concrete impacts—whether through new projects, the direct application of results in practice, or case studies capturing the benefits for regional and international environments. In this regard, international partnering should be concentrated on European institutions and select regions elsewhere that offer high-calibre research links and complementary high-quality study programmes.

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:

The university has recently introduced a doctoral programme whose structure and processes correspond to international standards and are already functional at this early stage. The programme combines study, research, and teaching components, with a strong emphasis on individual cooperation between the doctoral student and the supervisor, as well as on the gradual completion of clearly defined milestones (including the state exam, thesis defence, and mandatory international mobility). The requirement to publish in indexed journals and active involvement in grant projects further strengthen the quality and international dimension of outputs.

Statistics from the first two cohorts indicate a solid start: the dropout rate is low and doctoral students' publication activity is above average, with outputs appearing in higher-quartile journals. This suggests that the established system is producing results, even with the still small number of students. The onsite visit, which included a meeting with current doctoral students, confirmed their active engagement in research and provided evidence of the programme's relevance and quality.

Support for doctoral students includes individual study plans, systematic annual evaluation, administrative services, and access to professional counselling. The international dimension of the programme is reinforced through participation in the StudyEU Amber Road alliance and the activities of ECBR, which connect research with international partners and facilitate interdisciplinary collaboration.

Since the programme is new and has not yet produced graduates, career placement cannot yet be documented.

The university is preparing additional institutional instruments, including a doctoral colloquium as a regular platform for presentation and feedback, and an internal grant system to provide targeted support for early-career researchers and doctoral students. These forthcoming instruments will build on the existing strengths and provide further support within the institutional framework.

Recommendations:

For the coming period, the university should strengthen the institutional framework for doctoral education by introducing tools to which it has already committed. In particular, this includes the planned doctoral colloquium as a regular platform for presentation and feedback, and an internal grant system to provide targeted support for early-career researchers and doctoral students. These measures should complement the existing individual collaboration with supervisors and international mobility with a more systematic institutional framework. As the programme develops,

it will also be important to ensure the consistency and quality of the doctoral learning experience over time, with clear standards for supervision, training provision, and student support, treated as a priority within the university's internal quality assurance and enhancement processes. In the future, it will also be important to establish mechanisms for tracking graduate employment so that the university can demonstrate how the programme contributes to professional development and integration into academic or applied fields.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

4.14 Implementation of recommendations in Module 4

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

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

Rating [1–5]:

N/A - Not Applicable

Qualitative assessment:

Not applicable.

The university is being evaluated for the first time; no recommendations from a previous evaluation exist and therefore could not have been implemented.

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	4 - Very good
4.5 Structure of human resources	4 - Very good
4.6 Academic and Research Careers	4 - Very good
4.7 Gender equality measures	4 - Very good
4.8 Mobility of academic and research staff (including sectoral and inter-sectoral mobility)	5 - Outstanding
4.9 Research infrastructure	5 - Outstanding
4.10 Budget and structure of financial resources	4 - Very good
4.11 Rules for the use of institutional support for the LCDRO	N/A - Not Applicable
4.12 Important collaborations in R&D&I	5 - Outstanding
4.13 Doctoral studies	5 - Outstanding
4.14 Implementation of recommendations in Module 4	N/A - Not Applicable
AVERAGE RATING	5 - Outstanding
GRADE [A–D]	A
Summary assessment: The university's research and institutional environment functions as a coherent whole, clearly aligned with its mission and vision. Research is firmly embedded both in university governance and at faculty level, and is perceived as an integral part of the institution's identity rather than a separate activity. Support services operate in a coordinated manner, and quality assurance processes – including the ethical framework and transparent publication of evaluation results – demonstrate that the university applies a multi-level and practically oriented system rather than relying on formal structures alone. The evaluation indicates that the university is capable of linking governance layers and creating predictable conditions for profiling, internationalisation, and societal relevance. The framework for sustainability and resilience is appropriate to the size and focus of the institution and combines specific applied projects with regional partners, ethical and data-security mechanisms, and a well-developed digital infrastructure. The financial base relies on stable domestic public funding,	

complemented by competitive grants and contract research, which together form a balanced and relatively resilient structure.

A major strength is the university's ability to generate collaborations with demonstrable impact – ranging from methodological tools for professional practice, through policy-relevant analyses for public authorities, to participation in international alliances that enhance visibility and readiness for larger consortia. Human resource processes are transparent and supportive, although some instruments are still in development following recent institutional transformation. Mobility and the doctoral programme offer important prospects for international engagement and for the long-term renewal of human resources.

The main challenges concern further institutionalisation rather than systemic weaknesses. These include embedding open science and research data management more firmly at the institutional level, improving gender balance in senior positions, formalising selected HR instruments, and enhancing financial stability through long-term institutional support (LCDRO). These issues do not undermine the overall impression of a functional, forward-looking environment with strong growth potential.

Summary recommendations:

For the next period, the university should consolidate and institutionalise the mechanisms already introduced so that they become sustainable in the long term and less dependent on individual initiatives or projects. The panel identifies three priorities:

1. Institutional maturity – further development of unified rules and processes for quality assurance, career progression, doctoral education, and equal opportunities, ensuring that they become standard practice across faculties.
2. Financial stability – continued diversification of funding sources, stronger participation in international competitions, and preparation of a framework for the effective use of future institutional support (LCDRO) to finance development instruments.
3. Strategic positioning and visibility – use of new infrastructure and international partnerships to strengthen the university's profile and impact, while systematically advancing open science, research data management, equal opportunities, and modern technologies.

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 and vision of the university are realistic and correspond to its profile as a professionally oriented institution in the socio-economic fields. They are closely integrated with teaching and demonstrate that research is being systematically developed across all levels of study, from Bachelor's to Ph.D. The alignment with national strategic documents—particularly the frameworks of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MŠMT) and the National RDI Policy 2021+—as well as with European priorities, including Horizon Europe programmes and gender equality policies, situates the university's orientation within a broader political and institutional context.

During the past five years, the university has demonstrated its ability to implement this orientation through concrete measures. It has introduced a doctoral programme in Economics and Management, established the ECBR Research Institute, strengthened the systematic involvement of students in research and in collaboration with the application sphere, and expanded opportunities for international mobility and partnerships. The adoption of the Gender Equality Plan 2024–2028 and the preparation for integration into EOSC/FAIR infrastructures within the OP JAK programme further confirm progress in the institutional environment and a commitment to international quality standards.

Research capacities, defined according to the FORD classification, demonstrate both continuity and realism. The core lies in economics and business, with a balanced representation of basic and applied research, complemented by law, socio-economic geography, psychology, and media/communication. The trajectory for the next five years is credible, as it builds on existing competencies and partnership networks rather than on expansion into unrelated fields. The university's mission and vision are therefore not only well formulated but demonstrably being implemented in practice. Institutional foundations—including doctoral studies, the research platform, ethical and gender infrastructure, and internationalisation—have been significantly strengthened in recent years and provide a solid basis for the next period.

Recommendations:

In the coming period, the university should monitor the fulfilment of its mission and vision more systematically through clearly defined indicators. Particular attention should be given to international mobility, publishing activity, grant success, and the career progression of doctoral students. The collected data should not only serve monitoring purposes but should also be regularly evaluated at the institutional level and used to inform decision-making by the leadership. In the next evaluation, the university should provide evidence of measurable progress towards the stated priorities and ambitions through verifiable data, offering a clear picture of how the mission and vision are being translated into everyday practice. At the same time, the university is encouraged to reinforce the synergy between learning, teaching and research by embedding research practice more broadly across study programmes and by placing greater emphasis on student-centred and problem-based learning, consistent with the university's mission to link education and research.

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:

The objectives set for the next five-year period correspond to the size and profile of the university and build on areas that the institution has already been successfully developing. They are grounded in applied research in the main disciplines while maintaining a line of basic research as a necessary theoretical foundation. The thematic orientation (digitalisation, AI, circularity in economics and management, entrepreneurship and SMEs, law, public administration, regional development, media and communication, geography, psychology) is consistent with the mission and vision and builds on existing projects and partnership networks.

Planned participation in national (TA CR, GA CR) and international programmes (Horizon Europe, Interreg) is appropriately set and does not exceed the institution's capacities. Cooperation with the application sphere, public administration, and NGOs rests on long-term partnerships, knowledge transfer, and the creation of opportunities for students. A particular strength is the emphasis on a two-way flow of knowledge—inputs from practice into research and outputs from research into decision-making.

Institutional objectives are formulated realistically: they strengthen the career framework with clear requirements for teaching, publications, and internationalisation; introduce systematic training in methodology, publishing, and project management; support international recruitment as well as family-friendly measures; and work in a targeted way with doctoral students. Stability and resilience are further enhanced by diversification of funding across national and European programmes, the establishment of an internal fund for strategic projects, ongoing risk management, and engagement in regional and thematic networks (MSIC, Horizon clusters).

Particularly valuable is the embedding of Open Science principles—the establishment of a repository for articles and data, support for open access, rules for data management in line with FAIR principles, and the ambition to connect to EOSC. Equally significant is the framework for ethics and integrity (codes of conduct, training, anti-plagiarism) and the planned responsible use of AI. These steps form a strong basis for quality and international compatibility.

The objectives appear achievable, as they are based on existing competencies and infrastructures and do not envisage expansion beyond the university's disciplinary foundation. The main risk lies in insufficient operationalisation—therefore, it will be important to complement the key objectives with measurable milestones (e.g., publication targets, grant success rates, OA/RDM shares, international recruitment) and ensure regular reporting.

Recommendations:

The university should maintain the realistically set framework of its strategic objectives while complementing them with measurable milestones that allow progress to be tracked over time. Special attention should be given to internationalisation, Open Science, and career development—areas where ambitions need to be translated into clear indicators. Regular reporting mechanisms should be established to ensure that both achievements and potential risks are identified in a timely manner. In the next evaluation, the university should demonstrate not only the formulation of objectives but also their systematic monitoring and the use of results for management purposes.

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:

The university has established a stable and functional framework for implementing its research strategy, with instruments that are well interconnected and proportionate to its profile. The Strategic Plan, with its annual implementation plans, translates objectives into specific tasks and KPIs, while the Academic Council and the Internal Evaluation Board provide quality assurance and monitoring. The university's recording system (EPC), linked to a motivational scheme, supports attention to publication quality and performance. The ECBR Institute plays a central role as an accelerator of interdisciplinary collaboration and contract research, while the Code of Ethics and the Ethics Committee ensure a stable framework for research integrity.

For the next five-year period, the university has prepared an expanded set of tools designed to strengthen excellence and internationalisation. These include internal grants for seed projects for young researchers and doctoral students, specialised research units (centres of excellence) in key fields, an annual doctoral colloquium, an internal peer-review platform for manuscripts, a visiting researchers' programme, an internal science and innovation forum, and a Strategic Partners' Council to systematise collaboration with practice. These instruments have the potential to reinforce the pathway from idea through high-quality manuscript to funded project and its application in practice, while simultaneously expanding international networks.

However, most of the new instruments are scheduled to be launched only from 2026. During the transitional period, this may create a gap in areas such as seed funding and formalised peer review, which could otherwise accelerate improvements in the quality of proposals and publications. Similarly, initiatives such as the visiting researchers' programme or the Strategic Partners' Council could already begin to strengthen internationalisation and knowledge transfer. This is not a systemic weakness, but rather a risk of delayed benefits. At present, the instruments in place correspond well to current needs and function effectively, while the planned elements realistically develop capacities towards higher quality, internationalisation, and resilience. The key challenge will be to secure sufficient resources, define clear responsibilities, and set milestones for 2026, while avoiding the accumulation of multiple new mechanisms without prioritisation. If successfully implemented, the new instruments will make a significant and measurable contribution to achieving the university's research objectives in the next period.

Recommendations:

In the coming period, it will be important to ensure the timely and smooth introduction of the planned new instruments, to define their priorities clearly, and to allocate sufficient resources for their implementation. Pilot testing of these instruments in advance is advisable to minimise the risk of overloading the system once they are formally introduced after 2026. In the next evaluation, the university should be able to demonstrate that the new instruments have been implemented, are actively used by researchers, and have begun to deliver measurable results.

In addition, the university is encouraged to complement these instruments with a supportive 'teach-the-teacher' scheme focused on student-centred learning and personalised learning.

5.4 Implementation of recommendations in Module 5	
Evaluate how the HEI has reflected the recommendations from the previous evaluation of the IEP, if applicable.	
If the HEI has not been evaluated before, the indicator will be marked as N/A – Not Applicable.	
Rating [1–5]:	N/A - Not Applicable
Qualitative assessment: Not applicable. The university is being evaluated for the first time; no recommendations from a previous evaluation exist and therefore could not have been implemented.	
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	5 - Outstanding
5.2 Research and development objectives	5 - Outstanding
5.3 Institutional instruments and measures for the implementation of the research and development strategy	4 - Very good
5.4 Implementation of recommendations in Module 5	N/A - Not Applicable
AVERAGE RATING	5 - Outstanding
GRADE [A–D]	A
Summary assessment: The university's strategic orientation is consistent and clearly aligned with its mission as a professionally oriented institution in the socio-economic fields. The mission and vision are not detached declarations but are integrated into the full educational vertical from Bachelor's to Ph.D. studies. Research is embedded in teaching, grounded in collaboration with practice, and demonstrates clear international ambitions. Over the past five years, this orientation has been confirmed by concrete institutional developments, including the introduction of doctoral studies, the establishment of the ECBR Institute, the strengthening of gender and ethical infrastructure, and the enhancement of internationalisation. These steps show that the strategic trajectory is not only declared but actively implemented in practice. The objectives for the next period correspond to the scale and profile of the institution. They build on areas where the university already has capacities and established networks, without attempting rapid expansion into unrelated fields. The emphasis on two-way engagement with the application sphere and public administration, together with clear requirements for publication quality, project	

activity, and internationalisation, creates a coherent framework within which ambitions can be achieved. To ensure success, progress should be continuously measured and reported in key areas such as publications, grants, mobility, and doctoral milestones, so that implementation can be managed on the basis of verifiable data.

Institutional instruments are clearly structured and interconnected. The current framework, which combines the Strategic Plan with implementation tasks and KPIs, quality assurance mechanisms, monitoring and incentive systems, and the role of the ECBR Institute, is functional and appropriate to the university's needs. The planned expansion with internal seed grants, a peer-review platform, a visiting researchers' programme, and centres of excellence represents a logical step towards strengthening excellence and internationalisation. The main risk lies not in the design of these instruments but in their timing, as most are scheduled for launch from 2026. If their introduction is managed smoothly, including possible pilot versions, the entire chain will be reinforced—from the generation of ideas through high-quality manuscripts and projects to the application of results in practice.

The strategic objectives and development plan are realistic and consistent with the university's mission. The remaining challenges relate primarily to the full institutionalisation of Open Science and data management, the formalisation of selected human resources tools, and the systematic evaluation of impacts. These are not systemic weaknesses but areas whose further development will support greater institutional maturity. The university is well prepared for further growth in quality, international openness, and societal relevance.

Summary recommendations:

In the coming period, the university should focus on the systematic monitoring and evaluation of its mission and strategic objectives, the timely implementation and active use of new institutional instruments, and the strengthening of international visibility through Open Science, partnerships, and doctoral studies. Strategic documents and intentions should not only be translated into plans but also into verifiable outcomes, demonstrated through data, results, and concrete examples of impact. Ensuring that these steps become part of stable institutional practice, rather than isolated initiatives, will be essential for advancing institutional maturity, financial stability, and international openness.

OVERALL EVALUATION IN MODULES 1 TO 5

OVERALL EVALUATION

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

MODULE	MODULE WEIGHT	GRADE [A–D]
MODULE 1 and 2	50 %	D
MODULE 3	30 %	A
MODULE 4	10 %	A
MODULE 5	10 %	A
OVERALL RATING		B – Very good

Qualitative assessment:

The evaluation confirms that the institution has a consistent profile with a professional and application-oriented focus. The two evaluated units complement each other in size and orientation. The Faculty of Entrepreneurship and Law covers a broad range of fields in entrepreneurship, management and law, while the Faculty of Business focuses on professionally oriented areas related to tourism and aviation. Both units develop activities that correspond to the mission of the HEI and demonstrate links to external partners. Research results are mainly of applied nature and respond to practical and regional needs. Cooperation with users of results is established, and the involvement of students in research and project work is evident.

The institutional environment and the management of R&D are appropriate for the type and size of the HEI. Governance responsibilities are defined, and procedures for ethics, quality assurance and sustainability are in place. The internal system of research support functions adequately. Some procedures could be further documented, and the systematic use of monitoring data would help demonstrate the regular application of established processes.

The institutional strategy for R&D is realistic and reflects the professional orientation of the HEI. Strategic objectives are formulated and linked to internal measures. International cooperation and mobility have been developed, but participation in international networks and projects remains limited. Human resources policies are in place, and basic measures supporting equality and career development have been implemented.

The grades for Modules 1 and 2 are those provided by MEYS in accordance with the Methodology HEI 2025+ and are adopted by the panel as official external results for these modules.

Recommendations:

It is recommended to strengthen the systematic documentation of societal impact and the collection of feedback from users at the institutional level, in order to demonstrate the broader effects of research and applied activities. A more structured and coordinated approach to communication and popularisation should be developed, with clearly defined objectives, indicators and regular monitoring of outcomes.

The HEI should continue supporting participation in international networks and research projects to increase visibility and cooperation, while maintaining proportional development of research capacities and support mechanisms, including internal grant schemes and researcher development measures. It is also recommended to further formalise internal procedures and ensure the consistent use of monitoring data in management and quality assurance processes, to provide reliable evidence for decision-making and strategic planning.

The institution should maintain its focus on professional orientation and cooperation with external partners while gradually strengthening the quality and dissemination of research outputs and the integration of doctoral studies into institutional research structures.

Gjohelle Senter