MINISTRY OF EDUCATION, YOUTH AND SPORTS

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

HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION NAME: Jan Evangelista Purkyně University

COMPANY REGISTRATION NUMBER (CRN): 44555601

THE LIST OF EVALUATION UNITS IN MODULE 3:

Faculty of Education

Faculty of Arts

Faculty of Art and Design

Faculty of Social and Economic Studies

Faculty of Sciences

Faculty of Environment

Faculty of Mechanical Engineering

Faculty of Health Studies

CHAIRPERSON OF INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION PANEL

Name and surname: Martin Myant
Phone number: [redacted]
E-mail: [redacted]

LIST OF INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION PANEL MEMBERS		
Name and surname	**Position in IEP**	**Current position**
Prof. Martin Myant	Chair	University of the West of Scotland, European Trade Union Institute
Sofie Thorsen	Member	Funen Art Academy in Odense
Prof. Franz X. Bogner	Member	University of Bayreuth
Prof. Julien Steven Baker	Member	Hong Kong Baptist University
Prof. Paola Posocco	Member	University of Trieste
Prof. Maren Röger	Member	University of Leipzig

Assoc. Prof. Milan Edl	Member	University of West Bohemia, Czech Smart City Cluster President
Prof. Charles W. Rice	Member	Kansas State University

PROVIDERS METHODOLOGIST

Name and surname: Jakub Onderka
Phone number: [redacted]
E-mail: [redacted]

Date of on-site visit of higher education institution:

In Ústí nad Labem date 11-13 June 2025 Signature M. R. My

(IEP chairperson)

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: The Faculty of Arts, Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem

FORD: 6 - Humanities and the arts

SOCIAL CONTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATED UNIT

3.1 Introductory information about the unit under evaluation
Indicator 3.1 is a non-evaluated indicator that provides basic information about the evaluated unit such as its mission and vision, organizational structure, size and staffing, or R&D&I capacities.
Commentary: Research and outreach in the faculty of arts are closely tied to the region's history and current affairs, resulting in a significant regional impact—whether in schools, public administration, or tourism. The faculty sees as its main purpose to educate future experts for and in the region, research and being a cultural and social center. The different disciplines have given themselves foci (usually 1-3, even 5 in political sciences). While outreach is extraordinarily strong, visible research seem to be made by a rather smaller number of staff members.

RECOGNITION BY THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY

3.2 Recognition by the research community	
Evaluate the position of the evaluated unit in the R&D&I research community based on the facts presented in indicator 3.2 and its annexed tables (3.2.1 to 3.2.5).	
Rating [1–5]:	**3 - Average**
Qualitative assessment:[1] The faculty's staff contribute in different ways and to different degrees to the visibility of research at a national and international level. There are individual members, particularly from German Studies and History, who appear to be quite visible and have been appointed to supra-regional and international committees (e.g. Prof. PhDr. Michaele Hrubá, Czech Historical Review). This comprises editorial boards from various countries in Central Europe. One colleague from political sciences is very present with expertise in evaluations (Doc. PhDr. Pavel Maškarinec, Ph.D.). International prizes had been not awarded in the period under scrutiny, but national recognition is there. The faculty also has some international presence by lectures abroad, and a few persons seem to be regularly presenting at international conferences and on invitation at universities, although there had not been a keynote on the list. At the same time they are inviting guest lecturers from foreign universities in order to substantiate internationalization.	

[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.

Recommendations:

Overall, it would be desirable for the faculty to further develop its research potential at an international level. In the highly language-sensitive humanities, this could include the support of publishing and lecturing in English, which has now become the main language of international exchange. The Faculty's strong and important tradition of researching the Czech-German border region often goes hand in hand with better German than English language skills. While German must remain important in the portfolio of the faculty, it should nevertheless develop strategies to better connect with non-German international research discourses. Research foci on the German-Czech region could be embedded in bigger questions on borderlands, on linguistic contact zones etc. Researchers should be rewarded for increasing international visibility, and supported in conference participation abroad and also research and networking stays.

RESEARCH PROJECTS

3.3 Research projects

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

Rating [1–5]:	**3 - Average**

Qualitative assessment:

Researchers in the faculty had been mainly successful with two funding schemes: The Czech Science Foundation and NAKI – Program of Applied Research and Development of National and Cultural Identity. While the first one is clearly competetive in regard to research, the second one is a funding scheme by the ministry of culture at the intersection of heritage preservation with research and outreach. Most, if not all research projects listed, were individual projects, covering women´s writing at the end of the 19th century, Czech Receptions of German-language literature, the vocabulary of German Reichsbürger, developments of Democracy on regional level, hence mostly from German studies and Political Sciences. These are all interesting projects, and individual research is the usual in the humanities, but the impact on internationalization and visibility stays limited to single – and changing – topics. There had not been any major bi- or trilateral projects (until 2022 existed a H2020-project that started in the earlier period). In comparison to the last evaluation period when the faculty seemedto be on the rise, having succeeded with some bigger grants(although the panel is fully aware that huge successes like H2020 can not be repeated easily), , one gains the impressionthat the path had not been continued systematically –. The other projects are applied projects - interesting enough, because humanities do not have at all places these kinds of projects. It seems that documentation is the aim.

Recommendations:

The Faculty of Arts named several research foci in the evaluation documentation, but one does recognize them only partly in the projects and publications. In general, the faculty needs to develop a more coherent strategy to make the strengths visible, and to further support already stronger areas into clusters, while not continuing areas that are not developing. It seems to be crucial to integrate more faculty members into research. Therefore, the faculty of arts needs a strategy to

catch up with other developments at UJEP. Other faculties opted e.g. for significant financial incentives for successful grant applications, but also for applications as such.

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: Through a wide range of projects, the faculty plays a vital role in deepening the understanding of the region's changing history and culture, and further adresses social challenges. Faculty members were especially involved into the mapping of cultural heritage, and contributed to numerous exhibitions, resulting in an impressive level of public outreach. These initiatives have successfully connected with a diverse array of groups, and it appears that nearly every academic discipline within the faculty is involved. Because of the faculty's structure, there is limited interaction with the corporate sector. But they enhance the development of tourism. A very good example seems to be the guide to the Abandonded Villages that adressed a broader audience, and won a prize for its outstanding design, made by the neighbouring faculty. Their activities in the cultural-heritage-sector contribute to sustainability.	
Recommendations: In the last evaluation period, the panel recommended a) to develop a strategic outreach concept in order to become more visible with this significant strenght of the faculty and b) to integrate these impressive efforts into transregional contexts. It now recommends to integrate the impressive outreach successes more with high-level-research: Why, when concenpualizing a exhibition on emotional aspects of the local history, not taking this empirical findings as a starting point for an internationally read article that connects regional history with broader research debates on the history of emotions, of belonging? Of course, faculty staff needs support for this integrated approach, and the faculty shall develop a strategy to integrate research and outreach, so the impressive outreach strategy can strenghten research.	

TRANSFER OF RESULTS INTO PRACTICE

3.5 Transfer of results into practice	
Evaluate the effectiveness of the transfer of results into practice by the unit being evaluated. Pay attention to whether the composition of the stated users of the results or the way the R&D&I results are commercialised (if stated) is consistent with the R&D&I results produced and the mission and vision of the evaluated unit and how successful the evaluated unit is in its activities, such as attracting new users of the results, commercialising the R&D&I results and obtaining funding from non-public, non-grant sources.	
Rating [1–5]:	**3 - Average**
Qualitative assessment:	

Outreach is already a notable strength of the faculty, and that, where possible for a faculty in the humanities at all, exists a strong link to practice. They are cooperating with museums, schools, tourism agencies. They list further workplaces for civic education, and subject didactics. In general, they receive rather small amounts of non-public revenues by German-Czech or German funding bodies.
Recommendations: The panel recommends the faculty to further expand its networks and activities. Being located in the border region, there might be European Union fonds available for research in humanities as well that has a potential impact on society

POPULARIZATION OF VAVAI

3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public	
Evaluate how active and successful the evaluated unit is in the field of popularisation of R&D&I and communication with the public.	
Rating [1–5]:	**5 - Outstanding**
Qualitative assessment: The faculty of arts communicates via different channels with the wider public. Its researchers contributed to several exhibitions and connected colloquia and workshops, among them the exhibition in the city museum about “Our Germans”. They further organized summer schools, lecture series, author readings and open nights. They developed impact in the region around Ustí, but also in the wider German-Czech border region. Some of them developed a significant presence in television (especially M. Veselý).	
Recommendations: Due to the different obligations of faculty staff, the panel does not recommend an quantitative increase in public presence, but to continue the efforts, and further develop an integrated strategic approach to interconnect outreach with research. If an important exhibition is done, why not write articles in peer-reviewed journals linked to the topic? Faculty needs a strategy with incentives, so the most active members are rewarded for their activities and find the time and energy for such an interconnected endeavour. Overall, few names keep appearing in the report, others seem to contribute only in teaching.	

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module 3	
Evaluate how the evaluated unit has reflected the recommendations from the previous evaluation of the IEP, if applicable. If the evaluated unit has not been evaluated before, the indicator will be marked as N/A – Not Applicable.	
Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**
Qualitative assessment:	

The last panel motivated the faculty to more international and transregional networking and integrating of research questions onto these levels while being fully aware about the specific role in the region. The report lists now three international projects.

They then refer mainly to the establishment of research teams around more senior researchers as a strategic decision, following up the recommendations. This strategic decision about clusters still seems to await bigger effects, because the research projects under scrutiny had been mainly individual grants (see above) and some successes in intraregional schemes, Also the oral presentation did not give any insights into bigger project ambitions by the deans present

While faculty kept and even expanded its strengths in public outreach, despite they limitations by COVID, they seemed to have rather not overcome their weaknesses when it comes to high-ranked-international publications. The panel does agree that it might take a while to change publication habits, they seemed to have missed to develop strategies of incentives (at the cost of cutting elsewhere and therefor at the cost of harmony) as other UJEP-faculties have.

Recommendations:

Overall, more attention should be paid to strategy work in order to increase national and international visibility through projects and publications. While other faculties work with incentive systems, this faculty seemed to lack these kinds of steering mechanisms.

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	**3 - Average**
3.3 Research projects	**3 - Average**
3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society	**5 - Outstanding**
3.5 Transfer of results into practice	**3 - Average**
3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public	**5 - Outstanding**
3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module	**4 - Very good**
Average rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**
Grade [A–D]:	**B**

Summary assessment:

The faculty of arts has significant strengths regarding the societal outreach in the region, the interaction with broader audiences, and some very strong researchers. Unfortunately, onlya few names keep re-appearing in the report. These persons seem to shoulder research projects, publications and outreach activities, mostly on national and regional, but partly also in international levels, while others are not visible at all. In general, this leads to the impression that faculty has still

not developed its full strengths and should dare more ambition, especially to be visible on a level beyond the region.
Summary recommendations: The panel recommends faculty to do intensive strategy-work in the next years. The aim should be to involve more personal into research, to motivate to high-ranking publications (including the appropriate means of support) and to combine outreach and publication strategy more intensively to profit from synergy effects.

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Art and Design

FORD: 6 Humanities and The arts

SOCIAL CONTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATED UNIT

3.1 Introductory information about the unit under evaluation

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

The Faculty of Art and Design at Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem (hereinafter referred to as 'FUD UJEP') offers bachelor's and master's degree programmes in design, visual communications and fine art, as well as a master's degree in curatorial studies and a doctoral programme in visual communication. A central aspect of the faculty's work is an emphasis on new technologies in visual art and design, as well as the relationship with traditional industries and the design tradition of Northern Bohemia. Over the last 30 years, the faculty has established itself as a significant cultural and artistic presence in the region. In the field of fine arts and curatorial studies, relevance to the local context as well as international networks is simultaneously pursued.

The R&D&I activities of the Faculty of Arts at UJEP are of a high quality for the field and are well aligned with the definitions of artistic and applied research as defined in the “Methodology for the Evaluation of Research Organisations in the Higher Education Institutions Segment 2025”. The faculty's activities align with its stated mission of responding to the issues of a specific, structurally disadvantaged region. At the same time, the faculty participates in and produces results recognised by national and international networks of art and design institutions as well as other HEIs.

Through different key laboratories and institutions such as the Ústí nad Labem House of Arts and the Ceramics Centre, as well as the FUD Editions, the faculty functions as a hub for exchange with the local community, the international art world (House of Arts) and industry (Ceramics Centre), and participates in the exchange of information in the art world through publications, as is typical for the field, such as monographs and other books (FUD Editions). These institutions have been developed and expanded in the evaluated period.

The faculty is or has been engaged in several larger international collaborations, such as the Gardening of the Soul project. Some research is conducted in collaboration with other faculties at the university, such as the Masec Radar Crate prototype developed with the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering (FSI UJEP), and the 'Transforming the form and content of education at UJEP', which will be implemented in collaboration with the Faculty of Social and Economic Studies (FSE UJEP).

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:[2]

Curatorial practices and a large number of practices in fine and new media arts that do not have the character of autonomous artwork are not finalised until they can be exhibited, which, by definition, involves an audience. This means that the transfer into practice, popularisation of results, and sometimes also validation by the research community, if work is executed in recognised institutions, can happen simultaneously. This also means that some activities will turn up repeatedly in this form because they simultaneously form part of a transfer into practice and popularisation, have an effect on society, and are recognised by the research community by being exhibited to an audience in relevant institutions.

The development of artistic, curatorial and design products and practices executed or developed by individual faculty members constitutes a large part of FUD UJEP's R&D&I, as is characteristic for an art and design faculty. Faculty members have curated exhibitions and participated as artists in exhibitions at recognised national and international art institutions, demonstrating an acknowledgement within the community of peers. Notable achievements include participating in projects outside academia, such as Lungomare Rijeka 2020, as curators and participating artists as well as the inclusion of works by several faculty members in the new permanent exhibition at the National Gallery in Prague, entitled '1939–2021: The End of the Black-and-White Era'.

Faculty members from different departments participate in Czech and international panels and boards and are continuously involved with other research institutions and higher education institutions (HEIs). Faculty members have lectures internationally particularly at the beginning of the evaluation period, and renowned international artists have lectured at UJEP.

Some of this activity was related to projects that have now been finalised, such as TICASS and the Garden of Soul and took place in the beginning of the evaluated period. It is unclear from the material whether the current active projects will result in the same level of activity and recognition beyond the region.

In the field of design, research and development conducted by faculty members, resulting in products and exhibitions, has been widely recognised during the evaluation period, with a number of nominations and awards at national and international level such as the international Red Dot Design Award, the Central European Design Exhibition Designblok or Czech Grand Design.

Recommendations:

This level of activity in design as well as fine art and curating should be maintained and, if possible, expanded.

While the art world relies mostly on participation in exhibitions at renowned institutions and publications related to such projects for recognition, publishing in other journals and media should be pursued.

[2] 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.

New international projects and collaborations with other HEIs as well as with artworld institutions should be sought to continue the international presence.

RESEARCH PROJECTS

3.3 Research projects

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

Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

During the evaluation period, the FUD UJEP initiated and participated in a number of projects.

Some of these projects, particularly Gardening of the Soul, address topics and problems that are specific to the region. At the same time, they engage in partnerships with international organisations, work directly with communities and produce independent artworks in public spaces. Such projects embody the faculty's vision in addressing local and regional issues, while also reaching out and becoming part of an international network. The projects generally align well with the faculty's profile, focusing on visual communication, media art, design and curating.

Important structural vehicles for R&D&I are the Ústí nad Labem House of Arts, the Ceramics Centre and FUD Editions. All of these have been developed further during the evaluation period.

In particular the Ústí nad Labem House of Arts is now a well-equipped exhibition institution that can attract international partners and recognised artists, thereby ensuring exposure to high-quality artistic activities for students and the public in a region with few such institutions.

By placing it outside the campus and naming it after the city rather than the university, it has the potential to become part of a larger local community, as do activities addressed to specific groups, such as schoolchildren, Ukrainian refugees and the local Roma community. In this way, it can function as an independent art institution, offering a variety of activities. This distinguishes the Ústí nad Labem House of Arts from typical exhibition spaces run by art departments, which often address an audience inside the university or academy, and sometimes lack a connection to an audience outside the school.

In addition to these more permanent institutional projects, the faculty has participated in projects with international partners and funding such as the EU-funded project TICASS (Technologies of Imaging in Communication, Art and Social Sciences), and the project EEA and Norway Grants funded project Gardening of Soul: In Five Chapters. A current project is the EEA and Norway Grant funded “Fórum Krásná práce – Platform for Strengthening Actors in Traditional Crafts, Their Networking,and Development of Interdisciplinary Collaboration. “

There have been some collaborations with other faculties, such as the development of the Masec Radar Crate and its prototype, which was developed in collaboration with the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering (FSI UJEP). Another project is 'Transforming the form and content of education at UJEP', which will be implemented in collaboration with the Faculty of Social and Economic Studies (FSE UJEP).

Overall, the results are of a high quality and cover a quite wide array of practices.

Recommendations:

The FUD Ujep has developed structures that allow for ambitious R&D&I in different types of networks, engaging local, regional, national and international partners. This approach should be continued and developed.

Further international collaborations should be pursued.

Some work is taking place with other faculties, but this could be developed further. During our brief visit to the other faculties, we observed that several are working on topics that are, while specific to the region, are also topics of the international artistic discourse. Examples include the changing of an industrial landscape, the ecology of these areas, and related imaging technologies. Collaborations with other faculties could be enhanced to explore the borders and possible synergies with science, and perhaps engage with artists who have experience of working with scientists.

This of course requires an interest in collaboration from other faculties as well. The Faculty of Art and Design has specific expertise in bringing physical form to ideas and communicating with an audience, which could be of great interest to other faculties.

3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society

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

Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

The activities at the Ústí nad Labem House of Arts, which are directed at local communities and fulfil the centre's role as a cultural hub, have a very direct effect on society. Understanding the Ústí nad Labem House of Arts as a laboratory embeds these local outreach activities within the broader context of the faculty's research, which aligns well with its mission.

Several publications by faculty members, some of them published in FUD editions, address societal questions and the social role of art in society, or in the specific regional situation of northern Moravia. These publications have the potential to change views on the function of art in our society.

Some of the international projects, such as Garden of the Soul, engage directly with communities, some of them disadvantaged and rely on collaboration with the audience, and can therefore be said to have a direct impact on society. A project such as the Grey Gold project, which focuses on the work of older female Czech and Slovak artists, has the potential to change society's view of older female artists.

Several of the R&D&I results in the Design Department have a concrete impact on society, such as the Libella Seat, which solves very specific problems for specific user groups. Projects such as the Mycelium Project have the potential to affect design processes and their environmental impact.

Recommendations:

As an interaction with the public is a part of the core mission of the FUD UJEP, already results with an impact on society is being pursued, - the current line of work should be continued.

The work of the Design Department to produce products that go into production and address specific problems should be continued.

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 exhibition, the meeting with the audience and the public, and the transfer into practice are integral parts of artistic research in fine arts and new media art. The exhibition is where curatorial and artistic work meets the public in the final stage of the creative process. Because of this, it can be hard to differentiate between the research and its integration into practice.

Understanding the Ústí nad Labem House of Arts as a laboratory provides the department with a space for this essential aspect of its work within a variety of activities at the faculty, ranging from curating exhibitions over presenting design to social and educational activities aimed at the local community. The Ústí nad Labem House of Arts can therefore be viewed as the central vehicle for transferring results into practice at local and international levels.

The Ceramics Centre is another permanent project closely connected to porcelain manufacturing. By working directly with industry, research and development can take place in an industrial setting and assure a better transfer into practice.

FUD Editions is another central part of the faculty's research infrastructure and a vehicle for the transfer om results. Presenting Research in the fields of art and design relies to a large extent on exhibitions and a system of information exchange, in which books are an important vehicle. As such, FUD Editions can be seen as a relevant hub in this circuit of information.

The books are often designed by faculty members or students, and as such, these publications have the potential to serve as a vehicle for the transfer of R&D&I results in the field of graphic design into practice.

The participation of faculty members in prestigious exhibitions should be noted here, such as the permanent exhibition at the National Gallery, the Lungomare exhibition as part of Rijeka 2020, as well as the other exhibitions in relevant art institutions.

Research activities of the Department of History and Theory, such as the Grey Gold project focusing on the work of older female Czech and Slovak artists, will result in an exhibition in the Bratislava City Gallery this year.

Several design products, including the LIBELLA seat, the SOLO porcelain series and the MASEC RadarCrate prototype, have gone or are going into production.

Recommendations:

The FUD UJEP is already ambitiously transferring the faculty's R&D&I results into practice. This work should continue and be developed further.

Current examples of collaboration with other faculties should be used as models for future collaborations involving work that can be transferred into practice.

POPULARIZATION OF VAVAI

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

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

Rating [1–5]:	**5 - Outstanding**

Qualitative assessment:

As public exhibitions are an integral part of artistic, curatorial and design practices, it can be difficult to differentiate between transferring results into practice and popularising them. Many of the activities mentioned in section 3.5 also constitute popularising results.

Naturally, the Ústí nad Labem House of Arts plays a central role here, particularly for the local community. The exhibition programme showcases the faculty's activities, research projects, and international collaborations to a local audience. The design festival gives access to the work happening in the design departments and elsewhere. Here it is also possible to acquire publications resulting from work in the faculty, often with graphic design by members of faculty or students.

The way in which the FUD UJEP has conceptualised the Ústí nad Labem House of Arts, especially after its renovation, gives it the unique potential to facilitate interaction between the faculty's R&D&I work and the public in a sustainable way.

Recommendations:

The current practice of popularising the work of the FUD UJEP through the Ústí nad Labem House of Art, FUD Editions as well as via national and international exhibitions and design festivals, should be continued.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module 3

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

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

Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

FUD UJEP has generally followed the recommendations from IEP 2020 in developing its research and artistic activities in the fields of visual art, visual literacy, art history and art education. Furthermore,

it has incorporated new topics such as psychology and cognitive science, in collaboration with other faculties.

It has, as recommended, continued its work on socially relevant design, artistic and curatorial work, and community outreach in the region, as well as its international networking. The recommendation to continue its popularisation efforts has also been followed, reaching a new quality through the renovation of the Ústí nad Labem House of Arts.

The faculty has sought to expand the capacity for commercialisation of its research activities and has also been successful in some projects. However, as was also stated in the IEP 2020, due to the particular structure of the field, the rights to the output of artistic and design processes belong to the author and cannot be commercialised by the university, which limits the possibilities in these fields. The recommendation to commercialise its R&D&I activities has been followed in projects such as the LIBELLA seat and further design projects aimed at commercialisation. Through such products, serious work has been done to follow the recommendation to support innovative products.

It should also be noted that the recommendation to develop new practices using online tools has been followed and developed during and after the pandemic, but seems to have reached a more sustainable level with a balanced mix of online and on-site activities in Usti nad Labem and abroad.

Recommendations:

The recommendations have been followed, so there is no need to add any more here.

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	**4 - Very good**
3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society	**4 - Very good**
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	**5 - Outstanding**
3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module	**4 - Very good**
Average rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**
Grade [A–D]:	**B**

Summary assessment:

The FUD Ujep works ambitiously to develop research in the form of artistic, curatorial and design work that reaches a local audience and has an actual impact on communities and the institutional landscape of a structurally challenged region, while participating in international networks and

setting an example of how to connect the research work of an art faculty with the national and international institutional landscape of the art and design world.

By establishing high-quality structures such as the Ústí nad Labem House of Art, Ceramics Centre and FUD Editions, the faculty is developing self-reliance and has the potential to become an attractive partner for other institutions, both within and outside academia.

This can be viewed as a model for art and design faculties outside urban and cultural centres, where there are few public cultural and creative industry structures with which to interact. Establishing such structures ensures independence and offers spaces for various projects while impacting the surrounding population.

FUD UJEP excels at developing projects with multiple qualities, such as “Garden of Soul”, which was an international collaboration with several partner, producing concrete outputs for society in the form of works in public spaces, as well as participatory activities reaching particular groups in the region and elsewhere.

There are some collaborations with other faculties, but there seems to be potential for further collaborations.

Summary recommendations:

Having established solid institutional structures and a well-developed programme, the current work at FUD UJEP should be continued.

The university has a strong presence in the region and the faculty seems to have achieved a position as a relevant player in the region's cultural landscape.

The work of being part of a national and international network of higher education institutions (HEIs) and participating in transnational projects with extarnal funding funding should be continued, with new projects being pursued.

Publication in journals and publication beyond FUD Editions should be increased.

Collaboration between the faculties can be strengthened.

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of EDUCATION

FORD: 5 - Social sciences

SOCIAL CONTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATED UNIT

3.1 Introductory information about the unit under evaluation

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

Commentary: The Faculty of Education of UJEP sees its primary mission is the preparation of highly qualified professionals in educational professions, mainly for schooling, and related helping professions. The focus is on supporting innovative educators who are capable to accompany current and future demands of the educational system. As everywhere in Europe, this includes bridging theory and classroom practice by achieving excellence in teaching and research, supporting research activities, and internationalizing education (just the European union has more than 50 school traditions), Cooperation with local, national, and international partners are recognised as the essential triggers (more than in every other faculty). As the field of education (especially in STEM education) requires frequent updating and coping with often unforeseen contemporary demands, not only in view of the recent Covid issue for which neither professors nor teachers were prepared for.

The faculty's role primarily lies in training educators and specialists who multiply their expertise during many age cohorts during the professional life. Almost all specialisations are offered from special and inclusive education to sustainability and health education. The reported distribution clearly shows the allocation (Social Sciences (71%, especially education), Humanities (18%, especially languages and literature), and Health Sciences (11%). Such structures require a strong involvement of psychological research, which is supportive for almost all research priorities in the faculty's sub-disciplines.

The faculty structure contains 4 specialized centres and 10 departments, all of them serving roughly a third of the UJEP students within almost two dozen study programmes (mainly for bachelor and master degrees). Additional almost two dozen professional development programmes assure a consequent lifelong learning without neglecting investing efforts in research in encouraging its academic members to contribute substantially the high-level research initiatives. Interestingly, the faculty not only favours a balanced age and gender structure within the academic body, but also harvests the expertise of senior professors older than 70 year which in the US is one of the anchors of success while Europe is not even aware of this valuable source.

RECOGNITION BY THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY

3.2 Recognition by the research community	
Evaluate the position of the evaluated unit in the R&D&I research community based on the facts presented in indicator 3.2 and its annexed tables (3.2.1 to 3.2.5).	
Rating [1–5]:	**3 - Average**

Qualitative assessment:[3]

During the last evaluated period, the faculty strengthened its position as a respected research institution. The faculty actively engaged in scholarly discourse through individual achievements of its staff, expert participation in national and international scientific activities, and extensive involvement in research project evaluations. Prestigious awards received by the faculty's academic staff underscore its high-quality research and creative activities, particularly in arts and education. The faculty's international recognition is further evidenced by active memberships of its academics on editorial boards of prestigious international journals. Additionally, academic staff played a significant role in evaluating research projects and programs at national and European levels, including involvement in the Czech Science Foundation, the Slovak Research and Development Agency, the Slovenian Research Agency, and various Czech university grant agencies. The faculty also actively contributes to the broader academic community through organizing significant international conferences.

Compared to the previous evaluation period, the faculty has significantly expanded and deepened activities across all monitored areas, clearly demonstrating its growing academic prominence and enhanced research quality. The faculty intends to continue this positive trajectory, reinforcing its position as a leading institution in scientific research and innovation.

Recommendations:

The faculty serves about a third of all UJEP students which is aligned with a high teaching load. Due to its focus on teacher education, it bridges the gap between theory and practice in line with a high multiplication factor (as every graduated teacher serves about four cohorts of the new generation). Some faculties of education in Europe are satisfied with this challenging role although a university faculty needs to follow the Humboldt vision of combing own research with teaching. In consequence, a faculty needs to strengthen its position as research institution nationally even by serving in editorial boards of international journals in the field. As national funds in general are limited (especially in the field of education), successfully applying for European funds is offering two advantages: First cooperating internationally and second adding European value (as Europe has more than 50 educational systems). In consequence, the faculty's intent to continue this positive trajectory to reinforce its position as research institution in scientific research needs further support. Nevertheless, education departments all over Europe shouldn't compared with science departments with their advantages of funding (and not to forget much lower teaching load due to lower student numbers). Therefore, comparisons within subjects are advisable. The faculty apparently is focussing towards the appropriate direction and thus needs encouraging to continue the existing run. This metamorphosis process is taking place in many countries while some groups are acting as research pioneers, most others are following. The faculty clearly is located in the second group due to historical reasons.

As the academic bodies of universities in general are very constant and difficult to modify, developing a consistent recruitment strategy beyond teaching lines is strongly recommended. Such a visionary plan paper could easier follow a consistent line of recruitment for both, to strengthen

[3] 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.

existing research but also to develop new research areas. Adjacent efforts may provide an exchange with other universities for which the European Erasmus body is offering sufficient external resources (for both directions): If sufficient numbers of academics contribute on time, very quickly a network develops in fertilising research grounds, but also prepares the ground for student mobilities to expand their horizons within the Bologna frame. Of course, attracting visiting professors during their sabbatical slots may inseminate research cooperation. Nevertheless, preparing the ground for participating in or even leading EU-funded research initiatives should be the long-term focus which needs mobility efforts within teacher education institutions. EU-Calls for "green issues" or for science communication, currently are frequent, they need harvesting and East European countries often receive an easier access when competing submissions are neglecting such partners.

Recommendations (in a nutshell):

1. Continue to develop an research culture with interfacing the different within-faculty expertise as well as leading European institutions (at best via integrative EU-proposals).
2. Push towards publications in Q1/Q2 journals.
3. Formulate a strategy plan for recruitment priorities during the next decade.

RESEARCH PROJECTS

3.3 Research projects

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

Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

Several research projects contributed to the faculty's mission, five of them by the faculty's report were ranked as significant. All of them were nationally funded. The "Outdoor Teaching in Times of Crisis: Reflections on Distance Education in Primary Schools during the Covid-19 Pandemic" focussed on the effectiveness of outdoor education in schools by not only developing appropriate classroom materials and methodological resources, but also extracting practical teaching guidelines under the umbrella of interdisciplinary and fitting educational strategies in order support its practical application regionally and nationally.

In another national research project (Responsible Consumption – Educational Resources for Sustainable Lifestyle Education) the faculty acted a partner in developing comprehensive educational materials and to sensibilize for alternative teaching methodologies as well as to disseminate via workshops (externally) and teacher education modules (internally). The "Methodological Framework for Environmental Literacy in Schools" focussed on assessing pupils' environmental literacy through a validated methodological framework in order to offer educators and policymakers tools for systematically analysing educational initiatives. The sample consisted of more the 20.000 eight graders of all over Czechia in securing high-level analyses. The methodology is also employed in Slovakia. "Public Opinion Research on Crime Issues" examined public attitudes towards crime, security, and preventive measures. Detailed analyses provided valuable insights for regional policymakers and security authorities. The project aligned with the faculty's mission on non-teaching pedagogy. A final one focused on teaching Czech as a foreign language from the perspective of special education coming up with valid recommendations for teacher training.

The faculty acted as PI (principal investigator) in the first project, as partner in all others. All projects followed the faculty's strategic vision of a robust interdisciplinarity as well as a strong community collaboration. As the second project was already listed in 2017-2019, it is unclear whether this was done mistakenly or a second funding allowed an extension.

Recommendations: The funded national projects reflect the faculty's priorities showing its ability to involve different staff in research projects and what is even important to disseminate results into the school community. The roadmap is promising and needs subsequent continuation as this vision is supporting the road from the ivory tower to the in-service teacher community (which is essential especially within the STEM-sector). Providing incentives and encouragement from the faculty (as well the university) side may further support this roadmap. This transfer may also offer to the neighbouring faculties an option for their efforts of science communication. Nevertheless, when judging research efforts in school education, always a big portion needs assigned to applied research: Many initiatives need grounding and adjusting within robust classroom environments.

Recommendations (in a nutshell):

1. Continue collaborative and interdisciplinary research
2. Submit larger grant proposals with national/international strategic partners
3. Harvest your research outputs in leading international journals.

3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society

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

Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

The self-assessment includes an overview of outputs addressing the faculty's mission in order to support sustainability education and ecologically responsible behaviours. As it is supposed to disseminate into schools, approval by the Ministry of the Environment was needed. However, what is more, apparently curricula in selected schools were adjusted according the projects' outcomes. Within that context, environmental literacy was monitored in using the evaluative framework in targeting improvement strategies in environmental education.

All other projects seem to consists of applied approaches, for instance, towards classrooms. Distance education during the Covid-19 Crisis became an unforeseen focus resulting in a "Guide to Distance Outdoor Education" for supporting mainly preservice teacher in integrating outdoor environments into distance education effectively. Similarly, a local project about regional Crime Prevention influenced regional crime-prevention strategies and resource allocation. Other projects dealt with avoidance of school dropouts or strategies of inclusive education. All these papers seem to focus on political issues or to produce policy papers for administration purposes.

Recommendations: As usual in most of the European teacher education faculties, much of the research is closely linked to its practical application, mainly by its origins but also by the funding

requirements. As above listed, most projects aim to sustainability issue which is the general hot issue of funding everywhere. All of them seem eligible for subsequent transfer into classrooms in supporting innovative practical application. In consequence a life after the project endings is likely. This channel may also offer the other faculties a professional way of science communication in order to directly reach the multipliers to the next generation.

Applied research needs existing grounding or prospective impact of basic research. Although the latter is not very popular in our field, as applied research can more easily come up with solutions for an educational dissemination, it must be the very basis for any research. The ratio between both may be university or even country dependent, but it must be a ratio (without setting one column to zero). More than 100 school partnership promise a lot for one column, the other needs attendance for the upcoming evaluation period.

Recommendations (in a nutshell):

1. Continue networking within your national school system
2. Consider the potential conferences to disseminate relevant findings.
3. Search the potential for external funding applications.

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:

Transfers of research, development and innovation (R&D&I) into practice exists, initial teacher education as well as professional development initiatives are beneficiaries. Additionally offer the Centre for Lifelong Learning an appropriate umbrella. A constant connection to ministries and school administration allows a better adjusting school curricula or modifying educational initiatives. Public administration and regional government use consultancy at national and regional levels to intervene with the educational frameworks. Typical NGO partners include environmental centres or sports associations. Direct commercialisation is regarded as neither appropriate nor possible in the faculty's subject areas.

Recommendations: Transfer of results into practice is the genuine trade of education (see above). Continue to integrate school authorities and ministries in your strategic planning Overarching this segment may address parents and families. Besides the school segment recently science communication increasingly comes into play which give education the tool to assist for instance science for "simplifying" complex issues to general public level. Popularisation and communication with the public becomes an even more important and fruitful task as classroom lessons face the very same problem of making complex issues digest-able.

Recommendations (in a nutshell):

1. Continue networking within school authorities and ministries
2. Consider to expand your didactic expertise into science communication

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]:	**3 - Average**
Qualitative assessment: Popularisation takes a number of different forms and links to the faculty's research efforts in different ways. A considerable effort is put into popularisation of research in general through events organised to involve the public. Mass-media commentaries and social media posts are also used to popularise more specific results of research. There are also commentaries on recent events which do not necessarily relate directly to specific research results but are clearly linked by broad subject area and clearly reflect and benefit from prestige gained from research activities. There are also articles in expert journals, presenting the results of research in Czech in non-academic language. For those projects with clear practical application, there have been a number of active efforts to disseminate thinking to the appropriate practitioners, including public talks, stakeholder meetings and workshops. For at least some projects the data provided suggests considerable success in reaching the appropriate audience.	
Recommendations: There is experience with different kinds of popularisation. Events for a wider public are a positive part of fulfilment of the faculty's mission. Means of propagating specifically the faculty's own research have been developed for some projects. It could be valuable to investigate means to support efforts in the same direction for other projects. Ideally, researchers should regard popularisation (or in some cases possibly commercialisation) as an integral part of the research process. For this there should be faculty and university support. **Recommendations (in a nutshell):** **1.** Continue information dissemination as outlined. **2.** Consider the development of regional platforms to disseminate findings into school and stakeholder environments	

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module 3	
Evaluate how the evaluated unit has reflected the recommendations from the previous evaluation of the IEP, if applicable. If the evaluated unit has not been evaluated before, the indicator will be marked as N/A – Not Applicable.	
Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**
Qualitative assessment: The self-evaluation report suggests that recommendations were all taken seriously and changes have overwhelmingly been close to what was recommended. It would appear likely that recommendations were helpful in supporting directions that were being considered and in encouraging a search for solutions for problems that were identified. It is too early to see full results from changes that have been made.	

Recommendations: As the recommendations were taken on board, there seems no need to add anything under this specific heading.

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	**3 - Average**
3.3 Research projects	**4 - Very good**
3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society	**4 - Very good**
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 - Average**
Average rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**
Grade [A–D]:	**B**
Summary assessment: The faculty has been moving from a lower level of research to a level that, while not high and not involving the majority of academic staff, provides conceivable potential for further development. There are some prestigious projects and well-known individuals alongside a significant number with some recognition and some involvement in research. There have been serious efforts to expand international contacts and doctoral study programmes in English recorded from 2021. Changes at the university level in support to research and incentives to those taking part in research were too new to show clear results in the review period, but can be expected to be beneficial. It clearly remains difficult to expand lengthy visits from abroad and periods abroad for members of the faculty, but where this has been possible there have been positive results. The picture is of a faculty that is developing and innovating with every prospect of further improvement.	
Summary recommendations: The broad direction being taken seems to use the potential to continue improvements. The message therefore contains the promise to keep the direction taken so far, to take advantage of the relative newness of the institution – without strongly entrenched research agendas that discourage incomers - welcome new research areas, try to make the environment attractive to incoming researchers and visitors and continue to learn from examples of what has been successful.	

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of the Environment

FORD: 1 - Natural sciences

SOCIAL CONTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATED UNIT

3.1 Introductory information about the unit under evaluation
Indicator 3.1 is a non-evaluated indicator that provides basic information about the evaluated unit such as its mission and vision, organizational structure, size and staffing, or R&D&I capacities.
Commentary: The Faculty of the Environment identifies itself as the very first faculty oriented to environmental protection in the former Czechoslovakia and also as a founding faculty of the new university. Its starting point was concern in the region over environmental damage especially from open-cast mining, use of brown coal and the presence of the chemicals industry. It is retained, and developed from, that research orientation. In terms of teaching students, numbers relative to academic staff are small, pointing to a need for a higher level of research and commercialisation activity. The former of these has seen gradual expansion by broadening fields of research interest, often starting from the original base in the region's needs, by broadening contacts within Czechia and by developing more international contacts and forms of collaboration. Success has been aided by; - enhancing academic staff by applying continuous monitoring and career development (in line with university policies and practices), by hiring and retaining successful senior staff (reflected in an academic staff structure including some in the older age categories), by recruitment and continued development of former younger researchers, - linking study programmes into developing research areas, although steady increase in numbers on masters and doctoral programmes is yet to be demonstrated. This could change with the recent addition in 2023 of three new Masters programmes and of a doctoral programme in English, - by the expansion of international contacts, including the presence of staff with international experience and contacts and of staff from outside Czechia.

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:[4] The faculty's self-assessment points to improvement in recognition and standing as demonstrated by the increasing international contacts, the hiring of international academic staff, the increasing number of international students and the accreditation of new study programmes. At the same time, it acknowledges that there have been no big prizes for individual staff members and that an attempt to develop a research journal within the faculty was ultimately unsuccessful. At the same time, recognition is clearly demonstrated by the large number of invitations to individual staff members, from very diverse parts of the world, and by the number of significant international figures who have visited UJEP. It is also significant that individuals are present on important evaluation panels for research. Another guide to recognition is the extent to which UJEP is sought after as a partner in research projects and the extent to which it can attract participation in research projects that it leads, as covered in subsequent sections.
Recommendations: There clearly has been progress and continuing with the same approach makes sense, using opportunities provided by university policies and incentive schemes. Recognition for the faculty has followed from recruitment of individuals who already have recognition. The next stage could see more emphasis on active promotion for those earlier in their careers. There might be thought of attempting to restart a research journal, but publications in journals already with international recognition would seem a more sensible priority.

RESEARCH PROJECTS

3.3 Research projects	
Evaluate the most important research projects of the evaluated unit, especially regarding the results achieved and the application potential of the project, the proportionality with respect to the R&D&I capacities of the evaluated unit, the degree of interdisciplinarity and collaboration with other parts of the evaluated HEI, and the consistency with the declared mission and vision of the evaluated unit. Use the data from the full list of research projects and contract research activities in Tables 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 to supplement the evaluation.	
Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**
Qualitative assessment: There has been a considerable increase in funding from a variety of public sources, spanning fundamental research and applied research projects and a number of items of specific, contracted research. UJEP has been the lead institution in some of these, including ones with a strong focus on regional environmental issues. It has been in the role of another participant in the biggest projects. These latter have been the most important and lucrative. Among them is a project to develop means for removal of pharmaceuticals from wastewater, funded by Norway's contribution within the framework of EU funding, in which a commercial company was the lead grant-holder and the main beneficiary in financial terms. The faculty was also involved in an even bigger project concerned with	

[4] 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.

recycling from lithium-ion batteries, receiving substantial public funding, although only a small share of the total alongside other beneficiaries. In these and other cases, the faculty was fulfilling its research mission, its contribution to regional improvement and development, and frequently directly enhancing its teaching mission by involving research students in related projects. Projects have benefits from, and helped to develop, international contacts and collaboration between faculties within the university, although that is visible only in some. Some research is also focused on more clearly regional problems, including a publicly-funded project on water problems in the near-by national park which included developing methods for mapping effects, using satellite imagery and aerial surveys. Taken as a whole, there is a high level of consistency with the faculties declared mission.

Recommendations:

The faculty should continue with its current attempts to become involved in bigger international projects,

Serious efforts should be made to be the lead institution in international projects rather than just a participating partner.

Efforts could be made to involve other faculties more. The potential is probably greatest for the more regionally focused 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:

Applications in practice have been most visible for projects that were already targeted at practical environmental and regional issues. The faculty has led in the preparation of a regional strategy for environmental education, training and awareness and in specific projects relating to water, brownfield development and environmental analytical chemistry. Revenues have been substantial and a number of projects were set to continue beyond the review period. In some cases research has also led to academic publications, alongside their local impact. The project on removing pharmaceuticals from waste-water has led to an EU patent application while contacts have been developed with commercial companies, aiming for an early commercial launch. There is positive evidence of combining fundamental research with outside contacts, within Czechia and internationally and with both academic, commercial and non-commercial partners. Overall, application of research results and achieving an impact appears as an impressive part of the faculty's activities.

Recommendations:

The chosen approaches appear to have been successful, and should therefore be continued. Some reservations and recommendations are covered below under 3.5.

TRANSFER OF RESULTS INTO PRACTICE

3.5 Transfer of results into practice

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

Rating [1–5]:	**3 - Average**

Qualitative assessment:

This section could repeat much from 3.4. There seems to be no explicit system for transferring results. There has been successful transfer, probably helped by contacts established before or during a research process, such that a more explicit system may not have appeared necessary. Recent developments include bonuses for successful transfer and the university's education strategy on IP protection and transfer. At the same time, commercialisation of patents appears not to be providing revenues while there are significant earnings from use of devices and know-how in analytical chemistry.

Recommendations:

There could be benefits from a more systematic approach to publicising in a popular way through local and national media the results of the faculty's own research, alongside the popularisation measures referred to under 3.6.

There could also be a more systematic approach to patents and their commercialisation, linking with expertise that could be developed within other university bodies. This could be an area for sharing expertise and experience across faculties via the Centre for Technology and Knowledge Transfer.

POPULARIZATION OF VAVAI

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

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

Rating [1–5]:	**5 - Outstanding**

Qualitative assessment:

This is another impressive area for the faculty. It is involved at the local and regional level and also in events in Prague, presenting research results to a wider general public.

Recommendations:

This is a good area for other faculties too. The main recommendation has to be to continue to develop it, finding a means to do that even should existing funding mechanisms for some activities not be continued.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module 3	
Evaluate how the evaluated unit has reflected the recommendations from the previous evaluation of the IEP, if applicable. If the evaluated unit has not been evaluated before, the indicator will be marked as N/A – Not Applicable.	
Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**
Qualitative assessment: The response indicates how the faculty has been changing over the period. These changes, many in line with changes across the university, are consistent with past recommendations. Two areas that they refer to specifically are; 1. the need to contribute beyond their own region with expertise they have developed. Efforts and progress have been made, but this recommendation is obviously difficult to implement in view of resource constraints. 2. the need to expand the basis for funding and to collaborate across borders for EU funding. The faculty has clearly made progress in this direction, but remains more successful as a partner in projects led by others.	
Recommendations: On point 1, despite difficulties, this would be a valuable means to increase national and international standing and to spread benefits of research more widely. It is to be hoped that the same recommendation will be borne in mind for when opportunities arise. On point 2, and recognising progress made, this recommendation remains fully valid as a next step in the development of the faculty's research.	

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	**4 - Very good**
3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society	**5 - Outstanding**

3.5 Transfer of results into practice	**3 - Average**
3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public	**5 - Outstanding**
3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module	**4 - Very good**
Average rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**
Grade [A–D]:	**B**

Summary assessment:

The faculty was involved in the founding of the university in 1991 and has developed a relatively strong research orientation, building prestige by recruiting people with established reputations and contacts. The faculty is fully aware of the need for, and benefits of, international research contacts and winning funding for big research projects. It earns significant external income and has a substantial role in the region both in research and in popularisation. Weaknesses remain especially in being at best a participating partner rather than the lead institution in bigger research projects with potential international implications. There may also be unused potential in the commercialisation of research and use of patents.

Summary recommendations:

Past strategies should be continued and developed. Research can be further strengthened by recruitment of established researchers, but there is an increasing need to develop research from younger personnel. Efforts should continue with active use of incentives in line with university policies, both to encourage new researchers and to promote collaboration between faculties. However, it is too early to see results from many new initiatives and they should therefore be carefully monitored. The faculty should ensure that it is working with other faculties and central university bodies to improve commercialisation and exploitation of patents.

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Health Studies

FORD: 3 - Medical and health sciences

SOCIAL CONTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATED UNIT

3.1 Introductory information about the unit under evaluation

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

Commentary:

The Faculty of Health Studies is the only higher education institution in the Ústí nad Labem region specializing in non-medical healthcare fields, making it one of the key actors in regional healthcare education. Since its establishment in 2012, the faculty has accredited nine bachelor's degree programs, covering specializations such as physiotherapy, occupational therapy, general nursing, midwifery, paramedic studies, radiological assistance, health protection and promotion, biomedical engineering, and paediatric nursing. In response to the growing demands of the labour market, the faculty has expanded its educational offerings to include two master's degree programs: Healthcare Organization and Management and Teaching of Vocational Subjects for Healthcare Schools. At the end of 2023, the faculty prepared the concept for a doctoral program (currently undergoing accreditation), which has been absent until now, this is desirable and has affected the faculty's research activities and potential. The faculty is actively involved in developmental projects that enhance its infrastructure and encourage academic staff to engage in publishing activities. The faculty's research activities are supported by sixteen clinical workplaces, with the Orthopaedic Clinic and the Neurosurgery Clinic among the most significant and active. Collaboration with Krajská zdravotní, a.s. within the Masaryk Hospital in Ústí nad Labem has become a key pillar of research activities, ensuring the connection between theoretical knowledge and daily practice, benefiting patients, students, and the public. To further develop its academic and research capacity, the faculty organizes thematic conferences for both professional and general audiences. A key aspect of the faculty's conceptual development remains multidisciplinary collaboration, which integrates teaching with practical skills. Further to this the faculty places great emphasis on international partnerships and actively engages in global projects, strengthening its international reputation and contributing to the exchange of knowledge on a global scale. The faculty has recently constructed a new, modern building that meets 21st-century standards and is equipped with cutting-edge technology. In addition to modern lecture halls featuring high-end audiovisual equipment, the facility houses two simulation centers and one mobile simulation center (an ambulance unit). The faculty currently maintains high-quality staffing levels, with an academic team composed of experts from clinical practice as well as internationally recognized specialists in various healthcare fields. Notable members include Prof. MUDr. Martin Sameš, CSc., Prof. MUDr. Vladimír Černý, Ph.D., and Assoc. Prof. MUDr. Roman Škulec, Ph.D., among others. These experts incorporate modern trends into non-medical healthcare education and significantly contribute to the faculty's growing research activities and reputation. Currently, nearly 40% of students come from the Ústí nad Labem region, with the remaining 60% from other regions of the Czech Republic. In response to labour market

needs and regional demands, the faculty continues to accredit and expand its study programs, which are gradually attracting more students. Staffing structures within the faculty are well balanced and provide a good variety of expertise and experience.

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:[5]

The Faculty of Health Studies (FHS UJEP), as an assessed unit, focused on strengthening its position within the research community during the 2019–2023 period. The faculty has achieved significant successes and demonstrated its international reach. A significant addition to the staff has been the recruitment of a prominent researcher, Prof. Robergs (H-index 35, Queensland University of Technology). As of 2024, he has become a strong international research asset for FHS UJEP. Further notable staff editions have included Prof. MUDr. Martin Sameš, CSc. He serves as the President of the Czech Neurosurgical Society, is a member of edito-rial boards of two international journals, and in 2020, he received the Governor's Award of the Ústí nad Labem Region for Science and Research. Further appointments include another leading neurosurgical expert Assoc. Prof. MUDr. Aleš Hejčl, Ph.D., who is currently undergoing appointment as a professor and has been repeatedly recognized for his exceptional scientific contributions. His achievements include the Rudolf Petr Award, presented by the Czech Neurosurgical Society. MUDr. Tomáš Novotný, Ph.D., has also achieved outstanding results—he received the 2023 Governor's Award of the Ústí nad Labem Region in the Social and Health Sector, the 2022 Ortho Paediatric/SICOT Foundation Scholarship, and the 2019 Lester Lowe SICOT Award. In the humanities and social sciences, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Michal Vostrý, Ph.D., stands out, serving on editorial boards of multiple international journals focused on education and rehabilitation. For his publishing and research activities, he was awarded the UJEP Rector's Award for Outstanding and Excellent Results for Academics Under 35. In pre-hospital emergency care, Dr. Patrik Christian Cmorej, Ph.D., made significant contributions, earning the UJEP Rector's Award twice during the evaluation period, as well as recognition from the Slovak Cardiology Society for the best original article published in Cardiology Letters. Finally, Dr. Miroslav Barták, Ph.D., significantly contributes to public discussions on addiction behaviour, frequently appearing in media debates. He is also the recipient of several awards and a principal investigator in multiple research projects. These achievements demonstrate that, despite its focus on non-medical healthcare professions, the faculty possesses strong potential for international collaboration and research excellence in medialy related research projects. This is further evidenced by its active participation in the EduCare 5.0 research alliance, where the faculty serves as the main coordinator. The faculty has significantly expanded and deepened its research activities, further solidifying its prestige and relevance within both national and international research communities. The faculty has many prestigious awards and projects as outlined in detail in Table 3.2.1. This is commendable and shows very good progress.

Recommendations:

4. Continue to develop a research culture with the potential to increase global reach.

[5] 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.

5. Consider publications in high impact factor Q1 journals.
6. Consider further collaborations with leading institutions throughout Europe and the rest of the World.

RESEARCH PROJECTS

3.3 Research projects

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

Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

The projects outlined by the faculty are innovative and relevant. These include NV17-32872A – Correlation of Hemodynamic Parameter Modelling with Histological Changes in the Walls of Brain Aneurysms (2017-2020, MZ0/NV) and NU22-08-00124 – Modelling Flow in Intracranial Vessels in Relation to Endothelial Changes and the Development of Intracranial Aneurysms (2022-2025, MZ0/NU). This work provides significant contributions to our understanding of stroke and related pathologies and is important locally and internationally. During the assessment period, four research projects were supported by the Ústí nad Labem Regional Fund, demonstrating strong regional cooperation and support for applied research. Further to this, the faculty also conducted additional research projects supported by institutional funding from Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem. This demonstrates further a broadening of the research culture and medical diversity. Several projects were also undertaken using contract research. This indicates and ability of the faculty to attract external funding for research work. Interestingly, all research activities were conducted in collaboration with clinical workplaces, including the Faculty of Health Studies clinics and Masaryk Hospital in Ústí nad Labem. Other key research partners included the Emergency Medical Services of the Ústí nad Labem Region, the Regional Public Health Authority, social service providers, and the Czech Police Academy. The faculty's engagement in applied research and contractual projects not only responds to MEP recommendations but also confirms the strategic direction the faculty intends to pursue which is commendable. The projects implemented have led to tangible improvements in healthcare professional training, enhanced intervention procedures in emergency medicine, and reinforced the importance of a multidisciplinary approach in education and clinical practice. The Faculty of Health Studies thus confirms its position as a center of excellence in applied healthcare research, positively impacting not only at the regional level but also at the national and international level.

Recommendations:

4. Continue to explore collaborative and interdisciplinary research
5. Look at submitting larger grant proposals with strategic partners
6. Continue to publish good quality research outputs in leading journals.

3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society

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

Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

The research activities of the Faculty of Health Studies reflect its position as a key educational institution specializing in the professional training of non-medical healthcare professionals in the Ústí nad Labem region. The projects support the innovation of study programs but also contribute to implementing research findings in clinical practice. The faculty also reflects a gender dimension, particularly in professional education and healthcare interventions. Projects focusing on expanding the competencies of general nurses, psychomotor therapy for seniors, and stress response in paramedics considers gender-specific aspects, both in terms of professional roles and physiological and psychological reactions. This is commendable and expected. In addition, the implementation of 3D virtual reality in paramedic and midwifery crisis training allows for more effective education while reducing the burden on physical resources. Similarly, the optimization of resuscitation protocols and the prevention of long-term health complications improve the efficiency of care while reducing economic and environmental costs. The overview of results outlined in Table 3.4.1 demonstrate a large community interaction with young and older populations. The impact of the research in tangible and important to the public and the faculty demonstrates a strong engagement with this group. The results of the endovascular stroke treatment project have been integrated into clinical guidelines, contributing to national recommendations and improving stroke therapy accessibility. The paramedic stress response study validated the effectiveness of 3D virtual reality for training and expanded into midwifery crisis simulations. The psychomotor therapy project demonstrated its benefits for seniors with neurodegenerative diseases and enhanced rehabilitation strategies in social services. Research on stress responses in healthcare workers led to revised resuscitation protocols, increasing safety and efficiency in emergency interventions. The faculty's research outputs also gender dimensions, particularly in professional education and healthcare interventions. For example, the stress response study in paramedics compared gender-specific physiological and psychological reactions, optimizing training strategies for different groups. Similarly, the psychomotor therapy study considered gender differences in neurodegenerative diseases, tailoring rehabilitation approaches accordingly. By integrating research findings into education and clinical practice, and collaborating with relevant institutions that provides continuous innovation, the faculty of Health Studies supports viable long-term sustainability of the healthcare system. These procedures and innovations reinforce the faculty in its role as a center of excellence in applied healthcare research.

Recommendations:

4. Continue to develop and implement projects that will make a difference to community health and the health of the general population.
5. Consider the potential of running local conferences at the university to present and disseminate relevant findings to the community.
6. Consider the development of a childhood obesity centre. This may provide potential for external funding applications and collaborative research.

TRANSFER OF RESULTS INTO PRACTICE

3.5 Transfer of results into practice

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

Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

The Faculty of Health Studies systematically transfers research results into clinical practice and facilitates education of health professionals, thus strengthening the link between academic research and the tangible needs of the health sector. Part of the transfer is facilitated by peer-reviewed publications in high impact factor journals, professional conference attendance and presentation and direct implementation of research findings into clinical practice via collaborating health care facilities and clinics that serve as joint faculty sites. This provides a valuable research asset to the faculty. An important platform for sharing scientific knowledge is the New Trends in Health Sciences conference, organised by the faculty, and the partner conference Quo vadiszdravotníctvo, organised by the University of Prešov. Direct application of research results is performed in cooperation with Masaryk Hospital and the medical staff of individual clinics in the Faculty of Health Sciences of the University of Applied Sciences, where their practical verification and implementation takes place. An exciting development are the new plans to expand the participants at the conference in cooperation with universities from the EduCare 5.0 research alliance (Germany, Portugal, Spain). In the field of pre-hospital emergency care. The faculty has established close cooperation with the Ústí nad Labem Region Health Ambulance Service (ZZS ÚK), which has been granted the status of a Faculty of Health Studies Specialist Unit. Two key joint projects, "Occupational Stress in Paramedics and 3D Virtual Reality" led to innovation in postgraduate education of professional paramedics, especially around preparation for mass casualty situations. The project "Objectification of the stress response in the use of personal protective equipment by non-medical healthcare workers in pre-hospital emergency care during a pandemic" contributed to changing the local resuscitation protocol and increased the effectiveness of the care provided in crisis conditions. This was a very important development. The transfer of research results is further supported by regular meetings with heads of clinics and other collaborating institutions, where the research projects of the faculty are presented and discussed with the professional public. To ensure executive distribution and application of innovative outputs in practice, the faculty started cooperation with the Innovation Centre of the Ústí nad Labem Region in the period under review, thus expanding its possibilities in the field of applied research and interdisciplinary innovations. The Faculty of Health Studies focuses on the transfer of its research results to target users, which include health care institutions, educational institutions, government and public institutions, the private sector in the field of health technology and professional organizations. The Masaryk Hospital, the clinics of the Faculty of Health Sciences of the Jagiellonian University, and the ZZS ÚK use the new findings directly in clinical practice, while universities and educational institutions apply them in the professional training of health professionals. Ministries of Health, Political and Social Communities can use the outputs for health policy making, while health technology companies can collaborate on their further development and implementation. This approach by the faculty extends the reach of its research outputs and ensures their application in practice. Table 3.5.1 provides a useful Summary of non-

public revenues received during the period under evaluation. The summary is comprehensive and commendable and provides examples of progress in revenue generation.

Recommendations:

1. Continue to develop outreach programmes to implement findings from the research.
2. Consider providing written reports of research findings that can be stored on university and relevant web-based sites for easy access for clinicians and the general public

POPULARIZATION OF VAVAI

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

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

Rating [1–5]:	**5 - Outstanding**

Qualitative assessment:

The Faculty of Health Studies (FZS UJEP) actively participates in the popularization of science research and innovation through a wide range of professional and popularization activities that bring the results of research projects to the professional practitioner and members of the lay public. A very important platform for the presentation of the faculty's research activities is the national event Night of Scientists, where the latest scientific findings and innovative projects of individual departments of the faculty are presented every year. The faculty also regularly participates in the Science Fair, where academic staff popularise research results through interactive presentations and expert discussions. This is very important and is commendable. An indispensable role in the dissemination of scientific knowledge is also played by professional lecture activities for the public, including the prestigious Nobel Picnic event, where faculty academics share current scientific trends with the public. Popularisation of science is also carried out in the form of specialised workshops organised as part of an Open Day, which are aimed at prospective students. There are also excursions for primary and secondary school pupils, where modern technologies and current research trends are introduced to young people interested in health care. The media outreach of the faculty's science popularisation is extended by news reports on Czech Television, which present important research projects and their benefits for society. In addition, the results of studies are regularly presented at UJEP student scientific conferences, where students can present their work and discuss scientific topics in an academic environment. Dissemination of information about ongoing research projects is also carried out through social networks, where the faculty uses not only its own communication channels, but also the platforms of partner institutions, such as the Facebook of the Medical Rescue Service of the Ústí nad Labem Region, thus effectively disseminating scientific knowledge among the professional community and the public. Thanks to these activities, the faculty systematically spreads broad awareness of scientific research in the field of health studies and promotes interest in science among students, future professionals and the public sector.

Recommendations:

3. Continue information dissemination as outlined.
4. Consider the development of media platforms to incorporate findings and information as video blogs.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module 3

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

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

Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

In the period under review, the Faculty of Health Studies (FZS UJEP) reflected on the recommendations from the previous evaluation and provided solutions leading to the development of its research and educational potential. In cooperation with the Regional Faculty of Health, the faculty has expanded the number of clinical departments to 16, and this network includes 15 clinics and the Institute of Biomedicine and Laboratory Diagnostics, which represent a key pillar of the faculty's clinical research. This has provided increased collaboration potential and further grant applications. A significant step in the field of pedagogical and scientific research activities was the establishment of the Specialist Workplace of the Faculty of Health Sciences of the University of Veterinary Medicine of the Ústí nad Labem Region, which is profiled as a unique platform linking academic education with specialized research in the field of paramedicine. In the context of the Czech Republic, it is an innovative model of linking a higher education institution with an emergency health care provider, which ensures executive transfer of research results into practice. As part of the strategy to strengthen scientific activities, the faculty has established the Research Centre of the Faculty of Science and Technology in the University of Ljubljana, which aims to integrate academic staff across departments and support interdisciplinary research towards national grant schemes. The faculty has also expanded its international collaborations with newly concluded agreements with partners in Portugal, Norway and Germany, opening new opportunities for joint research projects and mobility of academic staff. This has been a very desirable outcome and has great potential for further development. In accordance with the recommendation of the evaluation committee, the faculty is further developing the university infrastructure. Students now have access to the advanced patient simulators SimMan 3G and SimMam, which allows for the faithful simulation of clinical situations. In the field of international scientific cooperation, FZS UJEP is actively involved in the E-NUREMS project ("The use of innovative education tools in the fields of nursing and emergency medical services") within the Erasmus+ pro-gramme, where six academic staff from the Nursing and Emergency Medical Services study programmes that contribute to the development of innovative pedagogical methods. Based on the previous evaluation, the faculty has taken a clear stance on subsequent development. In terms of quality infrastructure, the faculty is in a new building which is 3 years old. The equipment in classrooms, lecture halls, auditoriums, laboratories and simulation centres are state-of-the-art, and the faculty budget continues to provide for regular investment in these essential areas. Modern facilities and a quality composition of academic staff are the basis for further development in the field of creative activities. From past evaluations, the faculty has developed supporting documents that more effectively evaluates academic staff and provides clear rules for remuneration in the form of incentive rewards. Compared to the last evaluation, the faculty has achieved qualitative and quantitative improvements and developments, but it should be noted that progress is still in its infancy. Further developments from a regional level, is a serious aim, where the faculty wants to reach a stable

position at both national and international level in the next 5 years. To achieve this goal, further work needs to be completed on facilitating greater internationalisation. This should be helped by the appointment of a long-term visiting professor from Australia. Additional support may be beneficial by increasing the number of Erasmus+ visits and arrivals for both academic staff and students.
Recommendations: **1.** Consider the employment of research active staff. **2.** Consider increasing the visiting professor scheme. **3.** Look at the potential for post-doctoral students.

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	**4 - Very good**
3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society	**4 - Very good**
3.5 Transfer of results into practice	**4 - Very good**
3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public	**5 - Outstanding**
3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module	**4 - Very good**
Average rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**
Grade [A–D]:	**B**
Summary assessment: The faculty has taken a clear stance on subsequent development and has made excellent progress. The equipment in classrooms, lecture halls, auditoriums, laboratories and simulation centres are state-of-the-art, and the faculty budget continues to provide for regular investment in these essential areas. Further external funding will help improve this situation. Modern facilities and a quality composition of academic staff are crucial for further development in the field of creative activities, and the addition of research active staff, where possible is desirable. From past evaluations, the faculty has developed supporting documents that precisely and effectively evaluate research directions and academic staff. The supporting information provides a set of clear rules for remuneration in the form of incentive rewards. Compared to the last evaluation, the faculty has achieved qualitative and quantitative improvements, but it should be noted that the faculty has further work to consider, to progress from a regional level, where it desires to reach a stable position at national and international levels in the next 5 years. To achieve this the faculty needs to become more international and perhaps increase the number of Erasmus+ visits and arrivals for both academic staff and students. Further to this, staff mobility to established medical laboratories	

internationally, will also help research development and grant applications development. This will increase potential for innovative collaborative research projects, large European and global grant applications and the development and understanding of new research innovations.
Summary recommendations: **1.** Increase research funding applications with credible institutions. **2.** Consider publications in very high impact factor journals such as the Lancet, Nature etc. **3.** Consider the recruitments of high-profile professors and staff. **4.** Consider exchange programmes of sabbaticals to labs where high profile professors are located to establish research collaborations. **5.** Perhaps consider a name change to the Faculty of Health Sciences. This potentially be more attractive to external funding agencies and collaborative partners.

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Mechanical Engineering

FORD: 2 - Engineering and technology

SOCIAL CONTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATED UNIT

3.1 Introductory information about the unit under evaluation

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

Commentary:

The Faculty of Mechanical Engineering (FME) of Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem is a modern institution that focuses on education, research and innovation in the fields of engineering, materials engineering and related technological disciplines. FME offers comprehensive university education at the bachelor's, master's and doctoral levels, with an emphasis on linking theoretical teaching with practice and current industry needs.

The main mission of FME is to prepare qualified experts capable of responding to the current challenges of industrial production, digitization and sustainable development. The faculty systematically develops cooperation with regional and national companies through applied research, technology transfer and contract research, thus facilitating the practical use of research and development knowledge in the industrial environment. Part of this strategy is the active role of the Faculty Industrial Council and cooperation with the Science and Technology Park of UJEP.

The vision of the faculty is to build a recognized research and educational center in the field of engineering, emphasizing interdisciplinary approaches and innovative technological solutions. The research activities of the faculty are focused on applied research and experimental development with a direct impact on industrial practice.

The faculty consists of two institutes that educate and carry out research in the fields of energy, engineering and materials sciences. In 2023, there were approximately 50 academic staff (20% women) and about 600 students in full-time and part-time forms. Thanks to the interconnection of study programs with practice and permanent contact with regional companies, FME graduates will find employment especially in key industries and energy.

The faculty has also long profiled itself as an important regional partner in the field of innovation, technology transfer and education of new professionals, actively responding to the demand on the labour market and the needs of regional development.

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:[6]

In the period 2019–2023, the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering (FME UJEP) strengthened its position in the Czech and international community. The academic staff of FME were intensively involved in research in the fields of engineering technology, materials engineering and applied technical disciplines, which resulted in both awards and active participation in international networks, professional societies and scientific committees.

FME UJEP has representatives on the editorial boards of major international scientific journals, which shows the respect and professional reputation of the staff. The staff members are active in the evaluation panels of grant agencies in the Czech Republic and abroad.

An important element of recognition is also active membership in the management of professional professional organizations and participation in doctoral study boards or scientific boards at leading Czech universities (Czech Technical University, Brno University of Technology, University of West Bohemia in Pilsen, Technical University of Ostrava).

During the evaluated period, the academic staff of the faculty were regularly invited to lecture at foreign universities and conferences (e.g. Technical University of Košice, Wroclaw University of Science and Technology, University of Žilina, Hochschule Zittau/Görlitz).

It also participates in the evaluation of major national and European research programmes and grant calls.

It should be mentioned that the faculty still has great potential for improvement in this area, especially in the area of joint international projects.

Recommendations:

- Systematically increase the involvement of staff in international scientific networks and greater participation in European projects.
- To support and motivate academic staff to publish in prestigious impacted journals - to introduce a system of motivational tools for internationalization
- Intensify cooperation with industrial partners with a strong greater international reach and use these contacts for joint projects and presentation of results abroad.
- Expand and connect networks of contacts – actively seek partners and opportunities
- Involve young scientists in international activities (internships, mentoring, grants)

RESEARCH PROJECTS

3.3 Research projects

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

Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

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

In the past period, the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering has implemented a number of important applied research projects that show high application potential, especially in the fields of materials engineering and power engineering. Projects were often linked to industry partners and covered both publicly funded research and contract research. It is significant that the projects correspond to the declared mission of the faculty—to connect theoretical and applied research, to support sustainable development of the region and innovation in industry, and to increase interdisciplinarity.

Interdisciplinarity and cooperation

- Other faculties of UJEP participated in most of the projects, which strengthened the range of possible applications of outputs and enabled the transfer of knowledge not only to industry, but also to teaching and training of new specialists.

Application potential

- A number of results are protected by patents (e.g. new alloys, surface treatment technologies) and several have already been transferred under license or directly implemented in partnerships.

Compliance with the mission and vision of the faculty

- Research projects are directly linked to the strategic direction of the faculty—emphasis on sustainable industry, innovative production technologies, and support for regional development. The faculty actively responds to market needs and systematically strengthens the involvement of industrial experts in education and research.

It should be mentioned that the faculty still has great potential for improvement in this area, especially in the area of joint international projects.

Recommendations:

- Strengthening internationalization and involvement in international projects
  - Expand participation in European grant schemes (e.g. Horizon Europe, INTERREG) in a targeted manner.
  - Systematically build support for international mobility (doctoral students, academics), expand strategic partnerships and develop "Global Expert" programs to increase the international engagement of research teams and internationalize doctoral studies.
- System support for technology transfer and innovation
  - To support active cooperation with businesses through the Science and Technology Park, to systematically expand contract research and the application of research results in practice.
  - To create a position in the knowledge transfer industry with coordination with the "Global Expert"
- Interconnecting UJEP faculties and supporting interdisciplinary research teams
  - Prefer the establishment of interdisciplinary teams on key topics (e.g. green energy, Industry 4.0, digitization).
- Strengthening strategic partnerships with industry and institutions with an international reach
  - To increase the volume and quality of joint research projects with industry leaders (including foreign ones), to use industrial advice to share the needs of practice and present results abroad.

3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society	
Evaluate the research results already applied in practice or intended to be applied in practice. When evaluating, consider whether the results are proportionate to the R&D&I capacities of the evaluated unit, how they contribute to the fulfilment of the mission and vision of the evaluated unit and, if stated in the self-evaluation, how the results take into account the gender dimension and sustainability. Use the data from the full results summary in Table 3.4.1 to supplement the evaluation.	
Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

In the period 2019–2023, the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering of UJEP (FME) shows a number of significant research results with a measurable, direct impact on industry and society. The high level of application of knowledge is due to the close connection with companies, involvement in contracted research and long-term efforts to transfer knowledge into practice.

Proportionality of results to FME capacities

- Due to its size and staffing (about 50 academic staff, of which 20% are women, about 600 students), FME is able to generate results that correspond to its capacities and regional possibilities.

Contribution to the fulfillment of the mission and vision of FME UJEP

- Research activities clearly reflect the role of FME as a regional technology transfer player, fulfilling the assignment of a "training and innovation centre" responding to current industrial needs. The involvement of industrial partners and student research increases the long-term societal impact.

The results of FME UJEP demonstrate a high level of social impact corresponding to capacities and regional anchoring, with good prerequisites for further development of internationalization, commercial application and sustainability. The emphasis on gender equality increases the relevance of scientific outputs in the context of current European trends.

Recommendations:

- Increasing the internationalization of applications – to develop a larger number of international projects focused on the transfer of applied outputs, to make better use of the results to participate in European innovation programs, to strengthen the mobility of academic staff and students.
- Deepen the regional and transnational network of users of the results
    - Active participation in trade fairs, innovation competitions, thematic panels abroad (e.g. Science Café, Researcher's Night, design/tech/art festivals, etc.).
    - Involvement in European thematic networks, platforms and working groups.

TRANSFER OF RESULTS INTO PRACTICE

3.5 Transfer of results into practice	
Evaluate the effectiveness of the transfer of results into practice by the unit being evaluated. Pay attention to whether the composition of the stated users of the results or the way the R&D&I results are commercialised (if stated) is consistent with the R&D&I results produced and the mission and vision of the evaluated unit and how successful the evaluated unit is in its activities, such as attracting new users of the results, commercialising the R&D&I results and obtaining funding from non-public, non-grant sources.	
Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

The Faculty of Mechanical Engineering (FME) of UJEP fulfils its mission of connecting the academic environment with industrial practice and focusing on the application of research and development outputs in the real environment. The transfer system is based primarily on cooperation with the Science and Technology Park UJEP (VTP UJEP) and the active activities of the faculty industrial council, which allows for rapid transfer of results, identification of current needs of companies and long-term development of partnerships.

Structure of results users

- The key users of the outputs include regional and multinational companies in the automotive, energy, engineering and materials processing sectors (e.g. LaserTherm s.r.o., KONE Industrial, Moldcast s.r.o., Povrly Copper Industries or ORLEN Unipetrol RPA). Relationships are developed both in the form of custom research and through the direct involvement of company experts in teaching and supervising final theses.

Consistency with the mission and vision of the faculty

- The focus on applied research, close connection with the needs of the region's industry and the development of knowledge needed for the transformation to sustainable technologies correspond to both the declared values and the long-term strategy of FME UJEP. Practical orientation is also strengthened by the involvement of students in research projects and applied transfer of innovation.

Commercial activities and obtaining non-grant resources

- The transfer of results is carried out mainly by the licensing policy and the ever-increasing volume of contract research. The faculty has shown an increase in the share of commercial activities and successfully raises funds from donations and direct cooperation with the corporate sector – in the period 2019–2023, it was in the order of hundreds of thousands of CZK per year from non-grant sources, in addition to income from licenses.

FME UJEP fulfils the transfer of knowledge into practice and systematically strengthens its role in the regional innovation ecosystem.

It is essential to direct development activities towards the institutionalization of transfer support, greater internationalization and diversification of commercialization activities.

Recommendations:

- Creation of a commercialization strategy and coordination with workplaces at the level of the Rector's Office
- Intensify support mechanisms for the commercialization of results at university level

- Methodological support for the establishment of spin-off and start-up companies and training of academics in the field of technology transfer.
- Motivation of academic staff and students to transfer results into practice.

- Continue to expand cooperation with foreign partners and membership in European projects to increase the volume of transferred technologies and internationalize impacts.
  - Fill professional positions such as "Global Expert" – the aim of which will be the transfer of know-how not only to science, but also directly to business and commercialization
  - Strategic partnerships with innovation hubs and centers
- Raise awareness of the possibilities of cooperation towards small and medium-sized enterprises in the region, for example by organizing sectoral networking events or thematic workshops.
  - Organization of regular networking events, innovation days, thematic workshops and "open-lab" days
- Monitor and systematically evaluate the effectiveness of individual commercialization routes (patents, licenses, services) to optimize benefits.
- Expanding support services to connect academic research and industry needs at the university level
  - Strengthening the team implementing knowledge transfer at UJEP
  - Active search for partners for contract research
  - Methodological support in the preparation of "proof-of-concept" projects

POPULARIZATION OF VAVAI

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

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

Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

The Faculty of Mechanical Engineering of UJEP systematically develops the popularization of science and technology, especially towards the general public, secondary and primary school pupils and the professional public. The essential forms are not only professional and popularization lectures, but also the organization of conferences, workshops, excursions or participation in educational fairs. Cooperation with secondary schools, support for talented pupils and career development of students, as well as active communication through modern media, are important.

The faculty has long preferred to connect science and practice with the everyday reality of the region and wider society. The most successful are public and school events, social media campaigns, popularization lectures and excursions. FME shows exemplary activity in supporting technical education, especially among the younger generation. It is good practice to involve industry experts in teaching, as well as to promote specific cases of applied research. There is room for improvement in strengthening media coverage, systematizing impact evaluation and developing interactive or online activities.

Overall, FME UJEP is active and successful in popularization and communication with the public, following the strategy of long-term connection of research, practice and education in the region.

Recommendations:

- Focus more on digital popularization content (video presentations, webinars, virtual tours of laboratories).
- To expand the systematic media coverage of the Faculty's achievements beyond the sectoral media, including regional and national channels.
- To maintain and expand the network of partner schools in the region, to pilot a "mentoring" program for talented pupils – the Children's Technical University.
- Furthermore, to involve industrial partners not only in teaching, but also in the joint organization of popularization events.
- Intensify the evaluation of the effectiveness of popularization events (questionnaires, monitor attendance, feedback).

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module 3

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

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

Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

Implementation of recommendations from the previous evaluation of IEP, Module 3 (FME UJEP)

The Faculty of Mechanical Engineering of UJEP took into account the recommendations from the previous evaluation of the International Evaluation Panel (IEP) as a key basis for further development. The main recommendations included strengthening international cooperation, linking research with practice and commercialization of results, greater involvement of students and young researchers, modernization of infrastructure and professionalization of knowledge transfer. Of course, it is necessary to continue in this direction.

Evaluation of the implementation of the recommendations

- **International cooperation:** FME UJEP has slightly expanded its participation in international projects, established new partnerships, and intensified the mobility of students and staff. An increase can also be seen in participation in professional networks, but long-term maintenance and consolidation of the position abroad remains a challenge (the need to obtain projects, e.g. Horizon Europe, participation in prestigious consortia, etc.).

- **Transfer of results into practice and cooperation with industry:** The number of patents, utility models, the volume of contract research and the involvement of industrial partners (Science and Technology Park) increased. The results are being commercialized (e.g. the sale of a patent for the production of tire molds), but broader system support (spin-offs, systematization of license sales) is still at an early stage and will need to be worked on.

- **Student involvement:** FME has expanded student grant competitions and student participation in key applied projects, but the level of involvement across disciplines is still insufficient.

- **Modernisation of infrastructure:** Investments in laboratories and research facilities have fundamentally improved the conditions for research and its applications.

- **Popularization and cooperation with the region:** FME actively communicates the results to the public, pupils and industry (science days, popularization lectures, career days).

The faculty has accepted most of the recommendations and is implementing them effectively, the overall shift is evident, yet the key areas (especially commercialization, inter-faculty and international ties, strategic work with industry, knowledge transfer) are still subject to further development.

Recommendations:

- Strengthening and professionalization of international activities, especially in the field of project management for European grants.
- Active development of long-term partnerships with key industry players – comprehensive training offerings, joint research and innovation.
- To increase motivation and support for young researchers and students to participate in strategic research projects and publish in prestigious foreign journals.
- Continue to invest in infrastructure and people, with an emphasis on profiling FME as a regional leader for sustainable and applied research.
- Strengthening the use of university services in the field of knowledge transfer

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	**4 - Very good**
3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society	**4 - Very good**
3.5 Transfer of results into practice	**4 - Very good**
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	**4 - Very good**
Average rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**
Grade [A–D]:	**B**

Summary assessment:

The Faculty of Mechanical Engineering represents a modern and progressive academic unit with a clearly defined strategic direction in the field of education, research and technology transfer. Its strongest point is its close connection with the industrial sphere of the region and the application focus of research. A significant benefit is the broad cooperation with industrial partners – faculty graduates have zero unemployment, participate in solving current industrial challenges, and the number of applied projects and outputs has a direct impact on practice and the regional economy. Research in the field of materials engineering and energy is in line with the long-term strategies of the republic and sustainability goals, which increases the importance of the faculty in a broader context.

The development of knowledge transfer thanks to the Science and Technology Park and the involvement of the Faculty Industrial Council, as well as interdisciplinary cooperation within the university, can be considered strengths. FME is very active in the field of popularization, effectively communicating with the public and secondary schools. The systematic involvement of doctoral students, support for young researchers and the growing participation of women in research teams can also be appreciated.

On the other hand, the weaker point of the faculty remains the lower level of internationalization – whether in the form of foreign research projects, cooperation or student and employee exchanges. Participation in highly competitive EU grant programs or expansion of publishing activities in recognized foreign journals is essential for further growth. Another development point is the strengthening of the strategy for more effective transfer of knowledge into practice in any form and the creation of a commercialization strategy in coordination with workplaces at the level of the Rector's Office.

The faculty is a distinctive regional leader with the potential to become an even more important player in the national and international research space.

Summary recommendations:

- Systematically strengthen internationalisation, including support for participation in European research programmes (Horizon Europe, etc.), establish strategic partnerships and increase the mobility of staff and students.
- Intensify publishing activities in prestigious international journals and motivate employees to win prestigious awards.
- To develop a commercialization strategy in coordination with workplaces at the level of the Rector's Office.
- To create a specialized position to support technology transfer, intellectual property protection and the development of spin-off companies.
- Continue efforts to link research, teaching and practice, including strengthening interdisciplinary collaboration and fostering talent.

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Science UJEP

FORD: 1 - Natural sciences

SOCIAL CONTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATED UNIT

3.1 Introductory information about the unit under evaluation

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

Commentary:

The Faculty of Science at Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem, established in 2005, is the only Faculty of Science in the Ústí nad Labem region. The faculty aims to establish itself as a regional leader in research excellence and high-quality education in the fields of natural sciences, nanotechnology, computer science, and mathematics. Its main mission is to prepare qualified professional and educators (for primary and secondary schools) and to contribute to scientific progress through innovative and impactful research. The faculty is dedicated to fostering academic and industrial partnerships, with a particular focus on serving regional needs while strengthening its international profile. The faculty also actively fulfils its third mission, promoting the popularization of science and making scientific knowledge accessible to the wider public.

The Faculty of Science envisions itself as a dynamic, open, and academically driven institution, recognized for excellence in research and education. It aims to strengthen regional and international partnerships, maintain high academic standards, and offer attractive programs in natural sciences, nanotechnology, computer science, and mathematics. With a focus on student development and ties to industry and the public sector, the faculty aspires to continuous growth and to solidify its position as a centre of excellence. As part of this strategy, the Faculty of Science participates in the Centre for Nanomaterials and Biotechnology (CENAB), a member of the large research infrastructure NanoEnviCz, which integrates the research facilities of Czech institutions. The Faculty of Science has long-lasting cooperation with other academic institutions, such as Czech Academy of Science, both for research and didactic activity.

The research activity revolves around four clearly identified priority areas of basic/applied research: i) new nanomaterials and biotechnologies for applications in biomedicine, environmental protection, and surface modifications; ii) theoretical frameworks for analysing physicochemical phenomena, technological processes, and novel materials in general; ii) environmental risk and land-use analysis, ecosystem services, policy evaluation, governance, cross-border cooperation, and geoinformatics for territorial planning; iv) data analysis in medicine using advanced IT methods and tools.

The Faculty of Science consists of six independent departments and two research centres and counts more than 160 academic, research, and other staff who participate in teaching, scientific activities, supervising students, and faculty administration. The faculty offers a wide number of degree programs at all academic levels -bachelor (12), master (13), and doctoral (6), covering all three levels

of study in several academic disciplines. At the time of the evaluation, approximately 1200 students were enrolled.

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:[7]

During the evaluation period, several members received awards for their innovative research, contributions to education, and efforts in science communication. Notably, a young staff member under the age of 35 was recognized for outstanding research achievements by the UJEP Rector. All awards were granted by national institutions or organizations; no international prizes were awarded.

The Faculty of Science has representatives on the editorial boards of international scientific journals, although these are generally medium-ranked. Additionally, some faculty members have been invited to deliver lectures at universities and conferences abroad (*e.g.,* The British Academy of London, Technical University Dresden, Cambridge Biomedical Campus), reflecting a degree of international recognition. At the same time, the faculty hosted lectures by visiting foreign scientists, fostering international academic exchange and collaboration.

Faculty members are involved in the evaluation of national and European research projects, with some cases reflecting a long-term commitment (*e.g.*, prof. I. Nezbeda and prof. P. Raška). These evaluation activities are primarily carried out through participation in the panels of grant agencies in the Czech Republic (Research, Development and Innovation Council; the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports; the Technology Agency of the Czech Republic; the Czech Science Foundation). In contrast, involvement in the evaluation of international and European research projects appears to be more limited and restricted to a few specific members.

The faculty has strong potential to further enhance its international reputation if this goal is actively pursued.

Recommendations:

Overall, it would be strategic for the faculty to further enhance its international reputation. Reinforcing this aspect would also benefit research activities (see also Section 3.3) by creating new opportunities for participation in international projects, involvement in cross-border collaborative networks, as well as increase the visibility of the diverse set of state-of-the art facilities available for research at the faculty. Alongside with existing institutional tools for promoting internationalization, the faculty could adopt more targeted measures, such as:

- establish a motivational scheme to encourage publications with international co-authors
- encourage student exchanges at the bachelor and master levels with foreign universities for internships and thesis work
- enrich the offering of courses in English and establish joint degree programs
- support short-term research periods for doctoral students

[7] 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.

- expand the participation of staff in international associations, scientific boards, clusters, commissions
- leverage the 'Global Expert' initiative to bring expertise in international funding, strengthen internal networking within the faculty, and enhance the faculty visibility abroad.

RESEARCH PROJECTS

3.3 Research projects

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

Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

In the period of evaluation, the Faculty of Science has been involved in a significant number of research projects, that show high application potentials. Two research outcomes are already protected by patents (*i.e.*, methodology for the production of self-supporting shape-flexible nanofibrous membranes – Patent CZ 310285; hydrogen sensor based on plasmon-active fibers – Patent CZ 308875). A methodology developed for supporting teachers in mathemathics has been certified (TL020002000) and other research otcomes are already in use (*e.g.*, TL02000114).

The projects cover all the key thematic areas of the faculty, such as nanomaterials, materials science, natural sciences, environmental studies, and education, with an emphasis on sustainability. The specific topics reflect the latest advancements in their respective fields. The projects are relevant and were well developed. These are collaborative projects, carried out in partnership with other institutions and industrial partners - although for a few projects, this was difficult to verify. In most instances, the Faculty of Science acts as a partner (primarily) or as a beneficiary.

The primary sources of funding for research projects come from national agencies, including the Czech Science Foundation, the Technology Agency of the Czech Republic, the Ministry of Health, and the Ministry of Education. This reflects the faculty strong ability to attract competitive funding and suggests a good success rate in securing research grants during time. Numerous research contracts are also reported for the evaluation period, highlighting the faculty reliability and credibility with industrial and public partners. Contracts are signed either with national or multination companies (examples include ADLER Czech, a.s., ORLEN UniCRE, Inc., Insion Ltd., ŠKODA AUTO Inc., Severočeské doly, Inc.) or public bodies (e.g., Agency for nature and landscape protection of the Czech Republic).

The projects are well aligned with the mission and vision of the faculty, which strives for excellence in research and education, as well as for a strong reputation both at regional and international level. Many of the research projects adopt a highly interdisciplinary approach, often integrating three or more distinct disciplines—an aspect that adds significant value. Moreover, other faculties within UJEP participated in most of the projects, demonstrating a strong ability to collaborate and form inter- and trans-disciplinary teams.

Considering the faculty's R&D&I capabilities, there is considerable potential to continue and further advance this positive trajectory to ensure long-term support for research activities and personnel.

Recommendations:

- Strengthening internationalization and involvement in international projects
  - Expand participation in European or other grant schemes (e.g. Horizon Europe, INTERREG, COST, MSCA) in a targeted manner
  - Increase the international engagement of research teams
  - Conduct a critical assessment to identify the main barriers to participating in international funding schemes (such as, for instance, limited awareness of funding opportunities, insufficient institutional support, or a lack of networking contacts) and develop appropriate solutions to address them.
- Strengthening strategic (international) partnerships with industry, other academic institutions and public sector to foster the development of joint research projects to reverse the apparently declining (at least considering the years under this evaluation) trend in research contract volume.

3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society

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

Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

In its self-evaluation document, the Faculty of Science highlights a substantial number of research outcomes with direct impact on both industry and society. This high level of knowledge application is attributed to strong collaborations with industry, local policy-makers and schools, active engagement in contract research, and well-established interdisciplinary research.

These research outcomes are diverse and include patents, hardware and software solutions, predictive models for regional development, educational tools, certified methodology for teachers, and documents utilized by local policy-makers. They cover a wide range of scientific fields, reflecting the full scope of the faculty activities. These efforts are also well aligned with the faculty mission.

The faculty also actively considers the gender dimension in its projects. Owing to its overall balanced gender composition, it is claimed that most project teams include both women and men and are assembled based on expertise and available capacity. This balance enhances diversity of perspectives and research approaches at the Faculty of Science.

The impact of the research on society is further supported by a record of publications in high-quality and well-recognized journals.

The research outcomes with direct or potential impact on society are consistent with the research activities conducted at the Faculty of Science.

Recommendations:

Overall, the Faculty of Science is performing very well. The following recommendations aim to further consolidate the impact of its research outcomes and increase the faculty visibility.

Continuing in seeking collaboration with industrial and public sector partners at both regional and national levels would be an asset. At the same time, expanding participation in international

collaborative projects would also help amplify the reach and influence of the faculty research and activity on a national/internationale scale and society.

The use of communication strategy - through clear, targeted outreach - could be a mean to raise the faculty visibility among stakeholders, funding bodies, and the wider public, further solidifying its role as a key contributor to scientific and societal advancement.

TRANSFER OF RESULTS INTO PRACTICE

3.5 Transfer of results into practice

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

Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

The Faculty of Science has established a comprehensive system for translating research results into practical applications, leveraging collaboration with national and international industrial partners (*e.g.*, companies in nanotechnology, chemistry or pharmaceutical sector, as well as IT and technology companies), and public bodies (*e.g.*, Regional Authority of the Ustí Region, secondary and primary schools). This process is facilitated through mechanisms such as contracted research, partnerships with companies and institutions, direct student involvement in applied projects. Furthermore, the faculty is involved in technology platforms (*e.g.*, the Czech Membrane Platform, the Association of Nanotechnology Industry) and provides professional consulting and advisory services to external stakeholders.

A key strength of the faculty is that successful knowledge transfer examples encompass all its main scientific domains, including nanomaterials, applied computer science, natural and educational sciences.

New users are reached through professional conferences, technology fairs, networking within professional platforms, grant schemes, student internships, and outreach events.

Commercialization of research results is primarily implemented through contracted research, licensing agreements, and educational and outreach services. Notably, between 2019 and 2023, the faculty secured roughly €60.000 from the sale of licenses for the developed EDUBO teaching suite, demonstrating its capacity to generate revenue from innovation.

Two potential spin-off initiatives - in the field of biotechnology and health care - are currently under assessment, reflecting promising opportunities for expanding the faculty impact on society.

The faculty is expected to gain significant advantages in future from the newly established Centre for Technology and Knowledge Transfer (CTTZ) at UJEP, particularly in the areas of administrative, legal, and management support to the faculty staff.

Overall, the knowledge transfer system at the Faculty of Science appears well-structured and proactive, combining multiple channels to ensure research outputs are effectively applied in real-world contexts. It is fully consistent with the mission and vision of the faculty.

Recommendations:

- Further strengthen collaboration with industrial partners, public agencies, and academic institutions to increase the volume of contractual research and transferred technologies and extend their impact internationally
- Aim at establishing long-term, sustainable partnerships
- Implement systematic monitoring and evaluation of the efficiency of the knowledge transfer processes, focusing on key indicators.

POPULARIZATION OF VAVAI

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

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

Rating [1–5]:	**5 - Outstanding**

Qualitative assessment:

The Faculty of Science demonstrates an organized and diversified approach to science popularization and public engagement. Its activities during 2019–2023 were not only aimed at presenting research outcomes but also at sparking interest among young people, future students, and the wider public.

The faculty participates regularly in major national events such as the Science Fair and Researchers' Night, both of which are key platforms for connecting academia with students, families, and industry representatives. In addition, it organizes or contributes to a wide range of specialized initiatives such as Festival for Science and Art, Biology Day, Hackathon, Spring Herb Recognition, Geography Days, Fest Up, and Technohraní.

The use of social media, podcasts, and YouTube demonstrates an understanding of modern communication channels and their ability to reach different audiences in a targeted manner.

The "Faculty School" initiative and the organization of summer schools show strong commitment to cultivate young talent and building long-term interest in STEM disciplines. Such targeted cooperation with primary and secondary schools is particularly valuable in creating early engagement and a pipeline of motivated students.

Thematic exhibitions, excursions, and expert lectures offer practical, accessible ways for the public to connect with science. Additionally, collaborations with industry and non-profit sectors, coupled with events like the Innovation Exchange and NANODAY, underline the faculty success in linking applied research with societal and economic benefits.

A notable achievement is the establishment of the AI Reactor platform, which connects science, education, and modern AI technologies. It serves as both a research and educational hub, offering workshops, projects, and support for teachers to integrate AI into education. This initiative not only fosters innovation within research and teaching but also contributes to the development of digital skills in the region.

Overall, the Faculty of Science is highly active in science popularization. It effectively combines large-scale events, specialized activities, and modern technologies to make science accessible, engaging, and socially relevant.

Recommendations:

- Systematic evaluation of the reach, effectiveness, and long-term impact of popularization and outreach initiatives. Metrics such as participation numbers, feedback collection, or follow-up engagement would allow the faculty to measure effectiveness and guide improvements.
- Leverage international partnerships to broaden visibility and influence beyond the regional and national context.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module 3

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

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

Rating [1–5]:	**5 - Outstanding**

Qualitative assessment:

The self-evaluation report suggests that the Faculty of Science has taken a structured approach in responding to all the recommendations of the previous International Evaluation Panel. In particular:

- **Increase the volume of contractual research, diversify funding and improve resource management:** measures have been taken to diversify funding sources, and improvements in project and resource management. The development of the MATECH center is a valuable initiative, with the potential, if financed, to significantly enhance regional cooperation and applied research output. The reduction of contractual research fragmentation and better integration of instrumentation planning and maintenance into funding models also indicate a thoughtful approach to long-term sustainability.

- **Collaboration with economists:** the faculty has made several actions to respond to the recommendation of integrating economic perspectives into its research activities. As an example, the promotion of multidisciplinary collaboration -through grant schemes and contractual research- demonstrates commitment to integrate economic, social, and scientific considerations into research planning.

- **Support to early-career researchers**: the faculty has implemented a range of measures to support early-career researchers. These include the introduction of a motivational system to reward research achievements, the establishment of the Dean's Prizes to promote student recognition and engagement, and dedicated grant programs. Opportunities for international mobility further enhance professional development and international experience.

- **Activities on public education and science popularization, while supporting students engaged in regional initiatives**: the efforts concerning public outreach are impressive, and they have already been evaluated as extremely positive in Section 3.6. There were also initiatives to involve students both in professional internships and in teaching and educational activities. The targeted support for student engagement, including municipal scholarships, further highlights a thoughtful and inclusive approach.

Recommendations:

The recommendations have been effectively addressed, and there is no need for additional measures here, other than to continue building on this positive trajectory.

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	**4 - Very good**
3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society	**4 - Very good**
3.5 Transfer of results into practice	**4 - Very good**
3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public	**5 - Outstanding**
3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module	**5 - Outstanding**
Average rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**
Grade [A–D]:	Choose an item.

Summary assessment:

The Faculty of Science presents itself as a modern academic environment. Housed in new buildings equipped with state-of-the-art laboratories and facilities, it offers a welcoming atmosphere for both students and staff. The faculty is rooted in the regional context, actively engaging with the local community through science popularization activities and knowledge transfer initiatives.

Its educational offer is broad and diverse, spanning bachelor, master, and doctoral levels, with PhD programs also available in English - an important step towards increased internationalization. A distinctive feature lies in the faculty commitment to support early-career researchers and students. Targeted measures, such as the Directive of the Dean No.1/2023, are in place to stimulate and recognize excellent academic performance, to reward participation in projects and encourage professional growth.

An important asset of the faculty is the availability of modern equipment and laboratories for both research and teaching. These facilities are newly established and equipped with cutting-edge instruments. Recently, the faculty diverse expertise has been consolidated under the umbrella of the CENAB Centre, an interdisciplinary research platform that fosters collaboration with both domestic and international research institutions, as well as with industrial partners.

The staff have shown consistent success in obtaining research funding from nationally competitive calls. The faculty also demonstrates a commendable focus on gender balance.

The area of internationalization remains a key domain for further development. To advance in this regard, the faculty needs to work on its engagement in international academic and professional networks. Such efforts would facilitate greater participation in international projects, which are essential for the faculty continued growth and visibility. Expanding the number of courses offered in English and increasing the mobility of academic staff would further support these objectives. Lastly, the faculty could benefit from a more strategic approach to long-term contractual research.

Summary recommendations:

- Systematically strengthen internationalisation efforts and establish strategic partnerships, while monitoring whether these efforts lead to greater international visibility and participation in high-profile EU or global funding schemes and research contracts
- Develop and implement a targeted strategy to grow contractual research, aiming for long-term partnerships
- Encourage greater involvement of staff in international associations, scientific boards, clusters, commissions
- Stimulate the international mobility of staff and students at all levels
- Enrich the portfolio of courses offered in English and establish joint/double degree programs
- Leverage the establishment of the CENAB centre to foster new international scientific collaborations, enhance institutional reputation, and increase global visibility
- Continue supporting students, early-career researchers, and staff in their pursuit of research excellence, professional development, and scientific recognition.

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Social and Economic Studies

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 sees its mission as contributing to improving the competitiveness and quality of life of the region. To some extent this is reflected in educational programmes and research directions that are broadly locally-oriented. Contributing to the competitiveness of the regions also means developing a successful and reasonably prestigious university, producing graduates who may also work elsewhere, as many from this faculty do, and conducting research with wider significance. There is no necessary tension between these two possible research directions, with the more local research focus providing potential for applications of more global significance. There are substantial contacts with local businesses and organisations, in line with the faculty's mission, and also some involvement in international research networks.

Over the evaluation period there has been significant progress in the desired direction, without radically transforming the nature of the faculty. The total number of academic staff is broadly stable, including representation for younger age groups, indicating an ability to recruit a base for future development. The gender balance continues to follow the traditional pattern with male dominance in academic jobs, not obviously improving in lower age groups and more pronounced than among the under-graduate population, alongside more equality (at least in total numbers) among technical and economic staff. Representation of non-Czech citizens remains low, although there is some teaching in English and the start to doctoral programmes in English – two running by 2023. The number of doctoral students remains roughly constant, albeit with low numbers successfully completing their programmes every year. Research priorities include areas of long standing and directions, or additions to existing directions, reflecting the ability to recruit new staff members who are often able, and encouraged, to use the freedom allowed in a relatively new institution to develop their own areas of interest. The atmosphere has been shifting towards a greater encouragement of the view that involvement in some form of research activity should be a natural part of an academic career. That applies across the diverse subject areas covered by the faculty and is an important resource for the future. The picture is of a faculty making progress towards a greater orientation towards research and putting in place changes to take this further. The evaluation of individual areas, covered below, should therefore take account of the direction of travel as well as the level reached by 2023.

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:[8] The tables, and also accompanying faculty annual reports, point to some level of identifiable recognition for about a third of academic staff. This includes quite prestigious international recognition for some individuals, such as awards and leading positions in very large international projects, and also recognition for many more within the university and Czechia. Three particular significant items indicating prestige are, first, the coordination of a COST project (2019-2022), followed by participation in two more large EU-funded projects. These indicate the international prestige of the faculty, made possible by the work of the coordinator, the administrative back-up provided and the ability to coordinate both across countries and institutions and with others within UJEP. Prestige is also confirmed by the ability to attract lectures from outside by internationally prominent figures, as listed, and by the arrangement of some long-term stays from abroad. A striking feature is that these stays were used very productively as they were linked to successful collaboration in grant proposals and publications, as indicated below in discussion of the particular projects. There are no grounds here for recommending any major changes in direction. The faculty has made progress and should continue to develop what is proving successful. Rising prestige has been dependent on the recruitment of capable people who are often attracted by the scope to develop new research areas. Establishing research areas has in turn encouraged others to come, including promising people at an earlier career stage. Funding is obviously limited for trips abroad and for inviting foreign visitors.	
Recommendations: The main recommendation must be to continue supporting research areas that have been successful while also enabling newer areas to develop. There should be an on-going assessment of how limited funding for international contacts can best be used, in so far as choices are possible. There may be choices between more shorter or fewer longer stays, to bring in visiting speakers or to concentrate on people who will stay for some time, to encourage researchers to spend time abroad for longer of for shorter periods. One week visits may be useful for experienced researchers developing a research project, but inadequate for a younger researcher developing a research area.	

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

RESEARCH PROJECTS

3.3 Research projects	
Evaluate the most important research projects of the evaluated unit, especially regarding the results achieved and the application potential of the project, the proportionality with respect to the R&D&I capacities of the evaluated unit, the degree of interdisciplinarity and collaboration with other parts of the evaluated HEI, and the consistency with the declared mission and vision of the evaluated unit. Use the data from the full list of research projects and contract research activities in Tables 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 to supplement the evaluation.	
Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**
Qualitative assessment: A number of research projects are important, albeit with rather different kinds of results achieved and rather different potential for development. A number are clearly providing a service to the geographical area, such as one on the reasons for large numbers of younger people choosing to leave the area. Among the most prestigious is the COST project LAND4FLOOD which has led into participation in further EU-funded projects. In terms of the mission, it should be noted that the theme is relevant at the regional level, but also much more widely, as reflected in the broad international participation. The key factors in developing this research included the arrival some years earlier of new, experienced staff, plus the support from within the faculty and university and the potential for collaboration across faculties. For publicly-funded research there are a significant number of projects, with a fairly steady number over time and several producing published results. The larger sums of money come with EU funding, but the significant number of smaller, internally-funded projects demonstrate the diversity of participation in some level of research activity. It is not clear how many members of permanent academic staff are involved. Contract research income was strongly biased in 2019 by one particular project which in fact involved routine work with a low level of scientific input from the faculty. Apart from that, contract research appears to be a minor activity although, as explained in the context of one such project, publishing results may be impossible as they remain the property of the company for which the work was done.	
Recommendations: The projects undertaken reflect the faculty's priorities and suggest an ability to involve different staff in research projects of some level of complexity. A big task for the future is to continue the success of the best existing research areas while encouraging more of the academic staff to become involved either in existing areas or to develop new ones. This requires incentives, support and encouragement, taking full advantage of on-going changes in university policies. There is proven scope for collaboration across faculties and this should be developed as far as possible.	

3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society	
Evaluate the research results already applied in practice or intended to be applied in practice. When evaluating, consider whether the results are proportionate to the R&D&I capacities of the evaluated unit, how they contribute to the fulfilment of the mission and vision of the evaluated unit and, if stated in the self-evaluation, how the results take into account the gender dimension and sustainability. Use the data from the full results summary in Table 3.4.1 to supplement the evaluation.	
Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**
Qualitative assessment: Much of the research is closely linked to its practical application, as necessitated by its origins and methods of funding. The report provides details on four projects that are aimed at more general applicability and rely on a more substantial base in research and evaluation of international experience. There are other projects with potential for practical application, but they are considered in response to some of the other questions. The project WATER in the CITY led to a book that could be used by practitioners (it was written in a very accessible form) summarising results from other research and from some original research. Survey evidence from downloads showed that the material was used by engineers and teachers and has continued beyond the period covered by this evaluation. This can be judged an outstanding example of a practical application of research results. Two other projects also used a solid base in academic research to develop guidelines for practitioners and translation into English could enhance prospects for application, but the extent of their use is not documented. The fourth project covered relates to psychological issues during space flights, with the possible future application in planning a mission to Mars. It has attracted media attention and also international attention, but it has yet to achieve a full application in practice.	
Recommendations: The projects covered under this heading are ones directly targeting practitioners. Methods of propagating and assessing results of research aimed at practitioners have been developed at least in the Water in the City project and could be applied more widely across other projects.	

TRANSFER OF RESULTS INTO PRACTICE

3.5 Transfer of results into practice	
Evaluate the effectiveness of the transfer of results into practice by the unit being evaluated. Pay attention to whether the composition of the stated users of the results or the way the R&D&I results are commercialised (if stated) is consistent with the R&D&I results produced and the mission and vision of the evaluated unit and how successful the evaluated unit is in its activities, such as attracting new users of the results, commercialising the R&D&I results and obtaining funding from non-public, non-grant sources.	
Rating [1–5]:	**3 - Average**
Qualitative assessment: A considerable amount of the research undertaken has been specifically contracted by a potential user and transfer into practice could be assumed to have successfully taken place. Different questions relate to transferring into, or adapting for, practice the results of research starting from within the faculty or jointly with its partners. As pointed out, direct commercialisation is often neither appropriate nor possible in the faculty's subject areas. To fulfil its mission of	

improving the competitiveness and quality of life of the region, propagating and making available as widely as possible the scope for application of research results is often the appropriate way to proceed, as with the water project. However, that has been helped by seeking funding from donations and, where appropriate, crowd funding. Another method mentioned is to hope for help from the university level through the Centre for Technology and Knowledge Transfer, although that may prove more beneficial for research areas covered by other faculties.
Recommendations: For specifically contracted research consideration should be given of using results as a basis for expansion into more substantial academic research projects, or into practical help to other clients. Income from transfer of knowledge from more academic research projects is notoriously difficult in the subject areas covered here. This should nevertheless be considered, alongside popularisation and communication with the public.

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: Popularisation takes a number of different forms and links to the faculty's research efforts in different ways. A considerable effort is put into popularisation of research in general through events organised to involve the public. Mass-media commentaries and social media posts are also used to popularise more specific results of research. There are also commentaries on recent events which do not necessarily relate directly to specific research results but are clearly linked by broad subject area and clearly reflect and benefit from prestige gained from research activities. There are also articles in expert journals, presenting the results of research in Czech in non-academic language. For those projects with clear practical application, there have been a number of active efforts to disseminate thinking to the appropriate practitioners, including public talks, stakeholder meetings and workshops. For at least some projects the data provided suggests considerable success in reaching the appropriate audience. There is experience with different kinds of popularisation. Events for a wider public are a positive part of fulfilment of the faculty's mission. Means of propagating specifically the faculty's own research have been developed for some projects.	
Recommendations: Ideally, researchers should be encouraged to regard popularisation (or in some cases possibly commercialisation) as an integral part of the research process. For this there should be faculty and university support.	

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module 3	
Evaluate how the evaluated unit has reflected the recommendations from the previous evaluation of the IEP, if applicable. If the evaluated unit has not been evaluated before, the indicator will be marked as N/A – Not Applicable.	
Rating [1–5]:	**5 - Outstanding**
Qualitative assessment: The self-evaluation report suggests that recommendations were all taken seriously and changes have overwhelmingly been close to what was recommended. It would appear likely that recommendations were helpful in supporting directions that were being considered and in encouraging a search for solutions for problems that were identified. It is too early to see full results from changes that have been made.	
Recommendations: As the recommendations were taken on board, there seems no need to add anything under this specific heading.	

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	**4 - Very good**
3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society	**4 - Very good**
3.5 Transfer of results into practice	**3 - Average**
3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public	**4 - Very good**
3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module	**5 - Outstanding**
Average rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**
Grade [A–D]:	**B**
Summary assessment: The faculty has been moving from a very low level of research to a level that, while not high and not involving the majority of academic staff, provides potential for further development. There are some prestigious projects and well-known individuals alongside a significant number with some recognition and some involvement in research. There have been serious efforts to expand international contacts and two doctoral study programmes in English recorded from 2021. Changes at the university level in support to research and incentives to those taking part in research were too new to show clear results in the review period, but can be expected to be beneficial. It clearly remains difficult to expand lengthy visits from abroad and periods abroad for members of the faculty, but where this has been possible there have been positive results. The picture is of a faculty that is developing and innovating with every prospect of further improvement.	

Summary recommendations: The broad direction being taken seems to be bringing improvements. The message should therefore be to build from the direction taken so far. The faculty should take full advantage of incentive and funding opportunities developed within the university. Advantage should be taken of the relative newness of the institution – without strongly entrenched research agendas that discourage incomers – to welcome new research areas, to make the environment attractive to incoming researchers and visitors. Full advantage should be taken of opportunities for cooperation across faculties.

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 Education	**B**
Faculty of Arts	**B**
Faculty of Art and Design	**B**
Faculty of Social and Economic Studies	**B**
Faculty of Sciences	**B**
Faculty of Environment	**B**
Faculty of Mechanical Engineering	**B**
Faculty of Health Studies	**B**
Summary grade	**B**

Summary quality assessment: Evaluation reports for individual faculties point to very similar trends, strengths and weaknesses, albeit with some differences and exceptions. The ratings are consistently 'very good', reflecting an improvement from the last evaluation. Faculties show considerable interest in finding improvements which are often in line with the recommendations from the last evaluation. Faculties have benefited from the construction of new facilities, from their own initiatives and from the application of new initiatives at the university level aimed at enabling and motivating active researchers. They have built from their base within a regional university with some outside contacts towards a more proactive engagement in international research activities. This has been helped by the employment of established researchers from outside. At the same time, there are weaknesses in several faculties in the continued limitations in their international reputations, and the reputations of their members, and in the more frequent appearance as a partner than as the lead in prestigious international projects. By no means all of the academic staff are involved in research, albeit with differences in levels of involvement between faculties, and a significant number reportedly show limited interest in international contacts and travel, without which research is difficult to develop.

Another frequent area of strength is in popularisation and contacts with the community, especially within the region, and with organisations and businesses. This too has seen recent development and improvement, but there are weaknesses in the dissemination and publicising of faculties' own research. There has been commercialisation of some research results, but there may be more scope for systematic publicization and also for exploitation of results through patents and other forms of collaboration.

Summary recommendation: Recommendations are largely to continue with the current direction of development. A number of recent initiatives – incentive schemes, the initiation of a centre for transfer of research results, emphasis on research in individual career assessments, means to

encourage visits and stays by foreign experts, scope to raise complaints through an ombudsperson – have brought some positive results and may bring more, but in many cases changes are too recent to justify firm conclusions. Central recommendations are therefore to continue to seek means to increase research activity, to recrute established researchers, to encourage and enable activity from younger researchers and to raise the univerity's research profile while continually monitoring the effects of changes that have been implemented.

EVALUATION REPORT FOR MODULES 4 & 5

HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION NAME: Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem

COMPANY REGISTRATION NUMBER (CRN): 44555601

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.	
thin Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:[1]

The structure as described is similar to that for other similarly-sized universities. There are possible questions about the number of faculties and overlap between them, about their autonomy in relation to the central authority, about the roles of centres and clusters within them, and about specific centres with a university-wide function.

Faculties should group together activities that can be assessed with similar evaluation criteria while not being so large or diverse as to make internal administration difficult and to mask both good and bad performance within an averaging for the faculty as a whole. There should also not be too much overlap and competition with other faculties. These criteria appear to be fulfilled, albeit with some inevitable overlap, such as between Natural Sciences and the Environment.

Faculties have appropriate autonomy in relation to the centre, but there are questions about how far university initiatives and developments are adhered to, fully exploited, or always known about at faculty level. There are differences between faculty practices that are not easy to explain in terms of normal differences between subject areas. An example is the balance between teaching and research expected of staff.

Scope for creating centres for specific research activities, which can span faculty boundaries, should be judged very positively. They can be beneficial both internally – bringing researchers together and facilitating collaboration – and externally in giving a higher profile to areas of research. Similarly, the promotion of clusters has clear benefits. This should not be a mandatory imposition such as to rule out areas of individual research.

A specific role is to be played by the CTTZ (the Centre for Technology and Knowledge Transfer) which is given a substantial role in transferring research results into practice. Questions here concern its small size (one staff member up to now, albeit set to expand in the near future) and the diversity of its roles spanning establishing contacts and giving advice on intellectual property protection. This follows similar organisations formed in other universities. At the same time, experience in UJEP 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.

elsewhere confirms the central role of researchers in establishing contacts, while different expertise may be needed in other areas, such as patents and protection of their benefits.

Recommendations:

The directions being taken appear to be the right ones. The university could give consideration to;

- how all faculties are made aware of the potential benefits from central decisions and how those decisions are implemented,

- how the CTTZ can best fulfil its role, using experience from other universities and coordinating with similar bodies there both on collaboration with commercial actors and on development of its own role,

- whether the CTTZ should have a more specific role in relation to intellectual property protection, an area where there should be potential for substantial development and which requires considerable expertise.

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]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

This response covers a large number of points. The university was asked to provide data to provide evidence of effectiveness, but this is rarely done. The obvious justification is that so much is being developed and/or changed and it is still too early to identify successes in terms of clear research outcomes. We therefore have to judge measures being implemented in terms of how far they respond to past weaknesses, how far they reflect good practice elsewhere, and the coherence and consistency with which they are being implemented. An obvious requirement is that all new structures should be assessed and kept under review to see how far they are proving helpful.

There is a danger of creating too many new bodies without clarity over how they may overlap with other new, or existing, bodies. There are questions over the role of the centre in relation to autonomy for faculties, as referred to above.

A number of initiatives must be judged very positively. The newly-created systems of incentives, it can be hoped, will have a positive effect, although that will require future monitoring. The doctoral academy is in line with good international practice and the reasoning behind it and its role seems appropriate. It is very valuable for doctoral students to be aware of more kinds of research method than just what they are using at the time.

Three points of possible controversy are;

1. They refer to a ‘cluster’ concept for research and it obviously makes sense to bring people together with similar research interests, both in the interests of good research and to raise an

internal and external profile. It is good to see the idea of 'global experts' linked to encouraging the development of groups around research projects. At the same time, this should not exclude research of high quality by researchers who are working alone, or to discourage recruitment of high-quality researchers active in areas that are new to the university, although in both cases collaboration with others and development of new clusters can be facilitated. There is a line to be walked here for the development of the university's research activity.

2. They refer to having no concept for the emergence of new research areas. This is accurate in the formal sense, but it is clear that new areas have emerged. Typically, this has depended on initiatives from individuals that have then been encouraged. These are largely newly-arriving academics, at differing stages in their careers, some already with established reputations. In more than one faculty, it has been people first, followed by university support. Remaining open to such development in the future would seem essential for future development and success.

3. An issue for developing, and also assessing, research is the extent of differences in practices and criteria across subject areas. To some extent each faculty has its own specificities which make it difficult to use a common standard for evaluation, such as public research funding, success in commercialisation or publications in journals of different perceived levels of prestige. The Faculty of Art and Design seems to deviate the furthest from any such universal standard, although it is clearly involved in creative and popularisation activities that have commercial implications, if not direct financial benefits to the university, and other benefits to the region. As indicated in the Module 3 assessments, we have assessed each subject area within the criteria generally accepted for that subject area, even where there may be some differences between national systems.

Thus, to repeat, there are questions for the future. Our assessment is that recent changes should be judged very positively, with the caveat that effects should be monitored over time. The score reflects the assumption that this will be the case.

Recommendations:

Changes that have been recently undertaken cannot be given a conclusive judgement at this early stage. Our recommendation for all is to keep them under review, to keep learning from practice and results elsewhere and to complete changes being made so that their effectiveness can be assessed more comprehensively in future.

4.3 Quality control system for R&D&I environment

Evaluate the described internal and external evaluation system in terms of its quality, effectiveness and suitability for the HEI.

Rating [1–5]:	**3 - Average**

Qualitative assessment:

A lot is described on the external evaluation system, but there are no explicit examples to show how far it is effective. As in several other areas, new systems are being set up and it is too early to see results. The criteria for evaluation are indicated, but without clarity on how they are to be

weighted. Standard quantitative indicators, such as external research funding and publications in prestigious outlets, often form a large part of such evaluations elsewhere. Including more criteria and allowing flexibility between subject areas is appropriate. It is not clear how results of evaluations will be used. At the moment there is a kind of external evaluation, in the form of the current exercise, and it is not made clear how these new systems will differ from, or overlap with that.

Elements of the internal evaluation system, and their use, are in place and should be judged positively. Again, results in terms of clearly better research remain to be demonstrated. However, there appear to be differences between faculties in how far they use the available instruments.

The establishment of an ombudsperson seems to have had both an impact and to have brought benefits very quickly. It evidently both caters to a need and serves to reveal problems felt by different groups across the university.

Recommendations:

A consistent recommendation where new systems are being introduced is to ensure their effectiveness is monitored and discussed. In these cases, issues could be;

- for external evaluation, how frequently this should be undertaken and what impact it should have on decisions within the university. The apparatus as proposed looks substantial and will require organising. Is this valuable when an external evaluation is already undertaken every 5 years?

- for internal evaluation, the need is to see results in practice and to compare with systems and experiences in other, similar universities.

- for the ombudsperson, results suggest a preexisting need. This area of work should be assured of adequate resourcing, including contacts and opportunities to learn from similar initiatives in other universities.

4.4 Sustainability and resilience of R&D&I

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

Rating [1–5]:	**3 - Average**

Qualitative assessment:

This is a large and diverse area, lumping a number of themes under the ‘sustainability’ heading. Within these themes, some can be evaluated very positively, some suggest positive efforts without evidence of outstanding results and some show efforts and initiatives that are too recent for meaningful assessment of outcomes.

Very positive areas come under ‘environmental sustainability’ and ‘social responsibility and inclusion’. The university is good on community involvement and popularisation, albeit often popularising science in general with less reference to the results of its own research initiatives. Commitment to involving the university with the region, using EU funding as support, is clear in the development of a sustainable development strategy and in the orientation of some research projects.

More difficult areas are the transfer of the results of new research and knowledge into practice. Sometimes commercialisation is not the appropriate means (notably in some research focussing on

environmental issues), but it is an issue particularly under 4.4.3 and 4.4.7. Considerable hopes are attached to the CTTZ. Its role is still to be fully clarified, depending on the expansion of staffing beyond the one employee with which it started. The remit of supporting knowledge transfer from research to practice by contacts with companies can, from experience elsewhere, include a number of activities. It will hopefully become clear how the CTTZ cooperates with individual researchers who have developed new knowledge and technologies and who may have contacts with the commercial world.

At the same time, the university may be underperforming in earnings from its 15 active patents and there may be more research which could benefit from patent protection. This is an area in which researchers are often not the best negotiators and support from a body like the CTTZ, if it has expertise, experience and contacts, may bring substantial benefits. Managing IP protection partly at the faculty level and partly at the central level does not seem optimal. Would it not be more effective to concentrate all IP protection activities within the CTTZ now that that centre exists?

The aim of providing some form of training on commercialisation, start-ups and intellectual property protection to staff and students is a positive step. How substantial this training is to be remains unclear and it would be valuable to see some data on the number of participants, the level of satisfaction and whether it has led to any positive results. In general, these activities remain difficult for active researchers with their other commitments. The role of the CTTZ will require further clarification, as will the conduct of these activities in relation to faculties.

The sections dealing with institutional resilience and digitalisation appear in line with practice elsewhere.

Recommendations:

Much of the university's activities covered in this section should be judged positively. The recommendation must be to continue to develop outreach, involvement in the local communities and region and the popularisation of knowledge.

A number of areas are under development and results of initiatives remain to be seen. Key areas of doubts and concerns relate to commercialisation of the results of the university's own research. The initiatives taken represent positive steps, but results are uncertain. These are areas for future monitoring, following the experience of others and continued sensitivity to the different needs of practices of diverse subject areas.

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]:	**3 - Average**

Qualitative assessment:

There has been activity in investigating and auditing the employment structure. It does not appear that much has changed in the age structure, but the employment of foreigners has increased. There does not appear to be an overall strategy but there have been recommendations and initiatives in relation to equal opportunities, recruitment of foreign nationals and career development, as discussed in subsequent sections. The age structure shows a representation across age groups. The number of professors in the oldest age groups warrants comment, as to their role and importance in research which, at least in some cases, appears to be significant.

Recommendations:

The university could consider whether it needs a consistent strategic plan over several years on recruitment, covering age, gender, research lines and teaching excellence.

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's response does not include all the recommended information, such as an anonymised career path or evidence on the effectiveness of systems used. Two important themes here are the career growth rules and the experience of returns.

The first of these shows a substantial commitment to support for career development, but effectiveness appears not to have been monitored. An important open question is the balance between research and other activities in an academic career. It is clear that some staff undertake much more research activity than others, but it is not clear whether this is a planned part of career development. It appears from at least some faculties that a mere teaching path is easy, suggesting no effective strategy or clear rules on the right proportions between research, teaching and other activities. The financial incentives referred to may make a difference, but outcomes so far are unclear.

The second provides some evidence of broadly successful results in practice, without evidence of a systematic approach. The implication in relation to maternity and paternity leave is of an approach based on admirable flexibility in reaching agreements with individuals. This appears not to have led to complaints, and the new ombudsperson system has provided another channel should grievances be felt. It remains a fact that women are underrepresented at all ages. The expected development of a children's group could prove a positive development, although it obviously cannot eliminate all problems of conflict between work and family life.

Recommendations:

There is scope for checking the appropriateness and success of initiatives. The career growth rules suggest a complicated system, but do they lead to more research activity, and among staff at what stage of their careers?

The positive impression for those returning to work is encouraging and suggests a flexible approach from management. It would be useful to have clearer evidence from returners, and from non-returners, that they found systems satisfactory.

4.7 Gender equality measures	
Evaluate the gender equality measures described in self-evaluation. Evaluate the measures in terms of their quality and effectiveness, as well as the potential absence of key measures.	
Rating [1–5]:	**3 - Average**

Qualitative assessment:

This is an area of considerable activity in terms of developing policies and procedures. The table shows little change in the gender bias, which anyway would take time and may depend on external factors, notably the gender of people applying for certain positions. We are given information on gender balance in management positions, but not on all other areas: it is not clear that any consideration is given to nominations to professional bodies which could be indicative of how far all have an equal chance. There may still be some lack of awareness at lower levels of university-level initiatives. It is also noteworthy that the Board of Directors has achieved zero representation of women.

Recommendations:

Continue with gender equality measures and ensure awareness of them in all faculties.

Take steps to enable women's representation on the Board of Directors

4.8 Mobility of academic and research staff (including sectoral and inter-sectoral mobility)	
Evaluate the described mobility of academic and researcher staff. Pay attention to whether the evaluated HEI achieves the set objectives, whether the mobility objectives are appropriately set for the HEI and whether the strategies in place lead to their achievement or help remove existing barriers to mobility.	
Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

International mobility is considered extremely important to the development of research. It is also proving a difficult area with a number of barriers, as also recorded in reports from faculties discussed under Module 3. The university has evidently been involved in a large number of bilateral mobility agreements, but far fewer cases of actual mobility. The proposed concentration on active partners and dropping inactive partners appears sensible. Monitoring has already facilitated the identification of the main barriers, including language abilities, internal financial resources, clashes with teaching duties and lack of recognition of the benefits of mobility within some departments. Perhaps surprisingly, family commitments are not mentioned among identified barriers. Above all, a major barrier appears to be lack of motivation which is evidently difficult to overcome.

Recommendations:

Ensure gender issues and family commitments are fully investigated in monitoring of mobility

Ensure full use is made of EU support mechanisms for mobility.

Ensure travel to, and contacts in, other countries are sufficiently emphasised in career development plans.

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]:	**3 - Average**
Qualitative assessment: The university has recently completed a massive programme of construction and reconstruction, with external resources the dominant means of financing. A specific policy or system for sharing devices and infrastructure in the future has yet to be formulated. However, a basis is being prepared for sharing, particularly from the Faculty of the Environment which has significant overlap in its activities with other faculties. This would be in line with experience of other universities. Much of the information provided by the university under this heading is concerned more with research projects than with instruments and equipment. However, there is evidence of acquiring equipment, and developing facilities, that can have ongoing, and multiple, uses. The unrefined nature of the response suggests scope for more thought from the university in this area.	
Recommendations: For the future, the university will need to formulate a concrete strategy for utilising internal funds to support research facilities and infrastructure and to ensure the long-term sustainability of newly-acquired instruments and laboratory facilities that they have in place.	

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: Information on projects is also given by individual faculties. Examples here confirm again that the university participates in international projects, in some cases with very substantial budgets and in the role of lead institution. This suggests significant development and progress, in line with ambitions to become a significant regional university with wider recognition and impact at least in some areas. Judging against the criterion of what is appropriate for a university of its size, type and recent development, results should be judged very positively. The task for the future is to spread similar development across more of the university.	
Recommendations:	

Experience to date indicates methods that work; attract outside talent where possible; make resources available to develop contacts and to win external funding; include research as a natural part of an academic career structure.

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]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

The system of research evaluation is set out in the university's response, indicating a change in 2025. There can be questions about the division between central and faculty responsibilities. One could expect some concerns over whether all decisions are fair. Appropriateness can only be revealed by practice. The weighting of different elements, such as quality of publications, or the very low weight for an IEP evaluation could be questioned.

The emphasis on clusters is well-established as effective. It obviously should not be interpreted as meaning that no research can exist outside a prescribed cluster.

Central support allows the university to guide faculties towards common institutional goals by adopting shared indicators for fund allocation. Faculty-level support can be used to address specific faculty issues or to advance strategic directions determined at a more peripheral level.

Overall, they have many tools in place, but no examples or data to demonstrate success for these measures or the extent of participation.

Recommendations:

With so much that is new, the next stage should start by evaluating results before further changes are made.

NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

4.12 Significant collaborations in R&D

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

Rating [1–5]:	**4 - Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

We see again projects that we mostly know something about from other university responses. This again confirms the university's ambitions and progress to date. It is able to collaborate with other universities both in the country and outside and to work with other kinds of institution. When set against the past and the type of HEI, the level seems to satisfy the appropriateness criterion. There is a basis for future development. The weakness is the extent to which participation is often not as lead institution, but there are welcome exceptions to this.

Recommendations: The ideal direction for development obviously involves more such collaborative projects and more cases of being the lead institution within them.

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]:	**3 - Average**
Qualitative assessment: This is in line with responses in other areas. A lot of measures have been instituted that can be expected to help, but it is too early to see results Quantitative indicators still show little positive change. The numbers enrolling are much higher than the numbers graduating, suggesting that quite a few are lost along the way. There are possible explanations for this in terms of the financial support relative to incomes elsewhere, the quality of internal support within the university and the quality of doctoral students that are recruited. Assuming that the systems are implemented as outlined, improvements could be hoped for. It is unclear how far this is monitored. There is pressure to develop new doctoral programmes and there is clear progress in that direction. At the same time, consideration could be given to recruiting fewer students if that could be associated with better quality. There is no reporting of an assessment of why so many do not finish. Nor is evidence provided ofhow many did complain and change their supervisor.	
Recommendations: If this is not already done, there should be an annual survey among doctoral students to assess their satisfaction across various areas, such as mentoring, infrastructure, financial support, training activities and care systems.	

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

4.14 Implementation of recommendations in Module 4	
Evaluate how the HEI has reflected the recommendations from the previous evaluation of the IEP, if applicable. If the HEI has not been evaluated before, the indicator will be marked as N/A – Not Applicable.	
Rating [1–5]:	**5 - Outstanding**
Qualitative assessment: Changes made have been in line with recommendations, albeit not following on every point and to the letter. Not everything has been easy, but there is a broad recognition of challenges that coincides with areas of concern in the recommendations. There is therefore no reason for any sort of negative assessment here. A common, and major, concern is the existence of of barriers to foreign travel. The motivation issue looks particularly difficult. There is the same awareness and the same need to investigate, but we heard a lot of moans about the younger generation simply not being interested.	
Recommendations:	

There are no new specific recommendations, beyond the general need to continue developing, to continue learning from others and to continue monitoring results as they become visible.

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	**4 - Very good**
4.2 System of support for a quality R&D&I environment and incentive measures for quality science	**4 - Very good**
4.3 Quality control system for R&D&I environment	**3 - Average**
4.4 Sustainability and resilience of R&D&I	**3 - Average**
4.5 Structure of human resources	**3 - Average**
4.6 Academic and Research Careers	**4 - Very good**
4.7 Gender equality measures	**3 - Average**
4.8 Mobility of academic and research staff (including sectoral and inter-sectoral mobility)	**4 - Very good**
4.9 Research infrastructure	**3 - Average**
4.10 Budget and structure of financial resources	**4 - Very good**
4.11 Rules for the use of institutional support for the LCDRO	**4 - Very good**
4.12 Important collaborations in R&D&I	**4 - Very good**
4.13 Doctoral studies	**3 - Average**
4.14 Implementation of recommendations in Module 4	**5 - Outstanding**
AVERAGE RATING	**4 - Very good**
GRADE [A–D]	**B**
Summary assessment: They are doing a lot. Much of it is accompanied by investigations of causes of problems. Worries would be that new initiatives, new structures and new policies are being agreed from the centre, but faculties are not always responding in the same ways and, in some cases, may not even know about all the new initiatives and systems. From an outside perspective, the overall structure appears complicated, leaving possible scope for confusion over who does what, or should do what.	
Summary recommendations: The general recommendation is to continue with the current direction, but with an open mind towards; the need to monitor and evaluate changes that have been made,	

the need to be sensitive to possible differences between the needs and practices of different subject areas, the need to ensure that all are aware of the systems in place and hence of the opportunities available to faculties and individuals. This may be helped by ensuring involvement in, and discussion of, decisions that are taken.

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]:	**4 - Very good**
Qualitative assessment: Much under Module 5 is repeating what we already know from Module 4 and reports from faculties. Here we have a long response (actually repeating parts. It looks like they were pasted in twice by mistake) which seems very adequate on the past. A full vision for precisely the next five years is not set out explicitly. The intention is broadly to continue to develop and improve. This has to be the right approach in view of the extent of recent changes that have yet to be consolidated. Questions will remain over how far they should prioritise particular research areas while remaining open to the development of new ones and how far they can ensure that good ideas from the leadership are accepted and implemented across the university. The strategy for gender equality identifies relevant issues. There could also be more consideration for other issues relating to equal opportunities, including race, nationality, sexual orientation and more.	
Recommendations: No further recommendations here beyond what has appeared in other sections.	

5.2 Research and development objectives	
Evaluate the set goals of the HEI in both the area of R&D&I and the development of the HEI as an institution. Consider whether the goals are adequately established in relation to the size and type of the HEI, as well as its mission and vision, and whether they are achievable within the proposed timeframe.	
Rating [1–5]:	**3 - Average**
Qualitative assessment: The content of the Strategic Plan 2021+ is largely discussed elsewhere and the content of the Research Strategy 2025-2030, broadly a continuation and consolidation of previous activities, has also been discussed already. The goals would seem to be adequately set and not obviously over-ambitious, not least because they do not say how much better they hope to be or when everything will be achieved.	

The commitments to developing young researchers, doctoral students, research teams and international staff are all good. There could also be consideration to the attraction, and continued support for, older and established researchers and to development over a whole career. There is more on this under 5.3.

The commitment to regionally-relevant and regionally-based research is welcome and appropriate, particularly when it is combined with broadening national and international links with others undertaking similar kinds of research.

Recommendations:

The strategy as outlined is in parts very general. It would be worth ensuring that it does not remain at the general level and is translated into more specific detail over time.

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: A very full response has been provided, showing the development of strategic instruments. For the most part, these are judged very positively in earlier sections. The Doctoral Academy has already been judged positively. It is to be hoped that it will develop satisfactorily. Similarly, the 'global experts' initiative seems a very good idea that is already showing results: it responds both to weaknesses in existing expertise and to the benefits of close international contacts for the development of research projects and clusters. As currently stated, funding is guaranteed only to 2027, making difficult firm long-term plans. It is to be hoped that the university will be successful in its efforts to extend this programme.

International contacts for the development of new ideas could be better explained. This is referred to in relation to equal opportunities and the role of the ombudsperson, suggesting that UJEP can both learn from, and contribute to, the development of good practice across European universities.

Recommendations:

Since most of the tools and measures for implementing the university strategy in the near future are already in place, the main general recommendation is regular monitoring and reporting on their effectiveness, with a view to changes and adaptations as appropriate.

International cooperation could also include participation in discussions on the themes covered in this and other sections, as indicated in 5.3.6.

In relation to HR strategy, there could be more explicit consideration to the ratio between teaching and researching staff and how far all academic staff should be expected to undertake research.

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]:	**4 - Very good**
Qualitative assessment: Our recommendations were generally close to what the university has been doing over the following years and their goals are in line with national and international policies. Some of the issues we raised are no longer relevant in the same way. We asked if they were considering the implications of receiving less EU finance and they reply that it has changed more or less nothing. That looks right. We would seem to have seen the end of big infrastructure spending, in terms of new building, and they now aim for stability, rather than growth, in student numbers. The importance of external funding continues to mean that they cannot be completely certain of the continuation of all projects. That may increase the importance of other revenue sources, but a degree of uncertainty is inevitable.	
Recommendations: No further recommendations here.	

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	**4 - Very good**
5.2 Research and development objectives	**3 - Average**
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	**4 - Very good**
AVERAGE RATING	**4 - Very good**
GRADE [A–D]	**B**
Summary assessment: The university has a conception for development from a regional university into an institution with more international contacts and a significant level of research activity. It has gone through a recent period of construction and expansion followed by the development of various instruments to encourage research and to make it sustainable. Much that is new looks	

good and some initiatives have proven themselves in practice, but much remains to prove itself in practice. Early successes include the ombudsperson, which can quickly show up where problems lie in the HR field and similar areas, and the initiation of the 'global expert' programme, which should help in developing fruitful international collaboration. These and other initiatives will hopefully prove beneficial in future. Big barriers remain in the apparently low level of interest in foreign travel and international contacts and in the fact that large numbers of academics are yet to be involved in research activity. How far the incentive structures that have been created will help to overcome these barriers remains to be seen.
Summary recommendations: There should be continual monitoring and discussion of new initiatives and structures, This should be combined with following, and learning from, developments and practices in other universities, Efforts should be made to ensure the widest possible awareness of developments and also of outside opinions, including those expressed in the IEP reports.

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 %	**B**
MODULE 3	30 %	**B**
MODULE 4	10 %	**B**
MODULE 5	10 %	**B**
OVERALL RATING		**B – Very good**

Qualitative assessment: As results for Modules 1 and 2 and evaluation reports on Module 3 show, there have been improvements across faculties in research profiles and activities. The university has a conception for development from a regional university into an institution with more international contacts and a significant level of research activity. It has gone through a recent period of construction and expansion followed by the development of various instruments to encourage research and to make it sustainable. Much that is new looks good and some initiatives have proven themselves in practice, but much remains to prove itself in practice. Early successes include the ombudsperson, which can quickly show up where problems lie in the HR field and similar areas, and the initiation of the 'global expert' programme, which should help in developing fruitful international collaboration. These and other initiatives will hopefully prove beneficial in future. Big barriers remain in the apparently low level of interest in foreign travel and international contacts and in the fact that large numbers of academics are yet to be involved in research activity. How far the incentive structures that have been created will help to overcome these barriers remains to be seen.

Recommendations: The general recommendation is to continue with the current direction, but with an open mind towards;

the need to monitor and evaluate changes that have been made and to follow and learn from development in practices other universities,

the need to be sensitive to possible differences between the needs and practices of different subject areas,

the need to ensure that all are aware of the systems in place and hence of the opportunities available to faculties and individuals.

Efforts should therefore be made to ensure the widest possible awareness of developments and also of outside opinions, including those expressed in the IEP reports.

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 %	**C**
MODULE 3	30 %	**B**
MODULE 4	10 %	**B**
MODULE 5	10 %	**B**
OVERALL RATING		**B – Very good**

Qualitative assessment:

As results for Modules 1 and 2 and evaluation reports on Module 3 show, there have been improvements across faculties in research profiles and activities. The university has a conception for development from a regional university into an institution with more international contacts and a significant level of research activity. It has gone through a recent period of construction and expansion followed by the development of various instruments to encourage research and to make it sustainable. Much that is new looks good and some initiatives have proven themselves in practice, but much remains to prove itself in practice. Early successes include the ombudsperson, which can quickly show up where problems lie in the HR field and similar areas, and the initiation of the 'global expert' programme, which should help in developing fruitful international collaboration. These and other initiatives will hopefully prove beneficial in future. Big barriers remain in the apparently low level of interest in foreign travel and international contacts and in the fact that large numbers of academics are yet to be involved in research activity. How far the incentive structures that have been created will help to overcome these barriers remains to be seen.

Recommendations:

The general recommendation is to continue with the current direction, but with an open mind towards;

the need to monitor and evaluate changes that have been made and to follow and learn from development in practices other universities,

the need to be sensitive to possible differences between the needs and practices of different subject areas,

the need to ensure that all are aware of the systems in place and hence of the opportunities available to faculties and individuals.

Efforts should therefore be made to ensure the widest possible awareness of developments and also of outside opinions, including those expressed in the IEP reports.