

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

HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION NAME: Prague University of Economics and Business

COMPANY REGISTRATION NUMBER (CRN): 61384399

THE LIST OF EVALUATION UNITS IN MODULE 3:

Faculty of Finance and Accounting
 Faculty of International Relations
 Faculty of Business Administration
 Faculty of Informatics and Statistics
 Faculty of Economics
 Faculty of Management

CHAIRPERSON OF INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION PANEL

Name and surname: Jan Stejskal, prof. Ing., Ph.D.

Phone number: [REDACTED]

E-mail: [REDACTED]

LIST OF INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION PANEL MEMBERS		
Name and surname	Position in IEP	Current position
Jan Stejskal, prof. Ing., Ph.D.	Chairman	Dean of the Faculty of Economics and Administration, University of Pardubice, Czech Republic
Jean-Robert Tyran, prof., Dr.	Member	Professor of Economics, University Vienna, Austria
Nil Özçağlar Toulouse, prof., PhD	Member	Vice-President International and European affairs, France
Aljoša Valentinčič, prof., dr.	Member	Full professor of Money and Finance, School of Economics and Business, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
Xymena Kurowska, prof., PhD	Member	Associate Professor of International Relations, Central European University, Vienna, Austria
Marian Holienka, doc. PhDr., PhD.	Member	Head of Department, Comenius University Bratislava, Faculty of Management, Slovakia
Pavel Částka, prof., Ing., PhD.	Member	Associate Dean for Professional Engagement, Professor in Supply Chain Management and Sustainability, International Business School Suzhou, Xi'an Jiaotong Liverpool University, China
Axel Polleres, prof., Dr.	Member	Full professor, Head of Department of Information Systems and Operations

		Management at Vienna University of Economics and Business, Austria
Lenka Slavíková, doc., Ing., Ph.D.	Member	Vice-Dean for Research, Jan Evangelista Purkyně University in Ústí nad Labem, Czech Republic

PROVIDERS METHODOLOGIST

Name and surname: Mgr. Vratislav Kozák, Ph.D.

Phone number: [REDACTED]

E-mail: [REDACTED]

Date of on-site visit of higher education institution: 19.6.-20.6.2025

In Prague, 30. 9. 2025

Signature:

Jan Stejskal, prof. Ing., Ph.D.
Chairman

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Finance and Accounting

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 Finance and Accounting (FFA) is a mature and ambitious academic unit with a clearly articulated mission to combine high-quality education, internationally relevant research, and, as a result, strong engagement with the broader society. It is aiming to achieve the position as a leading institution in the region of Central and Eastern Europe, with aspirations to be recognized internationally in finance and accounting. This ambition is supported/evidenced by a broad portfolio of study programmes, a sizeable student body of over 2,800, and an academic staff of nearly 100, two fifths ($\approx 40\%$) of whom hold senior academic titles. The gender balance is achieved at the student level, less so at the faculty level ($\approx 30\%$ are of staff are female). Research activities are organized around 7 departments and two dedicated institutes, together encompassing a broad range of research areas, including financial and economic modelling, risk management, monetary and fiscal policy, corporate valuation, and energy economics, the latter an area in which the faculty has built significant expertise that bridges into environmental sciences. The portfolio of research activities of the faculty has resulted in several high-quality international journals (a total of 30 in Q1 and Q2 in WoS in 2023, increasing over time). The unit itself publishes three peer-reviewed journals, including the *Prague Economic Papers* indexed in the Web of Science. The FFA faculty is engaged with external stakeholders. FFA has established strong connections with professional organizations, the business sector, and governmental and non-governmental bodies. These relationships support applied research, consultancy, and policy advice, ensuring that the faculty's work has broader societal relevance. This is, among other things, reflected in the ability of FFA to raise significant funds from non-public sources (EUR 336,000 for the last reported year). Overall, although broad in scope, the Faculty of Finance and Accounting efforts result in very good academic capacity and integration of education, research, and societal responsibility. These characteristics justify its aspiration to be recognized as a regionally very important (if not leading) and a respected international institution in the field of finance and accounting.

RECOGNITION BY THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY

3.2 Recognition by the research community

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

Rating [1–5]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:¹

The unit is very well recognised and integrated in the research community. This is evidenced by at least the following: i) involvement of the members of the academic unit in some key international (e.g., EFRAG, EAA) and pillar domestic institutions (e.g., the Czech National Bank, the Czech Accounting Board); ii) the members of the unit are involved in high-quality, internationally well-recognised journals as members of editorial boards (e.g., *Accounting in Europe*) and, since 2023, as publishers of *Prague Economics Papers*, an internationally-recognised journal also indexed in the *Web of Science*; iii) are invited as lecturers/presenters by various internationally-well known universities and institutions (e.g., in the area of financial accounting and reporting doc. ing. Procházka presented at the joint EAA/IASB/EFRAG workshop (European Accounting Association, International Accounting Standards Board, an important venue for the financial accounting community); iv) have hosted and will host the central scientific congress of the European Accounting Association (in our view, this would not happen had the members of FFA not been internationally-recognized); v) invite and are invited by international peers for research presentations, a feature not possible if the members of the evaluated academic unit were not themselves recognised internationally by their peers. The quantity of high-quality publications has increased significantly – 4-times – since the last evaluation (2020) and we conclude that FFA’s policies have had a positive impact on their research performance.

We note, however, that the portfolio of research covers very broad areas. For some of these areas it is not immediately obvious that they should be placed within FFA, as well as some areas that are covered by other academic units at VŠE. This can be problematic in further growth and development of FFA – especially from the perspective of external parties who might find the offerings (and overall direction of FFA) confusing. Moreover, in comparison to leading international business schools, the faculty’s research impact and visibility appear somewhat concentrated in regional and specialized publication outlets. While there is clear evidence of applied and contract research with societal relevance, the extent of publications in top-tier international journals, citations, and global collaborations is less emphasized. The areas also appear to reflect reflected in very diverse departments, resulting more from the “heritage” system rather than from an “organic” (defined by subject areas, rather than individual faculty members, as well as the ageing schedule of the department (not a critique or a weakness in itself, but a point to consider/keep in mind as 31 persons or 23.8% out of 130 persons of academic staff is 60 and above). Strengthening these dimensions would contribute to the FFA’s international standing.

Recommendations:

- Streamline the organization of FFA and its alignment with VŠE. FFA is currently covering a broad range of research and professional interests. Consider cross-faculty co-operation, which can be leading to integration/synergies and reorganization at the university level.

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.

Several faculties cover fields related to FFA's work, while FFA is at the same time covering areas that would be better placed and developed at other faculties at VŠE.

- Make sure junior staff are well-lead through research projects by subject covered, rather than the more "heritage" approach outlined above.
- Are junior members incentivised to conduct high-quality research? We note that the VŠE has a formal system of classifying publications, but we also note that some areas covered by FFA have de facto classifications that do not fully overlap with WoS.
- Are PhD students integrated with research conducted by members of FFA not mentoring them, with other PhD students from other faculties?

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 key takeaway from the 10 presented research projects/activities during the period 2019-2023 is that they lead to very-high quality publications in recognised international journals. Examples include, but are not limited to, publications in the following journals: Journal of Corporate Finance, Journal of Banking & Finance, International review of Financial Analysis, Finance Research Letters, Energy Economics, Journal of the Operational Research Society and others. Publications are appropriately targeted given the portfolio of very different research areas. This constitutes clear evidence that the researchers in this academic unit are able to recognize gaps in existing research, address these questions, execute the research and ultimately publishes these results. Other projects address various societal issues (e.g., road transport emissions, strategic analysis of a development bank).

What represents "the most important" research projects is a matter of criteria. One criterion is how relevant FFA's research is from an international, peer perspective. Projects under points 2, 4 and 10 have all resulted in very high quality publications in relatively competitive areas (evidenced by significant numbers of publications in these areas). Another criterion is societal impact. Projects under 1, 3, 7 and 10 are more relevant from a societal (impact) perspective, although project 10 has also resulted in very high quality publications. The research mix of these two criteria is a good way to go in general and from the vision and mission point of view. The main underlying weakness is the uneven balance between academic research excellence and demonstrable societal impact. From a slightly different perspective, some projects are highly relevant to local institutions or professional practice, but produce less in terms of internationally visible, peer-reviewed research output. Their results are mainly disclosed in internal reports or consultancy deliverables. Conversely, the projects with strong international publications (e.g., 2, 4, 10) tend to emphasise academic excellence more but provide less direct evidence of broad societal influence. Few projects simultaneously deliver both top-tier international publications and large-scale societal outcomes. This is important when these outcomes increasingly expected by leading accreditation bodies (AACSB, EQUIS) and national quality frameworks in other constituencies (e.g., REF in the UK). FFA demonstrates strength in both

dimensions separately, but less often in combination. This reduces the international distinctiveness of the research portfolio compared to leading business schools, where visibility and impact are pursued together.

Recommendations:

- The Faculty of Finance and Accounting should more deliberately integrate its two current strengths—academic excellence and societal engagement—into the development of research and its projects.
- Streamline the areas taken on by various research projects.
- Make sure junior staff are well-lead through acquisition and execution phase of these 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]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:

The report provides a detail account of 10 research results. The results demonstrate a positive impact of FFA on society – including projects with IASB, European Commission, etc.). As noted in the previous point, projects listed there under 1, 3, 7 and 10 are more relevant from a societal (impact) perspective, and project 10 has also resulted in very high-quality publications. As stated in the previous point, the research mix that attempts to mix the two criteria (peer-recognized excellence and societal impact) is a good way to fulfil the vision and mission point of FFA. From the societal impact, the following is noticeable:

- Projects do have a clear impact and FFA provides numerous examples of the impact. For example, Project 10 demonstrates how the results were used by Czech Export Banks. However, considering the broader (international) relevance projects 1 and 2 stand out: the first affects about 140 countries adopting the International Financial Reporting Standards, and the second the EU via VAT regulations that apply throughout the EU and wider.
- It is less clear what the magnitude of the impact is. For example, Project 6 claims that the results were used in preparation of policies. How central is this project in preparation of these policies? Please do not take this as a direct criticism of this particular project. Rather, take this as a reflection on the difficulty to assess the impact while simultaneously keeping in mind that not all projects can even be presented in a way that would allow an external assessor determine this.
- The examples provided often do not explain links to gender and sustainability dimension. Some explicitly state ‘no linkage’, others do not comment. It would be preferable to be consistent here and explicitly state “no linkage” rather than remain silent on the matter that is important for the assessment. We note that the gender balance is not optimal (only ≈30% are of staff are female, in contrast to FFA’s student population, which is balanced).

Recommendations:

- Conceptualize 'social impact' at FFA: determine what constitutes social impact and how is it measured.
- Collect evidence of social impact and find ways to provide objective and unbiased evidence of the direct as well as potential impact.
- Present (account for and analyse) societal impact at the FFA level; use the insights for planning and prioritizing of research and project activities at FFA.
- Integrate social impact into your mission.

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:

From the self-evaluation report, we note that FFA produces significant analyses, expert reviews, expert analytical outputs that all have relevance in practice, evidenced by market viability (i.e., the capacity of FFA to charge for its R&D&I results). The areas are in line with the expertise of the staff at FFA and with the stated mission and vision of the unit. The users of R&D&I results are private, the government and public institutions. The examples presented in the report of transfer of R&D&I results into practice are consistent with the researched areas and the types of research results being produced. We note that there has been a notable growth in non-public, non-grant revenue generated by FFA (Table 3.5.1).

We note however that there is a room for improvement in how FFA presents and approaches transfer of the results into practice. Whilst the rationale for a focus on particular activities (and not other activities such as patents and licences – as explained in the self-assessment report) is well articulated, the explanation of the transfer underscores the achievements and capabilities at FFA. In line with the comments in Section 3.4., the results are presented as individual outcomes (albeit noteworthy such as the growth in non-public revenue) rather than considering FFA as a unit. Moreover, while FFA demonstrates consistent and meaningful engagement with major Czech financial institutions, government agencies, and professional associations, these activities indicate regional leadership but limited global reach.

Recommendations:

- Develop a strategic perspective – linking research, societal impact and results transfer in practice as self-reinforcing activities.
- Determine how individual projects link up to a coherent image of FFA as a faculty with significant collective expertise in finance and accounting – or be more specific to articulate more precise areas of finance and accounting that you are known for.
- Expand international partnerships by engaging with international financial institutions, global regulatory bodies (those reported above, IASB, EFRAG, the EC, are good examples),

to apply its expertise in areas such as sustainable finance, risk management, and energy economics.

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:

- FFA engages in popularization of R&D&I through different means – mainly focusing on seminars, workshops, conferences and media activities.
- The report provides an in-depth outlook into various activities in this area – especially discussing in detail 10 examples.
- The report demonstrates well the variety of activities and it is clear that FFA takes the popularization of R&D&I seriously. At the same time, the report does not disclose a lot of details on the value and effectiveness of these activities. For example, on page 34, the report lists various example of appearance in media. Yet it is hard to see how these appearances contributed to the popularization efforts of FFA. Similarly, the 10 listed project explain the nature of each event without explaining the impact of the stakeholders.

Overall, however, the structure of these activities reflects the FFA's main areas of expertise – taxation, accounting, valuation, banking and insurance, public finance, financial regulation, and education. These activities are highly relevant in the Czech academic and professional environment: they create a bridge between academic research and professional practice, particularly in fields (accounting, auditing, taxation) where regulatory updates and applied solutions are crucial.

Recommendations:

- Develop a strategic perspective to drive you popularization activities.
- Be more specific which aspects of your expertise you aim to popularize.
- Measure your popularization activities

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

The self-assessment account from the Faculty of Finance and Accounting demonstrates notable progress and a proactive approach to enhancing its academic and societal contributions. The faculty has significantly strengthened its research capabilities by increasing key research capacities, including hiring new research staff and establishing new institutes like the Institute of Sustainable

Finance. Financial motivation systems have been revamped to stimulate research staff in acquiring applied and contract research, especially for international clients, and to provide greater financial support for excellent research teams and projects. This has led to an increased number of research projects and improved collaboration with external research teams.

In terms of societal engagement, FFA has made considerable strides in improving interactions with the public. FFA has expanded their targeted audience to include professional and general publics, significantly increased activity in publishing articles in professional journals, and broadened visibility through print and electronic media. Communication with the international professional community has also expanded, with international researchers being invited to conferences and workshops. The faculty has actively participated in some international projects, increasing its visibility within the international professional community and among international institutions. Furthermore, FFA has increased financial support for international cooperation and mobility, leading to more international connections for research staff and greater involvement in international scientific and professional associations.

While these achievements are commendable and reflect a dedicated effort to improve the faculty's standing, it is important to offer a balanced perspective to guide FFA towards further progress and development. It is noted that research has been strengthened by the faculty since the last evaluation in 2020. At the same time, it appears that the underlying "heritage" system continues to influence operations. This traditional approach may inadvertently create inefficiencies within FFA and lead to overlapping research portfolios and activities with other departments at VŠE. The self-assessment report comprehensively catalogues achievements in teaching, research, and societal engagement. While this demonstrates a broad range of activities, limited critical reflection on inherent weaknesses or challenges is offered. Finally, while FFA shares their achievements with the relevant communities, this is often based on individual achievements and efforts rather than presenting the FFA as a unit. Some areas would benefit from further development, for example a more detailed and long-term view on 'social impact' and how it is measured, especially in an international context, would be a good example how to strengthen this area. Detailed recommendations are provided below.

Recommendations:

- **Modernize Organizational Structure through alignment with other VŠE faculties**
Restructure the Faculty of Finance and Accounting to move beyond a "heritage" system towards a more agile and subject-focused approach. This recommendation is probably better placed at VŠE level, but also at the level of departments within FFA. We list this as part of this feedback to ensure that FFA plays an important role in this restructuring processes. Crucially, this modernization should prioritize providing robust, subject-based leadership for junior staff and PhD students, ensuring they are well-mentored through the entire research project lifecycle, from acquisition to execution, and integrated into broader research communities.
- **Foster Junior Academic Growth and Integration**
Prioritize providing robust, subject-based leadership and mentorship for junior staff and PhD students. Ensure they are well-integrated into the research community and supported through the entire research project lifecycle, from acquisition to execution. Implement systems that incentivize high-quality research from junior members and facilitate their active participation in broader research activities, including collaborations with other PhD students and faculty from different departments.

- Elevate International Standing Through Strategic Benchmarking and Talent Attraction**
 Systematically benchmark FFA's academic and research quality against leading international business schools. This critical self-assessment should identify specific areas of weakness, such as limited citations in top-tier international journals and insufficient participation in major international networks, or faculty/student mobility schemes. Develop targeted strategies to attract international talent and enhance the faculty's global visibility and competitiveness. The robust domestic presence and competence should serve as platform for this development.
- Integrate Societal Impact with Global Engagement**
 Develop a clear conceptualization and measurable framework for 'social impact' at FFA, ensuring it is deeply integrated into the faculty's mission, research planning, and project activities. Beyond local engagement, strategically link this societal impact with international academic and professional networks. Focus on demonstrating tangible evidence of impact and use these insights to collaboratively plan and prioritize research and popularization efforts that resonate on a global scale.
- Cultivate High-Quality, Internationally Recognized Research Output**
 Implement robust incentives and support mechanisms for all academic staff to conduct high-quality, impactful research that meets international standards. Address any discrepancies between internal publication classifications and widely recognized global indexing systems (e.g., Web of Science) to ensure research output gains maximum international visibility and citation impact in leading academic journals.
- Define and Strategically Popularize Distinctive Expertise**
 Clearly articulate FFA's precise and unique areas of collective expertise within finance and accounting, moving beyond a broad overview. Develop a strategic approach to popularization activities, focusing on these specific strengths. This includes actively communicating the faculty's core competencies to relevant stakeholders, measuring the effectiveness of popularization efforts, and demonstrating how individual research projects contribute to a coherent and internationally recognized image of the faculty's specialized expertise.
 Develop a system (a "quality loop") to follow student satisfaction, issues, etc. Some of these instruments are required by international accreditations, so the incentive should be high. Some international rankings (e.g., the Financial Times rankings) also require you to follow graduates in their career (employability, salary, etc.)
 Develop a list of relevant "competitors" (schools you see as competitors as such, schools that you aspire to and perhaps also schools from which you want to be distinct).

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	3 - Average
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 Finance and Accounting (FFA) is a mature and ambitious academic unit with significant strengths in research, education, and societal engagement. It has made demonstrable progress since the last evaluation, particularly in increasing the quality and volume of research outputs. This has increased its profile in the research community, and enhancing connections with domestic institutions and professional bodies. Its growing visibility in international academic forums, publication record in respected journals, and organization of major international events of major scientific organizations such as the EAA congress underline the faculty's credibility and ambition. At the same time, the evaluation reveals areas where development is required (advised) to strengthen FFA's international position and long-term coherence. The research activity is broad and, consequently somewhat fragmented, reflecting a "heritage"-based departmental structure and structure of the faculties within the VŠE that risks diluting the faculty's efforts. Transfer of results into practice and popularization efforts are strong in the Czech/regional context but remain limited in international scope, with societal impact often documented as individual achievements rather than collective faculty-wide outcomes. Furthermore, while junior staff and PhD students are active, their integration into structured, subject-focused mentoring and internationally benchmarked research practices could be improved. Overall, FFA can be considered a very good unit (Rating: 4), with strong regional standing and clear potential to achieve greater international recognition if it strategically consolidates its activities, defines its areas of distinctive expertise, and more systematically integrates societal impact and global engagement.	
Summary recommendations: • Modernize organizational structure to move from a "heritage"-based system to a more subject-oriented approach, encouraging synergies within VŠE and reducing overlaps. • Strengthen junior staff and PhD student integration by providing robust mentorship, incentives for high-quality research, and opportunities for international collaboration and development. • Benchmark against relevant international business schools to identify weaknesses and develop strategies for improving international visibility, talent attraction (PhDs, faculty and staff), and research impact. • Develop a clear framework for societal impact, and embed it into the mission statement, planning processes, and communication at both faculty and project levels. • Support high-quality, internationally recognized research output by aligning incentives with global standards (WoS, Scopus, FT lists, etc.) and ensuring visibility in (to) top-tier journals. • Define and popularize distinctive areas of expertise to present a coherent, internationally recognizable faculty profile, and measure the effectiveness of communication activities.	

- Introduce quality loops to systematically track student satisfaction, graduate career outcomes, and employer feedback, in line with international accreditation and ranking requirements.
- Map competitors and aspirational peers to guide strategic positioning and differentiation in both regional and international contexts.

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of International Relations

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 introductory information, including the mission statement of the unit, is clearly formulated and appropriate as compared with the international standards for institutions of this kind. Faculty of International Relations (FIR) sets out the objective to develop education and produce knowledge in the field of international economic and political relations and to provide internationally recognized study programmes based on subject expertise, critical thinking and inclusiveness, personal and societal responsibility, and commitment to lifelong learning. Its ambition to become the leading higher education and research institution in the field of international economic and political relations in Czechia is already well-substantiated through the historical record in the region and the contemporary strategy of reform and innovation which encompasses efforts at internationalisation, and optimisation and verification of internal processes of quality assurance. FIR has been recognised as one of the top ranked schools within the Central and Eastern Europe as it has established strong partnerships with a wide range of Czech and international entities, including key public administration bodies, non-governmental organisations, and other societal actors.

FIR research themes, and the corresponding expertise it has developed, encompass a broad spectrum of topics pertaining to issues in the evolving international political, security, and legal environment; innovative strategies for international business and enhancing the competitiveness of Czech enterprises amidst shifting political and economic conditions; and the strategic and operational management of business processes within an international framework. Institutionally and organisationally, FIR has faced the task of building an interdisciplinary school of international relations at a profiled university of economics and business. Its R&D&I capacities are distributed as follows: 39% economics and business, 40% political science (including basic and applied research), 10% law, 10% social and economic geography. This setup is a testimony to the multi-disciplinary character of the unit, which showcases its potential for excellence, but also creates administrative and substantive challenges in internal processes of quality assurance and for its positioning in global research communities.

FIR has more than 140 R&D&I staff, of which more than 40% are female. These are high numbers on both counts as compared to similar institutions in the region. It consists of four departments, two research centres, a centre for Asian studies, a centre for European studies, and an institute for sustainable business. As we highlight later in the report, it is important to attend to communication and coordination between these units and synergise the results of their work in the context of the overall mission.

There has been a drop in PhD students from 72 in 2019 to 48 in 2023. The drop reflects similar patterns in regional and global academia, as well as locally-specific changes in regulations, opportunities, and career structures for junior researchers. While this is a structural problem, attracting junior talent is crucial for research-intensive institutions, and we would like to encourage FIR to invest in such efforts strategically.

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:²

FIR understands its mission widely and in an interdisciplinary manner, in line with the current standards set for international politics departments globally, and as a reflection of its own internal composition. It is ambitious in its objective of becoming one of the best schools of International Relations in Czechia, but justifies this goal by describing the potential, leadership, and accomplishments within the national and regional research community persuasively. Its impact within the Czech scientific environment is indeed well-documented, while participation in and contribution to European and global scholarship are less prominent. Specifically, membership/leadership roles in relevant global associations/learned societies/journal advisory and editorial boards are still to be developed more extensively and systematically; the status of these associations and the concrete input of faculty members is uneven and underspecified, and tends to be limited to already established cooperation with mainly regional impact. The record of awards and publications reflects this focus, with the exception of the established partnership with partners from France. Further, while FIR has been successful in attracting distinguished global and regional scholars to deliver their invited lectures, the examples of similar engagements abroad by FIR's staff are less prominent. Finally, FIR staff have not been sufficiently involved in the evaluation of national or European research project/programme calls for funding, which translates into less influence over shaping regional research agendas.

Recommendations:

- In order to realise the stated ambition of research excellence and scientific innovation, it is advised to streamline and strengthen FIR's visibility, participation, and leadership role at the European and global level. While we are aware of structural inequalities regarding academic opportunities and trajectories, as well as limited institutional and personal resources, we would like to encourage FIR staff to invest more extensively and systematically in forging global networks that will bring rewards and greater recognition over time. The intermediary aims in achieving such goals may include joint publications with international scholars in renowned peer-reviewed journals, active roles in research communities and associations, and seeking leadership (PI) roles and responsibilities within externally-funded projects. We recommend planning how to leverage established reputation and networks and how to pool available resources to generate fresh and synergetic initiatives. Consider, for example, how academic events such as exchanges/visits/workshops (including in an online format) can be

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.

designed and followed up substantively as part of a larger set of priorities within the strategy for internationalisation. To this end, the priorities may need refreshing in light of globally evolving research and education developments and staff members may need to be incentivised to pursue demanding tasks of advancing both their research interests and the mission of the unit.

- To facilitate such activities financially and substantively, we recommend exploring potential sources of seed money for establishing and participation in research networks, and approaching framework initiatives with policies that seek to redress inequalities in access to research funding. See, for instance, how grant authorities such as European Research Council address the geographically and institutionally uneven distribution of their grant awards and check if any capacity building assistance can be sourced through such channels.
- For consolidating research recognition in line with the most recent disciplinary developments, we further advise greater attention should be paid to diverse while rigorous research methodology training as part of basic research, in the development of study programmes across levels, and in efforts to consolidating capacities and competence in designing, applying for and implementing large interdisciplinary research projects.

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:

Research projects presented by FIR are predominantly supported by domestic public grant funding schemes. Considering the faculty's R&D&I capacities, the extent of projects funded externally within competitive grant schemes is moderate. We note accomplishments of FIR in this domain, however, as evidenced, for example, by the establishment of The European Hub for Contemporary China and "EuroHub4Sino" as Horizon Europe projects funded by the European Research Agency. Further, the synergy of the presented pool of projects with the FIR's overall mission is not always sufficiently evident or explicitly elaborated in the projects' explanations. This is not necessarily an issue, as such additions could be the basis for both expanding/streamlining/substantiating the evolving expertise of the faculty and showcasing its responsiveness to research and societal challenges. Such developments could be more clearly laid out as part of the renewal of priorities.

The results achieved in the presented projects, in general, address both the scientific community and cross-sector audiences in policymaking. Their application potential is mainly seen (and already demonstrated) in the public sector, at the level of the national government and its bodies, and to some extent at the European level. The presented research projects involve interdisciplinary aspects and examples of collaboration with partners from other universities, some also from abroad, including partner entities from the public and private sectors. However, the report did not present sufficient examples of collaboration with other units of the evaluated university, signalling room for improvement in seeking internal synergies and in developing a strategic approach to designing follow-up projects and activities.

Recommendations:

We recommend consolidating a strategic approach to project design, implementation, and follow-up. We further suggest that larger projects, in particular, could be conceived with a broader impact in mind, considering how the local expertise can be leveraged as relevant beyond the local context and how individual projects synergistically contribute to building FIR's visibility more widely.

This requires a two-pronged process:

- FIR should further work towards increasing its involvement in international and global projects, ideally also in leadership/coordination roles that allow for shaping research priorities. It is recommended to replicate the internally identified good practices and achievements across more departments and research teams, and scale them to the faculty level. This would also contribute to efforts in recruitment and retention of international staff.
- FIR should define and prioritise the prospective research domains and systematically concentrate its capacities. Notably, it is recommended to develop a strategy on how to capitalise on the developing regional expertise on contemporary China and possibly also AI. Overall, there should be a clear strategic link to the FIR's mission, which itself would benefit from updating.

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]:

3 - Average

Qualitative assessment:

FIR demonstrates its potential to contribute to addressing local, regional, and global challenges and as such proves its relevance and expertise for research-based policymaking and evaluation. This said, and as also indicated above, the processes to exploit research results are not sufficiently clearly developed, or at least not sufficiently articulated/communicated. We acknowledge that policy relevance depends in part on the degree of receptivity by the policy community and government to research advice, so it is not the sole responsibility of FIR to make its policy input actionable; still, a more proactive and sustained and sustainable approach to translating research results for policy use is recommended given FIR's ongoing projects.

Recommendations:

- Any project which is conducted with a view to inform policy could include a realistic assessment and planning as to how its results may be fed into policymaking. While FIR receives significant government funding, it cannot be made exclusively responsible for dissemination of research results. It needs to be explored if adequate channels, process, and regulations exist which facilitate the absorption of research results.

TRANSFER OF RESULTS INTO PRACTICE

3.5 Transfer of results into practice

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

Rating [1–5]:

3 - Average

Qualitative assessment:

Commercialisation cannot be the overriding priority of FIR since the results of its research are, in principle, more akin to public goods as they respond to societal and national challenges and pressures. A mechanistic view on operationalisation of research results for commercial purposes would therefore not be adequate. Still, FIR has generated a range of high-quality research which has clear potential for direct beneficial impact on the Czech society, and possibly more broadly, also in terms of generating potential profit which can be re-invested to build research and educational capacities and visibility of the unit itself. For example, projects such as 'Decarbonisation of the Czech energy sector in the light of the new EU energy geopolitics' (GAČR 23-06411S) assist strategic policymaking in Czechia and beyond, here as regards a critical examination of Czechia's gas dependence within the broader context of the EU's reevaluation of key energy suppliers. This potential is in principle recognised, but its critical significance and a systematic approach to the exploitation of such research outputs is not sufficiently clearly set out in the view of the FIR strategic mission.

Recommendations:

Given FIR's potential for, first, supplying research-based, original, and tailored policy advice that meets contemporary challenges and, second, its demonstrated capacities for delivering high-standard executive education that can train well-rounded and critically thinking practitioners, we recommend undertaking a comprehensive assessment of how this potential can be mobilised regarding Czech and European policy needs. We note commendable engagement with high schools through knowledge contests/Olympiads, popularisation of knowledge, for example about the Czech presidency and, by extension, about the EU and regional urban population on mobility (in a form of certified methodology to be used for safety mobility evolution). This responds to the recommendation of the previous evaluation report.

Crucially, still, research priorities and activities should be developed through rigorous academic methodologies and cannot be solely policy demand-driven; policy dependency would overdetermine basic research agendas and limit innovation. These considerations need to be integrated into any strategic planning of knowledge transfer and dissemination. To this end, we recommend:

- Stocktaking and developing a more strategic while critical and flexible approach to knowledge transfer, including by more explicitly setting and contextually revising short-term and long-term priorities and procedures.
- Continuing to interact with a range of government and societal actors and approaching new potential beneficiaries of FIR research outputs by mobilising the cross-sectoral character of research results.
- Pursuing funding from diverse sources, including non-public, non-grant sources.

- Seeking regional/European impact by leveraging substantive trans-local expertise, potentially in the realm of disinformation and security research.
- Investing in a distinctively interdisciplinary curriculum for the executive academy, including through a diverse methodology training, in order to educate well-rounded practitioners who are able to discern and use reliable sources of knowledge in policymaking, in line with the mission of the unit to foster critical thinking.

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:

The presented R&D&I popularisation and communication activities include some media appearances and individual activities and achievements by a limited number of the FIR academic staff. The report further indicates some examples of communication towards professional audiences. However, information about popularisation is fragmentary and evidence of a systematic approach to popularisation and communication towards the general public is not sufficiently clearly presented.

Recommendations:

We acknowledge that not all academic staff need or can be involved in popularisation and media outreach but recommend continuation of dissemination efforts. Specifically, we recommend to:

- Systematise and institutionalise R&D&I popularisation and communication activities as integral part of implementing research projects. Earmark resources, including a dedicated staff capacity, for such activities in order to streamline visibility process and avoid overburdening researchers.
- Ensure that each project has a feasible and sustainable element of popularisation, over the course of it, and also for longer-term impact. While we highlight the unit-wide streamlining of popularisation, this does not mean that each project needs the same approach to dissemination, this should be tailored to the project's character and developed in cooperation with the researcher in charge.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module 3

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

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

Rating [1–5]:

3 - Average

Qualitative assessment:

It is demonstrated and well-documented that much reflection and planning went into processing of the recommendations in the previous evaluation report; most areas are at least considered, even if the resources to introduce and consolidate recommended changes might not have been available at the level of the unit as they require university-wide reforms. Overall, FIR is to be commended for its efforts to diversify their research portfolio, including through efforts to internationalise their collaborations, to secure contracts for applied research and research with potential societal impact. Internationalisation is still limited.

Recommendations:

To accomplish its mission of further consolidating recognition and deepening internationalisation, we recommend:

- Collaboration, scaling the good practices from the sub-unit level to the level of the entire FIR, and synergy across sub-units, including research centres and project teams need to be improved.
- Continue to build on, as well as review, existing expertise to adjust the set of research and teaching priorities and develop a strategy for future hires, even if it is aspirational for the moment. Such hires would ideally be external and involve recruitment for full-time faculty positions of graduates from different/international universities. They do not, however, need to be at the senior level. Attracting junior global faculty can be easier at this historical moment in the global academy and it would provide FIR with fresh research perspectives;
- Promote the visibility of the unit's expertise and accomplishments in research and policy communities, as well as across the university;
- Further enhance research environment/culture supporting quality and diversification of research in the context of FIR priorities, access to internal recourses based on merit, commitment to sustainable internationalisation/cooperations, especially for junior research staff;
- Continue and increase exchange with societal actors for developing research projects and partnerships.

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	3 - Average
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	3 - Average

3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module	3 - Average
Average rating [1–5]:	3 - Average
Grade [A–D]:	C
Summary assessment: FIR has made significant efforts towards realising its stated mission and implementing the recommendations of the previous evaluation report. Overall, improvements can be further introduced regarding: 1. the participation of the FIR staff in global research networks, specifically in leadership positions, and forging a greater range of sustainable research partnerships internationally; 2. strengthening and diversifying methodological expertise in existing study programmes and in further developing the executive education programmes; 3. greater mobilisation of the existing expertise for fostering regional and international impact, including at the societal European level, and for shaping research-based policy engagement in line with the FIR's commitment to critical thinking and social responsibility. This potential can be realised if adequate resources and an incentive structure are created to support the very high and increasing number of research staff, specifically the very high number of junior research staff (assistant professors).	
Summary recommendations: • In order to facilitate internationalisation, review the existing policies and practices of recruitment, specifically employment through local networks and of former graduates. Consider, for example, what mobility incentives and requirements could be introduced to increase faculty-level exposure to global research; • Introduce clear unit-specific rank descriptions and career pathways, including mentorship programmes for junior research staff and procedures for career advancement, including the role of external reviewers; • Introduce an incentive non-exclusionary structure for research staff to encourage, promote, and reward tangible research efforts and achievements; • Develop a systematic approach to exploiting research results for societal impact as part of advancing the unit's overall research strategy; • Improve intra- and cross-unit coordination and good practice sharing between existing research centres and projects.	

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Business Administration

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 Business Administration (FBA) at the Prague University of Economics and Business presents itself as a leading institution in management education within Central and Eastern Europe, distinguished by its Triple Crown accreditation.

The FBA's mission is to generate and transmit knowledge, develop skills, and shape attitudes vital for effective management, engaging in research, teaching, and industry collaboration with a focus on practical impact. Its vision is to be an acknowledged European higher education institution in management, striving for excellence and active participation in the international academic community. This is supported by the "Connecting Data, People and Business" strategic framework, emphasizing interdisciplinary collaboration and synergy between educational, creative, and social roles, along with an application-oriented approach in partnership with private and public sectors.

FBA is structured into nine departments and seven interdisciplinary Centres of Excellence. Departments like Arts Management and Marketing organize bachelor's and master's education. The Centres of Excellence, such as the Centre for Business Ethics and Sustainability Management and the Centre for Family Businesses, act as platforms addressing real-world challenges and facilitating interactions across basic, applied, and contract research. Faculty members, primarily department-hired, often also contribute to these centres.

FBA actively conducts basic, applied, and contract research, predominantly in Economics and Business, with contributions to Psychology and Sociology. Basic research focuses on areas like Entrepreneurship, Family Business Research, and Marketing Research, leading to publications in top journals and the completion of 11 Czech Science Foundation projects between 2019 and 2023, alongside securing a Horizon project in 2023 (albeit the project starts in 2024 and therefore falls outside the accounting period). Applied and contract research involves partnerships with governmental bodies (e.g., Ministries of Industry and Trade, Justice), non-profit organizations, and private enterprises such as Škoda Auto and ORLEN Unipetrol RPA. The Centres of Excellence contribute to these R&D&I efforts, with examples like the Centre for Restructuring and Insolvency collaborating on new legislation. Furthermore, FBA engages in technology transfer initiatives, including "start-up nights" and Unistarter programs with other universities.

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:³

Overall, FBA demonstrates a strong position in the research community. Its institutional recognition and reputation are supported by the triple crown accreditation (AACSB, EQUIS, AMBA). FBA is particularly strong in the individual reputation of several high-quality researchers. However, while its recognition in the international research community shows a positive development and improvements, it still mostly builds on outstanding individuals (or departments) rather than a broader recognition of the faculty as a whole.

Several FBA's academic staff received individual and other prestigious R&D&I awards for their outstanding work in research, including several awards for high-quality papers, a few reviewers' awards, awards from professional organisations, and several internal awards. Overall, the list of awards demonstrates a reasonable spread among the FBA's academic staff.

FBA's staff shows participation in the editorial boards of international high-quality indexed scientific journals, as well as several examples of memberships in international professional and academic organisations, which is positive towards the faculty's international recognition. However, this participation was demonstrated for a limited proportion of staff members, showing room for further improvement.

The presented track record of major invited lectures given by the FBA's academic staff at reputable, mostly European universities, as well as invited lectures given by foreign scientists and other relevant guests at FBA, demonstrates a sound and vibrant connection with the international academic and scientific community.

While several of the FBA's staff are involved in the evaluation of national project calls (TAČR, GAČR), the faculty did not demonstrate involvement of its staff in the evaluation of European project/programme calls, leaving room for further improvement.

Recommendations:

To further develop the FBA's recognition in the international research community, we recommend:

- Further increase the participation of FBA's academic staff at the editorial boards of international scientific journals.
- Further support individual memberships and also establish an institutional membership in international professional and academic organisations, research initiatives, and communities.
- Increase and support involvement of the FBA's staff in the evaluation of national/European research project/programme calls.
- Increase involvement of the FBA's staff in COST actions and, in general, in EU structures.

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.

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:

FBA shows very good achievements in winning research projects in domestic grant schemes, contributing to relatively stable domestic grant funding income during the monitored period from the projects with both beneficiary and partner roles. Yet, domestic projects clearly dominate over the international projects, with only a several international projects presented, and a low involvement of the FBA's staff in COST actions.

For most of the presented research projects, the contribution to the FBA's mission is clearly explained and justified. Also, the faculty clearly articulates how the knowledge was generated and presented within the academic community. For most of the examples, it also explains how the knowledge was transmitted. The application potential remains mostly in-house focused, through creating knowledge for further use in advisory, consulting, teaching, and student development. Yet, the faculty also demonstrates the application potential of its research projects for its external partners or businesses.

The presented research projects fall into the broad spectrum of research areas of FBA within the social sciences, mostly in economics and business. Other relevant fields include psychology and cognitive sciences. However, while some of the presented projects are potentially interdisciplinary, the FBA's research typically remains focused within the domains researched at FBA, and the exploitation potential of interdisciplinary opportunities remains underutilised. The same applies to the research collaboration with other units of the university and the involvement of other entities, such as the relevant stakeholders, in the research projects.

Recommendations:

- Strengthen the focus on international research projects.
- Foster interdisciplinary research and collaboration with external partners as well as partners from other units of the university.

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:

FBA convincingly demonstrates its ability to deliver research results with an impact on society, providing a list of results with very clear and existing applications in practice (mainly in public and business sectors) as well as in educational activities. Such focus is aligned with the FBA's mission and the thematic areas of its research. Furthermore, even in the cases where the actual impact is still to take place in the future, the target groups and application pathways are clearly indicated.

While the quantity of achieved research results with impact on society is fairly proportionate to the FBA's R&D&I capacities, room for further growth still exists.

When it comes to the gender dimension and sustainability, except for the research results that are thematically directly linked to these domains, these aspects are supported mostly indirectly, or their support is not specifically demonstrated, leaving room for further improvements.

Recommendations:

- Conceptualize measurement and reporting of research impact - encompassing scholarly, practical, societal, policy, and educational contributions beyond traditional academic metrics.
- Cultivate a culture of impact-driven scholarship; i.e., strengthen the application potential and research impact of the research activities from the outset of the research process (i.e., conceptualizing of research project should consider its social impact). This approach can be embedded across the faculty's research activities. For example, internal funding requirements should have very specific metrics in place to establish research impact potential of each project.
- Where applicable, emphasise gender and sustainability dimensions in your research impact and determine objective measures to account for such impact.

TRANSFER OF RESULTS INTO PRACTICE

3.5 Transfer of results into practice

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

Rating [1–5]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:

The transfer of FBA's research results into practice mainly relies on contract research studies and assignments (mainly methodologies and studies for ministries, tailor-made contract and applied research projects, mostly demand-driven, for companies and NGOs), consulting projects, and executive education units (Executive MBA, open and customised courses). Such pathways for commercialising the R&D&I results are adequate to FBA's research focus.

Typical R&D&I results' users include governmental entities (such as ministries), non-profit organisations, as well as private enterprises - multinational corporations, SMEs, and entrepreneurs. While FBA claims to actively engage in applied and contract research partnerships with various stakeholders, the SER provides a list of different partners and some framework examples, but it does not offer more specific details.

The presented examples of transfer of R&D&I results into practice are consistent with the researched areas and the types of research results being produced. Also, the presented approach to and achievements in the transfer of R&D&I results into practice are consistent with the FBA's mission.

The variety of contract research projects indicates a wider involvement of researchers. Also, it is plausible to see that, compared to the previous evaluation, FAB puts an emphasis also on new types of users, such as NGOs or cultural institutions.

It is plausible to see that FBA is gradually increasing its ability to obtain funding from non-public, non-grant sources. While the amounts generated from different resources (i.e., the contract research, consulting activities, and paid training) are volatile over the years, the overall trend is positive. Yet, compared to the R&D&I capacities or performance in other types of R&D&I funding obtained (such as publicly funded projects), the potential of this type of funding still can be further explored.

Recommendations:

- Include the emphasis on generating social impact when transferring R&D&I results into practice into the faculty's mission.
- Support more centralised mechanisms to develop, maintain, and capitalise the connections with practice.
- Act towards further increasing and reducing the volatility in non-public revenues, not dependent on individual tasks or 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:

FBA's R&D&I popularisation and communication activities include a blend of regular activities together with individual one-time activities/appearances, which is positive. Also, FBA's faculty members actively participate in diverse educational initiatives, and contribute by delivering talks at high schools. Furthermore, FBA developed a systematic approach to media coverage and employs a media relations specialist who helps with publicity of publication outputs through popular articles, interviews, and media commentaries. Also, the report provides evidence of the achieved increase in media publicity.

FBA offers several examples of innovative science communication activities, such as publishing managerial summaries of publication outputs that are shared with relevant media outlets.

On the other hand, the report does not provide specific indicators and their values to evidence the reach of the presented popularisation activities (e.g., number of social media profiles' followers, etc.). Also, it would be good to see the popularisation activities systematised by target groups. Notably, it would be interesting to see how FBA aims to catch up with the recent trends of reaching out to the younger generations (Gen Z, Gen Alpha).

Recommendations:

- Continue with a systematic approach to publicity and media, developing tailored strategies to different target groups (from the broader public through future students to current professionals).
- Explore the opportunities of implementing citizen science initiatives.

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:

FBA convincingly demonstrates how it has reflected on the recommendations from the previous evaluation. Notably, it improved the internal support structures needed to expand the EU-level funding applications, with tangible outcomes already seen (in terms of the projects obtained). It also convincingly presents the improved strategic focus on continuity and brand building, including increased self-awareness of tangible results of the implemented projects, and sharing knowledge within the faculty. Further, FBA presented concrete steps towards building partnerships with other academic centres (within the university sector) with technology and applied science profiles, to engage in technology transmission, commercialisation, and academic start-up programmes.

In terms of visibility in the scientific community, FBA has followed the recommendation to engage in editorial boards in quality journals and in academic and professional organisations. However, further efforts can be made to progress towards presence at higher-ranked outlets and recognized professional bodies (i.e., Academy of Management, EGOS, and others). In terms of its visibility in the broader public, FBA's staff further enhanced its engagement in popularising their research through both social media as well as press, TV, and radio.

Yet, some of the recommendations were, to date, addressed just partially. For example, the need for securing research funding from the business sector remains open, as the contract research funding is still significantly lower compared to public grants, and revenues from non-public, non-grant sources are relatively low and unstable. Also, merely individual examples rather than a systemic change at the FBA level to ensure continuity of the initiated impactful activities were presented. Finally, the indicated potential for open lectures for the general public and for prospective students has not been fully exploited.

Recommendations:

- Review your mission statement
The mission statement of FBA stipulates that:

“Our mission is to generate and transmit knowledge as well as to develop skills and form attitudes which are necessary for the successful management of companies and organizations in a changing world. We accomplish this mission by actively engaging in basic, applied, and contract research, as well as teaching and industry engagement. These activities are always pursued with a potential practical impact in mind.”

It is recommended that FBA reviews the mission statement and aligns it with the strengths and distinctive capabilities of the faculty.

- **Strengthen Your International Engagement**
The global presence of FBA should be further enhanced. This implies increased participation by staff in editorial boards of international scientific journals, along with active involvement in global academic organizations and communities. Support for staff in evaluating national/European research projects and engagement with EU structures like COST actions is crucial. A strategic focus should be placed on securing and collaborating on more international research projects, which will boost FBA's reputation and foster global knowledge exchange and funding.
- **Redefine and Measure Your Research Impact**
The understanding of research impact by FBA should be further broadened beyond traditional academic metrics. Impact should be conceptualized to encompass scholarly, practical, societal, policy, and educational contributions – in a transparent and outcome-focused manner. Integration of gender and sustainability dimensions is also crucial, where applicable in research. The measurement and reporting of research impact should reflect a comprehensive view of its value and reach. At present, the impact is presented in a form of narrative around individual projects – further quantification of the impact (both at project level and faculty) level is highly recommended.
- **Embed Social Impact in Your Mission and Practice Transfer**
The commitment to generating social impact should be explicitly integrated into FBA's mission statement. Furthermore, a strong emphasis should be placed on effectively transferring R&D&I results into practice, ensuring that generated knowledge leads to tangible benefits for society. Robust pathways for the dissemination, engagement, and application of research findings should be developed. By making social impact a core part of its identity and operational processes, FBA can reinforce its relevance and contribution to the wider community.
- **Centralize Practice Connections and Diversify Revenues**
To maximize practical impact and financial sustainability, more centralized mechanisms for developing, maintaining, and capitalizing on connections with industry and practice should be supported by FBA. This streamlined approach enhances partnership development and knowledge transfer. Concurrently, efforts should be focused on achieving more stable, non-public revenues, reducing dependence on individual tasks or projects. This diversification of funding, rooted in strong external partnerships, provides FBA with greater financial resilience and supports long-term research goals.
- **Enhance Your Public Engagement and Dissemination**
A systematic approach to publicity and media engagement is essential for effective communication of research findings and their impact by FBA to diverse audiences. This requires the development of tailored communication strategies for various target groups, from the broader public and future students to current professionals and policymakers. Additionally, opportunities for implementing citizen science initiatives should be explored to broaden public involvement in 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	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 Business Administration has made notable progress since the last evaluation and successfully addressed a large part of previous recommendations. Notably, it has enhanced internal support for EU funding, leading to positive outcomes already observed. Strategic focus on continuity, brand building, and knowledge sharing has improved, alongside new partnerships. FBA's scientific visibility has grown through increased engagement in quality journals and academic organizations, and public engagement via media has also risen. However, there are several avenues for further development – explained in detail in Section 3.7 and summarized below.	
Summary recommendations: To foster continued growth and maximize its influence, the Faculty of Business Administration should consider implementing the following strategic actions. These steps are designed to enhance its academic standing, societal contribution, and operational effectiveness. • Align the mission statement with the faculty's unique strengths and capabilities. • Enhance global presence through increased staff participation in international academic activities and securing international research projects. • Broaden the definition and measurement of research impact to include scholarly, practical, societal, policy, and educational contributions, integrating gender and sustainability where applicable. • Explicitly integrate social impact into the FBA's mission and develop robust pathways for transferring research results into practice for societal benefit. • Establish centralized mechanisms for industry connections and diversify revenue streams to achieve greater financial resilience. • Develop systematic approaches for public engagement and media dissemination, utilizing tailored communication strategies.	

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Informatics and Statistics

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 Informatics and Statistics (FIS) at the Prague University of Economics and Business (VŠE) is one of the leading institutions in data science in the Czech Republic. The main fields of activity are quantitative methods (econometrics and operations research, statistics and demography) and applied informatics (enterprise information systems, data warehouses and tools and procedures that enable data evaluation, artificial intelligence and machine learning). They engage in both applied projects with the public sector and industry and have a long-standing record in their respective disciplines.

Apart from “Social Sciences” as the primary FORD category, it should be emphasized that the faculty also fundamentally contributes to “Engineering and Technology”.

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

FIS continues to work in internationally well-connected activities and reports also growth (in terms of faculty and students in the last period. Various successful continued international collaborations (Data Management Association (DAMA), the IEEE, the DBpedia Association, the Data Science Society) are reported, as well as collaborations with strong international research partners (UC Berkeley, University of Vienna, University of Maribor, and Technische Hochschule Würzburg-Schweinfurt, Leibniz Center for Informatics, etc.). A solid publication output is reported with partial success in Q1 journals, plus some Q2 and also Q3 journals.

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.

FIS itself indicated high number of older professors and associate professors. This may represent the risk for the sustainability and development of the faculty in next 5-10 years. Explanation shall be provided how FIS plan to deal with this situation, what mechanisms are in place to support early career researchers and post-docs, especially women.

There are several high feature collaborations (UCB) and national projects – so overall tables and descriptions looks impressive. Given the size of the faculty and the number of senior academics, however, the performance in research excellence and internationalization may be stronger – e.g., given the number of international research grants, participation in prestigious editorial journal boards, etc.

Recommendations:

- Keep on your successful engagements in international networks and projects, which are a strength of the faculty, which should be sustained.
- Publication outputs, while solid, should be increased with a focus on quality, particularly targeting more “towards” Q1 journals or could also report top conference venues (with their own rankings, e.g., CORE in the case of CS/IS).
- Given age structure and also development, one may be tempted to sense a degree of stagnation rather than growth, despite the staff growth numbers reported. The next period should be focused to reconsolidate and ensure that the successful drivers are not lost, but handed over to new faculty, strengthening and incentivizing promising younger faculty.

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:

FIS prepared the list of the large number of mostly Czech research projects and contractual research activities. Compared to the last periods, there are again also successful projects in EU programmes and international collaborations, which however have not increased, and in particular mostly in the first half of the reporting period with lower success rate for international funding/projects reported in the second half. Nonetheless, the faculty continues operating on international standards level with very good demonstrated connections.

There is a large variety of topics – so it would be good to clarify, if (given the application of quantitative methods) FIS does not really prioritize the topics. This approach could be seen both, as the advantage (large number of various projects) and weakness (lacking international excellence in research). For instance, particularly successful topic areas like Open Data and Linked Data which at a European level have evolved to more general topics around Data Governance and Data Spaces could be potentially more actively continued and pursued.

Recommendations:

- Focus on specific success topics with known strengths or develop a strategy and priorities for focus topics to avoid a potential overdiversification in a fast-moving field with many disruptive changes (for instance, IS vs. rapid AI developments).

3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society

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

Rating [1–5]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:

The faculty has a strong record of collaborations with Public Administration with various active projects that contribute directly to society by impacting public policy, e.g., by analysing the impact of digitalization/technology on society, or by conducting applied projects that require data analytics in collaboration with public bodies.

Research results are commented on and many of them shows the application potential. More indicators to quantify impact on society shall be provided – in some cases the text only promises the impact that “will” happen, but after 4 years from the result existence, data on social impact performance would be useful.

Also, economically the faculty emphasizes that 80% of the department’s budget come from outside the university budget, which further demonstrates impact and transfer.

Recommendations:

- Since the past report, while the main focus of collaborations seems to be still on the public sector, we recommend to keep the strong ties and direct societal impact through these public sector connections.

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:

FIS names various collaborations with big enterprises (KPMG, SKODA) that contribute to practice directly, indirectly through practice-oriented collaborations with the public sector, but also in terms of education, e.g., through executive education activities, also on topic of private-public interest

(e.g., project on "Understanding Defence – a Business Perspective". Overall, the partners represent a good mix of public and private entities with maybe potential to further diversify on the industry side.

A potential question not entirely clear from the report alone is how the quite diverse topics align with the research foci of the faculty strategically, and/or how these collaborations could be sustainably strengthened to also create potential income streams to the university.

FIS presents the existence of donations. It would be good to see, how this private money is strategically used for the capacity building, young researchers, student projects, etc.

Recommendations:

- While the overall collaboration portfolio seems quite healthy and demonstrates demand of the department's expertise in practice, apparently the non-public practice partners have changed quite significantly compared to the last period. A recommendation for the next period could be to strive for and emphasize also on stabilizing longer-term industry collaborations, to appear less demand-driven but also develop leadership in the areas of strong research at the faculty.

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:

Again, this section presents a lot of very positive initiatives towards the public, including activities towards schools. The wide range of activities here makes it slightly difficult to tie these activities to the research focus/priorities at the department.

Recommendations:

- We recommend to sustain and continue successful activities in terms of third mission communication to the public and schools. Particularly this is important in times of disruptive technological changes and impact.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module 3

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

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

Rating [1–5]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:

We indeed recognize increased activities and see further potential now on public/private partnership projects (e.g., working jointly on SDGs and societal challenges, e.g., Data Governance practices and Data Spaces and implementing a European Data Strategy).

The question for activities into intellectual property trading, nor in the area of spin-off projects, sale of licenses, sale of patents, could not be addressed yet in the last period, apart from some starting measures.

Recommendations:

- Expanding its activities into intellectual property management, or in the area of incentivizing entrepreneurship and spin-off projects should further be addressed in an even more holistic strategy, potentially on the university level, rather than only per faculty.

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 has a strong position in data science, statistics, and applied informatics, with well-established collaborations in both academia and practice. The faculty maintains active ties with international networks and partners and demonstrates robust societal impact, particularly through collaborations with public administration and large enterprises. Research outputs are solid, with a number of publications in high-quality journals and applied results that directly influence policy and practice. FIS also shows success in attracting significant external funding. Engagement in popularization and outreach, including towards schools, is assessed as very good.

Nevertheless, challenges are evident. The age structure of professors raises concerns about sustainability, and support for younger academics—particularly women—needs strengthening. Research activities, while broad, risk overdiversification and would benefit from clearer strategic priorities in rapidly evolving fields such as AI and data governance. International research projects remain relatively limited and could be expanded further. While collaborations with private and

public sector partners are strong, they should be stabilized for long-term continuity and strategically linked to research priorities. Finally, activities in intellectual property management, spin-offs, and entrepreneurship are still underdeveloped and call for a more holistic approach.

Summary recommendations:

- Strengthen renewal of academic staff by supporting early-career researchers, postdocs, and women academics to ensure sustainability.
- Focus research efforts on selected priority areas (e.g., AI, data governance, data spaces) to build international excellence and visibility.
- Expand participation in prestigious international research projects and increase outputs in top-tier journals and conferences.
- Stabilize and strategically develop long-term collaborations with industry partners, ensuring alignment with faculty research strengths.
- Develop a clearer strategy for intellectual property management, spin-offs, and entrepreneurship, ideally coordinated at university level.

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Economics

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 Economics (FE) has 6 departments and two sub-units (Laboratory of Experimental Economics, Institute for Expertise). FE has a long-term research agenda encompassing a range of priorities, including qualitative and quantitative assessments of state interventions and regulations, economic efficiency, quality of life, as well as theoretical and practical aspects of regional development. However, the English website and supplementary materials do not provide access to the full research plan, its strategy, or any evaluation of its progress over time. Annual reports presented on the English website are only available in Czech language.

FE does not present itself like a regular faculty of economics at comparable universities or business schools at the international level. Some professors (e.g., Macroeconomics or monetary economics) one would expect to be members in the faculty (or even the department) of economics are situated in other faculties. This reduces the visibility of economics research at VŠE to outside visitors or evaluators. At the same time there are several departments in FE that one would not necessarily expect to find there (e.g., Philosophy or Law).

The total professorial staff of FE consists of approx. 71 people (about 50 FTE). The composition of the professors is highly imbalanced. 75% of professors and the vast majority of associate professors is over 60 years old. Half of the professors are over 70 years old. There are no women among professors. Such an imbalanced composition is not suitable for an economics department that aims to be state-of-the-art and internationally competitive. An extreme concentration of very senior professors prevents young scholars from within VŠE to make in-house careers and reduces the number of positions that can be internationally opened.

FE (perhaps along with the entire school which suffers from similar imbalances also in other faculties) urgently needs to develop a strategy of rapid rejuvenation which should be considered as a great opportunity to bring fresh impulses to the faculty. The absence of women among professors and the underrepresentation of women in higher academic ranks hinders the organization's efforts to foster an inclusive and equitable work environment. This massive gender imbalance and the sheer lack of female role models may discourage younger female academics from pursuing long-term careers within the faculty.

In the monitored period, FE acquired 10 research grants from the Czech Science Foundation, 5 contract research activities, resulting in 7 different research results (reports, analysis, handbooks). Members of FE published 9-12 journal papers in Q1+Q2 annually. This performance is commented on in detail in particular sections below.

Recommendation:

- Develop and implement a strategy of rapid rejuvenation of professorial body. Improve gender balance among full professors.

RECOGNITION BY THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY

3.2 Recognition by the research community

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

Rating [1–5]:

2 - Below average

Qualitative assessment:⁵

The reported research performance of the faculty includes three national-level Czech awards from outside the university, participation in the editorial boards of seven academic journals (three of which are ranked in Q1/Q2), a broad list of invited lectures, and involvement in two national project evaluations.

These activities indicate a clear effort by the faculty to enhance its international engagement, and some notable progress has been achieved in this area. However, the level of participation appears to be limited to a small group of individuals—primarily 3 to 5 professors and associate professors out of a total of 37 (as shown in Table 3.1.1.). While there are exemplary contributions from individuals such as doc. Čermáková and prof. Pělucha, these efforts remain concentrated within a narrow segment of the academic staff.

Moreover, the overall number of faculty members participating in international journal editorial boards remains modest, and most of the journals are ranked in the lower to mid-tiers of the Web of Science. Participation in the evaluation of European research programmes is not currently evident.

Efforts to build and promote institutional collaboration with foreign partners would benefit from more consistent visibility. Notably, the English-language webpage dedicated to international integration (<https://nf.vse.cz/english/international-integration/>) appears not to have been updated since 2019.

Recommendations:

- Increase the number of staff participating in editorial boards of high-featured international journals and evaluating (international) programme schemes.
- Consistently present your international partner institution in research (not teaching), both in the report and at the faculty web-site.
- Prague is a beautiful city that many people like to visit. Consider programmes targeting professors from abroad who are willing to visit (and perhaps teach short courses) repeatedly at VŠE. Also try to accommodate for double appointments if possible (Niclas Berggren is a very successful example).

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.

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:

The faculty reported one contract research project funded by the European Commission and nine projects supported by the Czech Grant Agency. The faculty served as the lead institution on all ten Czech research projects. These projects align with the broadly defined research mission and vision of the faculty. However, due to the nature of the Czech Grant Agency's funding scheme, which primarily supports academic publishing, the practical or application-oriented potential of many of these projects appears limited.

Considering the faculty's stated capacities and commitment to international collaboration, the overall number of research projects over the five-year period appears modest and concentrated within a single domestic funding source. The reasons behind the absence of a more diverse grant portfolio, particularly the lack of participation in European research excellence programmes, are not clearly addressed in the report.

The documentation also suggests minimal collaboration with other university units, despite the presence of departments, institutes, and research teams across the institution that work on similar or complementary topics. This may point to a degree of institutional isolation.

Furthermore, while partnerships with institutions such as the Ocean University of China and the University of Glasgow are mentioned in Section 3.2, it remains unclear how these relationships translate into concrete research outcomes, particularly in terms of joint project development or funding acquisition.

Recommendations:

- Diversify the research project portfolio, especially, bring the excellent international research project on board (COST, Horizon, etc.)
- Build the collaboration and join project cooperation with other units of your university to strengthen your research performance.

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]:

3 - Average

Qualitative assessment:

The faculty presented seven research outputs, primarily focused on regional development and social cohesion, and indicated their applicability in practice. This thematic emphasis appears to be the central focus across the reported results. While the relevance of these outcomes for practical application is apparent, there is room for improvement in systematically tracking their real-world impact—such as the extent of their use, the stakeholders involved, and frequency of application—supported by transparent and verifiable evidence.

Table 3.4.1. is intended to list all research results; however, it includes only seven entries. Given the faculty's stated R&D&I capacity, this output appears relatively modest and may not fully reflect the institution's potential in terms of applied research performance.

Recommendations:

- Increase the number of research results with impact on society.
- Be ready to systematically demonstrate the impact via clearly set and monitored indicators.

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:

The faculty demonstrates the transfer of research results into practice through the activities of its Institute of Expertise, which provides expert opinions to financial institutions. These opinions, grounded in financial and econometric analysis, successfully attract non-public funding. Additionally, the faculty benefits from private sector support in the form of donations for conferences and various academic awards, further indicating engagement with external stakeholders.

The total volume of these external resources remains relatively modest and shows considerable year-to-year variability. Moreover, the consultancy activities, while valuable, do not appear to be

clearly integrated with the faculty's broader research projects or contractual research efforts, which may limit their potential to contribute to long-term research development and impact.

FE and VŠE as a whole do not seem to have a clearly articulated policy on "consulting", advising, and "commercialization" of research results. Such activities may be socially desirable and deserve to be encouraged and (financially) supported by the university in some instances. For example, a particular consulting job may help academics to acquire or develop some quantitative techniques they would not have acquired otherwise. This knowledge can then serve to train future generations of students to become more competent analysts or consultants. In other instances, this is not the case. It is not in the interest of the Czech taxpayer to subsidize consulting for private firms that could have been done by private consultancies. Whether providing consulting by academics paid by the university is socially desirable may depend on whether there is market failure in the particular domain of consulting. But if there is a reasonably functioning market for private consulting, the main task of the university should be seen in teaching their students skills that are demanded by the private consulting companies rather than providing the consulting themselves. Consulting at market rates should be done by companies outside the university (which were perhaps founded by former students or former professors). Consulting at below-market rates can provide unfair (state-subsidized) competition for private consulting companies, and may undermine the functioning of markets for consulting.

Recommendations:

- Develop a coherent (perhaps university-wide) policy on consulting, advising, and commercialization of R&D&I.

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:

Overall, popularization and communication with the public is very good on a national level. Faculty members are regularly invited to contribute to national media on various platforms, which is a notable strength of the FE. Additionally, the faculty organizes several events for alumni, the public, and academic conferences, further demonstrating its engagement in networking with various communities.

However, there is scope of improvement of communication at the international level. The faculty's presentation on its English-language website needs to be improved. Key sections such as Grants, International Collaboration, Annual Reports, and Alumni appear outdated, with information from previous years missing or only available in Czech. This discrepancy may create confusion and highlights the need for a more systematic and consistent approach to engaging with an international audience.

Recommendations:

- Make your English language website more accessible and update it regularly. Provide timely information for an international audience.

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]:

2 - Below average

Qualitative assessment:

The faculty has reported on initiatives aimed at enhancing its scientific profile, particularly through support for project preparation, promoting high-quality publications, and fostering international collaboration. Special attention has been given to doctoral students and early-career researchers, with financial incentives and broader institutional support aimed at encouraging their growth.

However, the evaluation of these newly introduced policies remains unclear. The report does not specify when these policies were implemented, how frequently they were applied, or whether they achieved the expected outcomes. Additionally, the number of research projects and high-impact publications remains relatively low, and international projects are notably scarce. This suggests that while the policies may have had some positive effect, they have not fully delivered on their intended benefits and may require further refinement or complementary changes to yield more substantial results.

FE seems to have had only limited success in implementing some of the key recommendations from the previous evaluation which are means they are also key recommendations of the current evaluation. For example, the report from 2020 criticizes the age structure of professors (“needs replenishment and new blood recruitment”), that FE needs to become more engaged in the international research discourse (“lacking in a more strategic international research focus and ... needs to develop its European and International research focus”), and that the organization and structure of the faculty (and the allocation of competence in economics throughout the entire university) is not in line with international best practice (“modernise its departmental structures to better reflect modern day social science disciplines ... - the faculty seems torn in its mission and this needs consideration”).

Recommendations:

- Develop a strategy to address key issues of age and gender structure in the professorial body (“rejuvenation”), to become more internationally oriented (through hiring, visitor programme, part-time affiliation of foreign faculty, own participation in international research discourse), and make the university’s competence in economics more visible by reconsidering the organizational structure (this task needs to involve other faculties).

EVALUATED UNIT RATING

Evaluation of unit	
Having evaluated the individual criteria of module M3, please summarise your evaluation in the context of the module, describing and justifying the strengths and weaknesses of the unit being evaluated.	
3.1 Introductory information about the unit under evaluation	NOT RATED
3.2 Recognition by the research community	2 - Below average
3.3 Research projects	3 - Average
3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society	3 - Average
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	3 - Average
3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module	2 - Below average
Average rating [1–5]:	3 - Average
Grade [A–D]:	C
Summary assessment: The faculty demonstrates solid engagement in certain areas, particularly in popularization and national-level visibility. Faculty members are active in Czech media, organize conferences and alumni events, and maintain links with external stakeholders through consultancy and advisory work. The Institute of Expertise and selected professors contribute to societal impact. Overall, the faculty shows potential to contribute to public discourse and applied research in regional development and social cohesion. At the same time, the evaluation points to several structural weaknesses that significantly hinder competitiveness. The professorial staff is imbalanced in terms of age and gender, which limits renewal, inclusivity, and international openness. Research activity is concentrated in a small group of individuals, project funding is narrow in scope (largely national grants), and international collaboration remains modest and insufficiently reflected in joint projects. The faculty's English-language presentation is outdated, reducing its visibility abroad, while consulting activities lack a coherent institutional policy. Recommendations from the previous evaluation—such as strategic internationalization, and modernization of organizational structures—have not been sufficiently addressed. Despite some new initiatives, their impact is unclear and overall progress limited.	
Summary recommendations: • Rejuvenate and diversify the professorial body by creating opportunities for younger scholars, improving gender balance, and opening positions to international candidates.	

- Strengthen internationalization through active participation in European research programmes (e.g., Horizon, COST), double appointments, visiting professorships, and sustained partnerships with foreign institutions.
- Diversify research funding and collaboration by engaging in projects beyond national grants and fostering interdisciplinary cooperation within the university.
- Develop a coherent policy on consulting and commercialization to ensure alignment with the faculty's mission and avoid unfair competition with private sector services.
- Systematically demonstrate and track societal impact of research outputs using clear indicators, evidence of application, and engagement with stakeholders.
- Improve international visibility and communication by regularly updating the English-language website and presenting the faculty's research achievements consistently to a global audience.

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Management

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 Management (FM) is uniquely located in Jindřichův Hradec, outside of Prague and consists of 3 academic departments (Management, Data Analytics and Social sciences). With a strategic vision to empower individuals to address societal challenges through management education and research, FM operates across three strategic pillars: education, research-led teaching, and societal engagement.

The faculty offers bachelor's, master's, and doctoral programmes with a strong emphasis on academic quality, practical relevance, and internationalization, as reflected in high graduate satisfaction (90%) and AACSB accreditation.

FM's research activities, despite the institution's small size, consistently produce societally high-impact outputs. The faculty has been successfully involved in applied research projects on the local and regional scale, which constitutes their distinct strength, and to an extent also internationally.

Recent strategic developments include the establishment of support units, a significant increase in project application submissions, and more extensive collaboration with industry, public institutions, and local communities.

Another prominent focus of FM includes lifelong learning – in line with the university's overall commitment, regional support, and interdisciplinary research aligned with global sustainability goals. Its flexible, innovation and context-oriented approach continues to enhance its societal relevance, academic standing, and regional impact.

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:⁶

FM declares being widely recognized for its academic excellence and active involvement in academic communities. FM members are engaged in international associations such as the AMA, AM, and EMA, and they regularly organise major academic events. They also play key roles in reputable academic journals, serving as editors, reviewers, and conference committee members, and contribute to journals indexed in Web of Science and Scopus. They are further frequent expert commentators in national media, especially on topics like pension reform and education policy.

Moreover, FM members participate in national advisory bodies, including the Czech Science Foundation, and contribute to international accreditation agencies like SKVC Lithuania. They are involved in shaping national and global policies, including through roles in the World Health Organization.

The faculty maintains strong academic exchange, hosting international scholars and being regularly invited to present abroad. FM staff also serve on doctoral programme boards across Czech universities, highlighting their integration into the broader academic landscape.

FM collaborates on international research projects with institutions across Europe and beyond, including the Institute for Advanced Studies Vienna, NTNU Trondheim, SGH Warsaw School of Economics... FM regularly hosts guest lecturers from partner universities and sends its own representatives to speak at international institutions like Vrije Universiteit Brussel and City University of Hong Kong.

FM also contributes significantly to national and international research evaluation, participating in funding panels (e.g., GAČR, TAČR) and working with knowledge transfer organizations in Europe, and more.

FM's excellence is frequently recognized through awards (Rector's Award of VŠE, acknowledgements from the Hlávka Foundation, Best Reviewer Award at the Academy of Management Conference). FM's research has had tangible policy impact on EU health policies and national tourism law reform in the Czech Republic.

Recommendations:

- Further build on the regional and local identity to exploit research results and develop new relevant projects to continue contributing to regional development and leverage regional societal expertise, also on the European scale. This strength and its uniquely societally-relevant regional angle could be more visibly articulated and communicated to academic, policy, and general audience and more prominently cultivated as a unique profile of FM within the university; collaborate more systematically with other faculties to disseminate own research and seek partnerships for enhancing capacities for research performance of FM.
- Ensure more even involvement in active research across staff members whose contracts include research. The report shows concentration of publications and research activities around a few individuals. This objective will require a multi-layered strategy of developing an incentive structure for sustainable research engagement, building research capacities across staff members, clarity as to internal access to resources, as well as operationalisation of the regional expertise and the ability to communicate its value for societal impact and interdisciplinary input in design and implementation of joint projects with cross-university and international partners.

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.

- Systematise an overview of staff roles on editorial boards of international journals and in conferences. Support involvement in research and editorial leadership positions in reputable initiatives. Raise awareness about potential reputational harm (personal and institutional) of participation in initiatives which are known as 'predatory' journals and publishers and are not sufficiently recognised by global academic communities.

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:

The topics of the research projects are diverse and related to current research interests in management (e.g., AI adoption, AI social design, healthcare and drugs, managerial decisions). All of the research projects presented in the report have a significant social impact component.

The proportion of projects financed through international competitive grants remains moderate, although it has increased since the last evaluation. Over the last five years, FM has received a total of €340,000 as a beneficiary and €219,000 as a participant. For the moment, contractual research remains weak given significant efforts deployed to interact with relevant stakeholders. We can expect an increased research contractualization with companies or public institutions in the near future.

At the local level, self-assessments of research projects provided limited examples of interaction with other university faculties, despite the presence of various departments, institutes, and research units engaged in similar or complementary areas. This may reflect a degree of relative isolation of the unit, but it also indicates potential for improvement in fostering internal synergies.

At the international level, there are similar units and faculties that have a regional impact and social role. Identifying such potential partners and seeking sustained cooperation, including exchange of experience/best practices in research design/implementation/dissemination, should help adopt and a more strategic approach to local and regional development and thus enrich future projects and activities. An important dimension of such research, and a potential for FM research leadership role, would be a comparative perspective on different approaches to regional knowledges and their importance in global scholarship.

Recommendations:

- Foster, articulate, and communicate regional expertise in a few areas to be chosen strategically based on the research record and seek leadership positions (coordinator of the project as an institution, Principle Investigator as an individual staff member) on international/externally funded projects in order to gain visibility beyond the region; continue to obtain GAČR or TAČR projects and integrate international networks on regional issues, including by initiating and active participation in building research consortia (intra-university, cross-institutional in Czechia and internationally).

- Given the small size and limited resources of FM, strengthen cooperation on projects with other faculties and universities in the area, including foreign ones.

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:

Proportionality to the unit's R&D&I capacities: The collaboration with local actors (hospitals, tourism agency...) and the involvement of large institutions such as the Bavarian-Czech Academic Agency, Czech government, suggest a well-leveraged use of regional and cross-border partnerships, indicating effective use of institutional capacity.

Contribution to the mission and vision: The emphasis on practical application, particularly through stakeholder engagement (e.g., workshops, expert input), and the development of implementable frameworks and guidelines, indicates a strong orientation toward knowledge transfer and societal engagement—key mission components for most business schools or faculties of management.

Consideration of the gender dimension: According to description of various projects, the gender dimension is consistently taken into account. We are not presented with sufficient information as to whether this dimension is considered already at the stage of research project conception and design, or this is an a posteriori assessment/re-evaluation. That is, it is not known whether FM takes a strategic approach to gender diversity and what such an approach would consist of, beyond numerical composition/quotas.

Consideration of sustainability: Most of the projects do not directly reference sustainability goals, even if FM aims to have a stronger alignment with SDGs. This is another area where FM could develop explicit synergies and articulate a more systematic description of the link between its mission statement and concrete research activities.

Recommendations:

- Continue existing collaborations with local partners and mobilise more systematically and strategically the expertise of strong universities in the regions.
- Create suitable platforms for the use of research results (demand-oriented or supply-oriented).

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:

Most of FM's projects, including Interreg, V4s, and EEA initiatives, are driven by a strong imperative for societal relevance, particularly in the areas of lifelong learning, sustainability, and quality of life. The faculty aims to contribute to the sustainability goals have been prioritized. These efforts have the greatest impact at the regional and national levels and are commendable. We recommend these accomplishments are communicated more visibly towards internal and external audiences.

To formalize knowledge transfer and stakeholder engagement, FM established the Knowledge Transfer Centre (KTC), replacing informal networks with a structured, bidirectional approach (academic research ↔ real-world expertise). This has been in response to the recommendations of the previous evaluation report and showcases the capacity to use evaluation in a strategic manner, as well as organisational and institutional potential for a reform. The main focus of KTC includes several key activities:

- Serving as a single point of contact for external partners to showcase FM's expertise and facilitate collaborations.
- Contract research management: matching faculty experts, supporting negotiations, and overseeing projects (e.g., urban revitalization and hospital efficiency studies).
- Research dissemination: partnering with PR to promote findings through the media, social networks, and events, including executive summaries and SDG impact assessments. Student internships and applied projects: 80+ partner organizations, real-world challenges integrated into courses (84 projects completed during the evaluation period).
- Industry partnerships: collaborations with associations such as Alliance for Youth and companies or institutions (E.ON, Nestlé) for student programmes like the Winter Economic Academy.
- Stakeholder events: Organizing engagement activities (e.g., Innovation Week).
- Alumni relations including career tracking, networking, research collaborations.
- Prospective student engagement: open days, mentoring for high school competitions (SOČ).
- Lifelong learning: co-organizing University of the Third Age courses in the social sciences and public safety.

FM's knowledge transfer initiatives benefit five main stakeholder groups:

- **Research and Educational Institutions:** FM prioritizes high-impact publications (80+ Web of Science articles with half above median impact factor) and strategic collaborations (Erasmus, CESEENet and Horizon Europe). Notable projects include the economic burden of Alzheimer's disease, AI Social Design Thinking Lab, and Teaching Generation Snowflakes.

- **Business and Non-Profits:** KTC is the primary contact for contract research, with funding increasing from CZK 130,000 in 2021 to CZK 568,000 in 2024. This is a great to influence national policies and

deliver executive education. Projects include urban revitalization, gender data analysis, and family business succession.

- **Expert Community:** FM hosts public engagement events, such as Researcher's Night and Innovation Week and contributes to the media including Czech TV, radio, and podcasts on topics such as AI, pension reform, and digital marketing. This fosters dialogue with professionals and academics.
- **Students, Alumni, and Prospective Students:** FM offers research-led teaching, mentorship (SOČ), lifelong learning workshops (AI and digital literacy), and alumni networking. Outreach includes Open Days, "Student for a Day," and a national-level high school research evaluation.
- **General Public:** FM engages in science communication and public outreach to ensure research accessibility and societal impact.

KTC is a key element in FM's eco-system that strengthens its societal impact and third mission.

KTC is an excellent tool for transferring research. It facilitates the dissemination of applied research results and the development of relationships with stakeholders for future research projects. KTC also indirectly recruits new students, encourages alumni to recommend the institution and helps alumni for job placement.

Recommendations:

- Multiply different channels and regulatory frameworks to target policymakers, companies and other stakeholders in a synergetic manner.
- As per the recommendation above regarding research performance, streamline the main areas of FM expertise in order to be able to articulate clearly their value and uniqueness in the effort to increase the visibility of the unit outside.

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:

FM has adopted a strategic approach to societal impact influenced by the reform of AACSB accreditation criteria in 2020. This focus aligns with funding programmes such as Interreg and the Visegrad Funds, which prioritize societal impact. Following the last report, FM established stronger connections with academia, businesses, public institutions, and societal stakeholders.

FM encourages its academic staff to serve as knowledge transfer ambassadors and incorporates science communication into their annual performance evaluations. This is a valuable initiative.

They also engage the public through media and digital platforms such as LinkedIn, Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter, where they regularly share their research. They also contribute to podcasts, such as 10-Minute Faculty Talks (Podcast 1 and Podcast 2), as well as partner collaborations.

FM collaborates with the media plan at the university level to disseminate these outputs and has hired a professional agency to assist with communication and marketing activities.

Faculty members participate in expert panels, conferences, public discussions, interactive workshops, and educational events for the public. Their engagement in lifelong learning programmes is valuable to the entire university, especially their involvement with the University of the Third Age and the practical use of AI technology in teaching.

The faculty has several institutional partnerships to promote entrepreneurship and innovation. They are also members of the Universities for Entrepreneurship group and an inter-university platform called UNISTARTER that connects students and projects across universities and research institutions.

Finally, several initiatives have been implemented to improve internal communication and engage with students and alumni, such as newsletters and participating as evaluators in student competitions.

Recommendations:

- While we acknowledge the establishment of different media channels for communicating and disseminating knowledge produced in FM, the necessary next step is multifold: First, adopt a more discerning approach as to which media (including social media) are best suited for reliable and trustworthy knowledge transfer. This will have to be aligned with central university policies but consider for your unit-specific purposes the reputation and quality of the channels you routinely employ.
- Second, as per a follow-up to the recommendation for streamlining the unique expertise of FM, to will be more effective in terms of substantive knowledge dissemination and media strategies to focus on the key areas in which you excel and seek to communicate this research leadership in a substantive and specific manner, highlighting continuously its unique features, to garner sustained scholarly, policy and public recognition and thus also attract advisory roles/further research funding.
- Third, consider more systematically how valuable your research areas are to policymakers and cultural mediators, such as NGOs, social services, and other societal actors. To fully realise the potential of your impact towards such entities, a more granular media strategies need to be devised. Define your target populations, select the appropriate tools to effectively reach and engage them, and assess and measure your transformative capacity in this regard.

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-assessment of FM highlights several improvements and progress. Although a comprehensive analysis of available expertise has been conducted, the school's research identity remains unclear. Some progress has been made, such as aligning the research agenda with FM's strategy, tracking research activities, and fostering synergies between researchers and research

support. This includes research training for faculty members and PhD students. However, overall we note that FM may have not fully exploited its unique position and regional record to articulate its mission and strategy for research and impact to the extent that does justice to its own scholarly and societal accomplishments. Noting this, we are aware that FM can only (re-)define itself within the pre-given structure of the university and the external framework of performance criteria formulated at the governmental level, neither of which can be readily modified by a regional faculty struggling to keep up its activity amongst external pressures.

KTC seems successful in managing FM's engagement with external partners and developing contractual research. A significant number of research projects have applied for public grants, and the number of submitted projects has increased.

The development of the KTC strengthens transfer activities by monitoring and maintaining the cooperation partner network and improving knowledge transfer.

In terms of publication policy, FM introduced incentives to encourage project submissions, offering significant bonuses for international projects. FM also encourages representation on the editorial boards of prestigious journals. However, FM still needs to improve its academic visibility. Finally, thanks to the Annual Media Plan, there has been a real professionalization of public relations and popularization activities.

These achievements are remarkable and reflect the dedication not only of the faculty leadership but also of all FM members. However, FM is currently facing an identity challenge. Its strengths lie in its deep understanding of local and regional social and economic issues, yet it continues to present itself with a more generic management branding. This represents a major challenge for the future. FM must assess its positioning in comparison to other faculties and assert its unique identity. It also needs to clearly define its areas of expertise and focus more effectively on developing excellence in those fields.

Recommendations:

- Better define the relationship between the KTC and the project department and establish a balanced strategy between contractual research and public grants in order to bolster synergies across different activities.
- Clarify your research positioning compared to other VŠE faculties and similar faculties outside of VŠE. This may need to involve a revamp of what FM represents within the university, regionally, and externally but would also constitute an opportunity for a clarification of mission, communication of achievements and integrating individual research interests into a more systematic framework that increases visibility.
- Consider a more expansive interdisciplinary publication strategy, including encouraging research and publication for high-ranking policy and urban studies journals which can represent the diversity of research conducted by FM and which are not limited to management studies.
- Develop a mentoring programme with visiting professors and other faculties, such as the BA faculty in order to strengthen research capacities of all research active staff members.

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	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	3 - Average
3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module	4 - Very good
Average rating [1–5]:	3 - Average
Grade [A–D]:	C
Summary assessment: FM has undertaken tangible efforts to reform its internal processes and ensure quality of research and impact in response to the previous evaluation report. We acknowledge these reforms and their optimisation effects. While extensive and meticulous, such reforms have not, however, addressed the major strategic issue of the unit's identity internally and externally, the adequate exploitation of its expertise and research results, and the need to more accurately recognise, cultivate, and represent such the unit's challenges and accomplishments given their interdisciplinary regional nature. In our view, the underspecification of the unit's profile and activities, in which the designation of the 'faculty of management' reads as a misnomer to external observers, has limited its potential for growth, specifically as regards developing relevant visibility in global academic community. We communicate this observation as, precisely, external scholarly observers while we appreciate – as also explained by the faculty and university leadership – that both the present designation and organisational arrangements are due to the legacy of both the university and the structure of the academic field of economics and management in Czechia.	
Summary recommendations: • Leverage FM's unique regional and societal expertise to develop new projects and enhance regional development, both locally and on a European scale. Improve communication of this identity to academic, policy, and general audiences. Systematically collaborate with other faculties to disseminate research and build partnerships. • Address the concentration of research activities among a few staff by creating incentives, building research capacities, clarifying resource access, and operationalizing regional expertise for interdisciplinary and international projects. • Continue to track and support staff involvement in editorial boards and reputable conferences. Raise awareness about the risks of "predatory" journals to protect personal and institutional reputation. • Focus on a few strategic areas of regional expertise, seek leadership roles in international projects, and coordinate externally funded initiatives. Continue securing national (GAČR/TAČR) projects and integrate into international research networks.	

- Given FM's size and resource constraints, prioritize cooperation with other faculties and universities, both domestically and abroad, to expand project capacities.
- Continue and systematize collaborations with local partners and leverage the expertise of strong regional universities.
- Use multiple, synergistic channels and regulatory frameworks to engage policymakers, companies, and stakeholders effectively and focus and clearly communicate FM's core areas of expertise to increase visibility and external recognition.
- Refine Media & Communication Strategies to better use your energy (select channels wisely, focus on key strength and target strategic audiences).

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 Finance and Accounting	B
Faculty of International Relations	C
Faculty of Business Administration	B
Faculty of Informatics and Statistics	B
Faculty of Economics	C
Faculty of Management	C
Summary grade	B

Summary quality assessment:

During the onsite visit, all components of the university showcased their outputs and focused on selected topics as requested. Specifically, discussions covered internal regulations, employee remuneration, transparency, and the establishment of internal rules for both staff and doctoral students. The best results from the evaluated period were presented, along with the ways in which individual faculties and the university are implementing their strategic goals.

All parts of the university, including the university itself, demonstrated vitality and a commitment to continuous improvement. Compared to the IEP evaluation five years ago, better results were observed. The presence of excellent outputs is not coincidental but rather the result of a focused effort by the university and faculty management.

IEP members appreciated the efforts of faculty leadership to provide in-depth insight into the internal organization of their faculties. They were also open to identifying and discussing the challenges they face. Naming these problematic areas and weaknesses is crucial in the process of improvement and development. The IEP panel thanks the university leadership and individual faculties for their meticulous preparation, active engagement, and openness during discussions with

the panel. All written materials, self-evaluation reports, and presentations were of high quality and clearly demonstrated the excellence of the university's outputs.

IEP panel members evaluated individual indicators through a closed voting process and, in most cases, reached unanimous agreement on the final scores. This indicates a shared understanding within the panel regarding both the requirements and the quality of the outputs.

The final rankings of the individual faculties were either B or C, both of which are considered positive outcomes. Faculties rated B are more effective in working with their strategies; their management is active, embraces change, and implements measures that clearly enhance quality. Faculties rated C are undergoing internal changes and are in a transitional phase between the old and new states, which naturally requires additional time for the changes to settle. It is important to note that all faculties have embarked on a path of internal transformation.

It is gratifying that the final evaluation confirms the observed trends — namely, that the Prague University of Economics and Business is continuously improving when compared with the results of last IEP evaluation.

Summary recommendation:

Based on the IEP Panel's evaluation, recommendations were defined and are described in the individual faculty evaluation reports.

In general, the recommendations can be summarized as follows:

- Focus on quality in your research activities, create systems that support excellence and its expansion across all faculties.
- Pay attention to a transparent remuneration system that emphasizes excellence, possible substitution for a higher scope of pedagogical activities.
- It is necessary to support the preparation and submission of projects, especially foreign ones and those in which faculties will cooperate with renowned foreigners and foreign universities/organizations. It is likely that there will be positive knowledge spillover effects here.
- Faculty managements must have a platform on which they will discuss the implementation of the university's strategy as a whole and, if necessary, discuss specifics and deviations.
- Faculties must adopt a new concept of student remuneration (a new amount of scholarships) and turn it into a tool for attracting new high-quality research candidates, and later VŠE's employees.
- Faculties should use their own strategy as an active management tool, not fulfilling administrative requirements for the existence of a strategy.

The group of faculties with a B rating should focus clearly on quality and achieving excellent results. In the next evaluation, it is necessary to verify to what extent the management of this group of faculties has managed to expand excellent teams, acquire excellent projects and produce excellent outputs.

The group of faculties with a C rating must undergo a noticeable development of the internal environment by the next evaluation, must set an ambitious strategy, not be afraid of changes (even radical ones) and transform themselves in the context of the development of today's society and economy. The common denominator of the changes must be a quality work environment, a clear development strategy, easy identification for the outside world (including abroad), and establishing cooperation across the VŠE, as well as other economic faculties in the Czech Republic and, of course, abroad.

EVALUATION REPORT FOR MODULES 4 & 5

HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION NAME: Prague University of Economics and Business

COMPANY REGISTRATION NUMBER (CRN): 61384399

MODULE 4 – VIABILITY

ORGANISATION AND MANAGEMENT OF R&D&I

4.1 Organisation and management of R&D&I

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

Rating [1–5]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:¹

The organizational structure of the Prague University of Economics and Business (VŠE) includes clearly defined responsibilities in the field of science and research, which are distributed across various levels of management and organizational units.

At the head of the university is the rector, who is the highest representative and is responsible for the overall management of the institution, including the strategic development of scientific activities. The rector is supported by the Vice-Rector for Science and Research, who is in charge of coordinating research activities across the university. This vice-rector ensures support for research projects, cooperation with grant agencies, development of publication activities, and oversight of ethical aspects of research.

According to internal regulations, there are other bodies at VŠE that are authorized to manage or evaluate scientific and research activities. These are the VŠE Scientific Board, the VŠE Internal Evaluation Board and the International Advisory Board. The latter body is independent and consists of prestigious managers from leading international companies.

Each of the six faculties of VŠE has its own leadership headed by a dean, who is responsible for scientific activities at the faculty level. Faculties support research through their departments, research centres, and institutes. These units focus on specific areas of economics, finance, management, informatics, statistics, or international relations and carry out both basic and applied research.

Deans have the right to establish their own advisory body to evaluate and discuss science and research strategy.

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.

The Rectorate also includes the Department for Science and Research, which provides administrative support for research activities, manages publication databases, assists with grant applications, and ensures communication with national and international research institutions.

The university also includes research centres and institutes that specialize in particular research areas and often collaborate with industry or international partners. The Scientific Council plays an important role as well, evaluating the quality of research and approving habilitation and professorship procedures.

It should be remembered that the Prague University of Economics and Business is a specific university with a limited number of FORD, and this also results in specificities. Individual faculties can help each other with teaching subjects in which they specialize. This can significantly increase the quality of the subjects taught. Similarly, centres of excellence can naturally emerge, because scientists can deal with specific and socially necessary problems. This is largely true even today. However, not all faculties contain excellent natural hubs of scientists. The negative side of this arrangement is a certain "lock-in", when academic staff have no greater need to cooperate with others at other universities. Here, effective forms of cooperation need to be supported.

When compared to the recommendations from the previous evaluation, it is clear that university management is making efforts to improve the quality of study programs, staff, and high-quality outputs. Unfortunately, this effort is not always effective, and the results are not coming quickly enough.

Overall, science and research at VŠE are systematically managed and supported at all levels – from strategic leadership through faculties to individual research teams.

Recommendations:

- to vigorously implement the university's strategy with an emphasis on maximum quality of individual processes
- to focus on acquiring and stabilizing employees with high potential, including a personnel turnover strategy due to advanced age (i.e. systematic succession building at all faculties)
- to implement strategies that will contain clear steps, tools and procedures that faculty management can implement; introduce an internal tool to monitor the implementation of the strategy and its goals in the medium term
- to coordinate research topics across large number of teams and institutes across faculties that are so far very randomly interconnected

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:

VŠE describes in detail the system of support for a high-quality research environment and the motivational measures implemented at the VŠE to foster excellent science. The university has

developed a comprehensive support system that spans the entire research lifecycle—from project proposal preparation to implementation and the transfer of results into practice.

In the area of pre-award support, VŠE offers researchers assistance at various stages of project preparation. This includes consultations, administrative help, and training. For the post-award phase, the university provides project advisory services and administrative support to ensure smooth project execution and effective management.

VŠE also operates internal financial instruments designed to motivate researchers. These include rewards for publications in prestigious journals (especially Q1 and D1), support for participation in scientific conferences, coverage of open access publication fees, and funding for peer review and habilitation activities. A significant portion of institutional support funds (LCDRO) is distributed at the faculty level based on performance criteria. For example, at the Faculty of Business Administration in 2024, 27% of these funds were allocated as bonuses for publication outputs, with the highest rewards granted for publications in journals listed in the FT50 ranking.

The university also supports the formation of new research teams, including international ones, both financially and through shared infrastructure and administrative assistance. Young researchers and doctoral students have access to microgrants for data collection or database access and are encouraged to participate in mobility programs and research projects. There is a strong emphasis on supporting excellent science. In addition to financial incentives, the university encourages researchers to engage in editorial boards, grant agency review panels (e.g., GAČR, TAČR, RVVI), and international scientific networks. Interdisciplinary research is promoted through centres of excellence and cross-disciplinary projects.

With respect to the above mentioned, a key aspect of a successful Research strategy is the hiring policy. Positions must be opened internationally, and the positions must have characteristics that make it attractive for research-active professors to join the University. This means first and foremost: pay competitive salaries and provide enough time for doing research. Especially the younger faculty (assistant professors) should be hired internationally and with an eye on their research potential. They should be given time to do research (including sabbaticals), freed as far as possible from administrative obligations and should only be subject to limited teaching duties. At a systemic level, one way to achieve this is to make sure that overall teaching volume is limited (limit the number of student intake overall, reduce contact hours per student, have them do more self-study than conventional lectures, have more teaching done by “professors of practice” and external lecturers than by core faculty) and that administrative burdens to the professors are kept to a minimum. Administration should first and foremost be done by administrators not by research-active professors. At an individual level, younger and more research-active professors should be given more time to dedicate to research than other professors (e.g., do not make them teach large classes, provide them with support from teaching assistants). Professors motivated and successful in producing internationally competitive research should be praised, supported and enabled (e.g., funding for research assistants, travel, sabbaticals, inviting co-authors etc). It is important to establish and clearly communicate a culture of quality rather than quantity-orientation in publishing. One paper in a well-known and internationally respected journal is often worth more to the reputation of the University than many low-brow publications. One way to get (the knowledge required to produce) such publications is to engage in international collaboration. New international hires may bring with them a network of competent co-authors, but networks can also be built over time by (repeatedly) inviting professors to give talks and short courses. Another option

is to hire part-time professors affiliated elsewhere (e.g., Niclas Berggren could be a role model in this respect).

Recommendations:

- to implement HR management tools that will clearly define personnel goals for individual employees, including in the field of science - i.e., expected scientific outputs; link actual results to remuneration; establish a uniform system of expected results across faculties and the university (how much should a professor/associate professor/assistant teach; what results in science are expected of him/her, etc.)
- to create an internal policy for publishing doctoral students and implement it at all faculties (what is the expected number of scientific publications, what quality, etc.). The aim of this measure is to focus on quality, not quantity, and to teach this paradigm to doctoral students and scientific candidates as well
- to adjust the minimum criteria for habilitation and professorship procedures so that they are in line with the quality strategy. Newly qualified associate professors and professors must be a guarantee of high-quality outputs and new projects

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]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:

VŠE has established a comprehensive system for internal and external evaluation of the quality of research, development, and innovation (RDI), as described in section 4.3 of the self-evaluation report. This system operates across multiple levels of governance and control and is designed to promote performance, transparency, and accountability in research and scientific activities.

Internal evaluation of RDI quality is carried out through several mechanisms. A key tool is the allocation of institutional support for the long-term conceptual development of the research organization (LCDRO), 90% of which is based on the research performance of individual faculties in the previous year. This performance is measured by success in obtaining grants, publication activity, contract research, and results from national evaluation processes (Module 1 of methodology M2017+). The remaining 10% of the budget is distributed based on current performance, ensuring continuous motivation for improvement. The budget is approved by the Academic Senate of VŠE.

Faculties are required to submit an annual report on the use of LCDRO funds and a development plan for the following year, including the planned use of these funds. These documents are approved by the scientific boards of the faculties and include evaluations at the department level. Additionally, the Vice-Rector for Research and Doctoral Studies prepares an annual report summarizing research activities across the university.

External evaluation is ensured through the involvement of international scientific boards and other independent advisory bodies, which provide feedback on research strategy and output quality. VŠE also participates in national evaluation processes, such as the evaluation of research organizations under the M2017+ methodology.

The ethical dimension of research is safeguarded through a code of ethics, an ethics committee, and a whistleblowing system. The university has established procedures for addressing ethical misconduct and promotes a culture of responsible research.

VŠE seems to have all the right structures and advisory bodies in place. It is clear that VŠE did make some progress since the last evaluation. However, it seems that key concerns that were raised in the last evaluation have not been systematically addressed. There is a risk of doing a large evaluation every few years, writing detailed reports and then filing them somewhere in a drawer because the issues are “too difficult” to be tackled (with respect to age structure they even said that it is “not possible” to force very senior professors into retirement even if they are not research active – a claim that was clearly contradicted by the representative of the MŠMT Dr. Kozak, IEP panelist). This point is addressed in the last para below but we should probably emphasize it more. In fact, the recommendations must be discussed by the leadership, prioritized and implemented one by one, not sparing the difficult ones (which have to do with quality-orientation in research, the internationalization of the faculty, the unbalanced age and gender structure of professorial faculty, the large volume of traditional teaching, structure of Faculties and Departments).

Overall, as part of the evaluation, it should be noted that the VŠE has all the systems created and set up. Unfortunately, the evaluation shows that some of them have not been adopted by the faculties and that there is a large variance between the target (expected) values (goals) and the actual one. The faculty management's tolerance of these shortcomings is the cause of the low effectiveness of the application of internal evaluation mechanisms (especially at some faculties).

Recommendations:

- to ensure that the university's internal systems are fully adopted by the management of individual faculties and implemented
- to conduct a check of individual internal and external evaluation systems to ensure that indicators are not outdated and that they meet current requirements for international and national standards
- to ensure that internal and external evaluators are among the top scientists in the field and provide objective and constructive feedback; as well as ensure that the results of external and internal evaluations are discussed by the university and faculty management and clear measures are taken

4.4 Sustainability and resilience of R&D&I

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

Rating [1–5]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:

VŠE has implemented a structured and multi-dimensional system of measures aimed at ensuring the sustainability and resilience of its R&D&I activities. This system can be evaluated as follows:

The university demonstrates a clear commitment to sustainable development through its strategic planning and operational frameworks. Although the report does not detail a standalone sustainability strategy, it integrates sustainability principles into its broader institutional development, particularly through interdisciplinary research projects, partnerships, and the

application of research results in areas such as energy efficiency, public policy, and social responsibility.

In terms of gender equality and inclusiveness, VŠE adheres to national legislation (Labour Code and Higher Education Act) and applies internal regulations that ensure non-discriminatory recruitment and career development practices. Job advertisements are published without gender or nationality specifications, and selection committees evaluate candidates solely based on qualifications, experience, and competencies. This approach reflects a formal commitment to equality, although the report does not mention a dedicated Gender Equality Plan or strategic document explicitly aligned with EU-level frameworks such as Horizon Europe's requirements.

The university also supports work-life balance through flexible working arrangements, including part-time contracts and parental leave policies. However, while these measures are in place, the report does not provide specific data or examples of their uptake or effectiveness. Similarly, while the institution has mechanisms to address workplace misconduct, including mobbing and harassment, there is no detailed evidence of how these are implemented or monitored in practice.

Leadership positions and nominations to professional bodies are reportedly filled based on merit, but the report does not provide a breakdown of gender representation in leadership roles or decision-making bodies, which limits the ability to assess the effectiveness of gender balance measures.

In conclusion, the system of measures for sustainability and resilience of R&D&I at VŠE is well-structured in terms of compliance and general principles. It is effective in embedding sustainability into research themes and ensuring formal equality in recruitment. However, the absence of a comprehensive gender equality strategy, limited data on implementation outcomes, and lack of explicit sustainability metrics suggest that there is room for improvement in terms of transparency, monitoring, and strategic alignment with international best practices.

Recommendations:

- to ensure that the gender equality plan and sustainability strategy are implemented, including the involvement of students and other university staff
- to analyse the barriers that exist for taking up part-time jobs and minimize these barriers with concrete steps
- to support more systematically early career researchers

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:

The overall structure of human resources involved in research, development, and innovation (R&D&I) at VŠE reflects a relatively balanced and stable academic workforce, with a clear emphasis

on assistant professors, who represent the largest group of academic staff. In 2024, assistant professors accounted for over 323 full-time equivalents (FTE), with women representing 47.5% of this group. This indicates a relatively strong gender balance at the junior academic level. However, the proportion of women decreases in higher academic ranks. Among professors, women made up only 19.8% in 2024, and among associate professors, 37.5%. This suggests a persistent gender gap in senior academic positions, which is a common trend across many higher education institutions. Nevertheless, it is necessary to pay attention to this issue in the strategic considerations of the university and faculty management.

In terms of internationalization, the data show that the share of foreign staff remains low across all academic ranks. For example, only 5.6% of assistant professors and 3.4% of associate professors were foreign nationals in 2024, while there were no foreign professors. This indicates that, despite VŠE's international ambitions and partnerships, the degree of internationalization within its academic staff remains limited and must be further strengthened, particularly in senior positions.

Note: be careful not to put a wrong emphasis on "foreign staff". The critical aspect is not the passport of the faculty but their international experience. An excellent hire might be a Czech national who has had a successful career abroad and spent several years in excellent universities and then comes back home. This also shows that it is important to give young people an incentive to leave Prague rather than staying in the safe and cozy environment, and later to return to Prague rather than remaining in their internationally competitive research environment.

The age structure of the professorial staff is problematic. More than two thirds of professors are above 60, more than one third is above 70. Some faculties have an even more extreme age imbalance. Such an imbalanced composition is not suitable for a university that aims to be dynamic and internationally competitive. An extreme concentration of very senior professors prevents younger scholars from within VŠE to climb up the career ladder and reduces the number of senior positions that can be opened internationally. When prompted, the rectorate said it was aware of the problem but claimed that it is not legally in the position to force the professors who are not research-active (and some of course are very active and should not be made redundant) to retire. This claim was contested by the representative of the government accompanying the evaluation.

Rejuvenating the professorial corps provides an opportunity to internationalize the University and to improve the skewed gender balance. In 2024, only a quarter of all professors is female.

The age structure of academic staff is relatively well distributed, with a healthy representation across all age groups. Assistant professors are predominantly in the 30–49 age range, which supports the long-term sustainability of the academic workforce. Professors and associate professors are more concentrated in the 50–69 age range, which is typical for these ranks, but also signals the need for succession planning and career development pathways for younger academics.

In conclusion, the human resources structure at VŠE is solid in terms of age diversity and junior-level gender balance. However, the university faces challenges in increasing the representation of women in senior academic roles and in enhancing the internationalization of its academic staff. Addressing these areas would further strengthen the institution's capacity for high-quality, globally competitive research and education.

Recommendations:

- to create a system for recruiting staff from abroad who are associate professors or professors and have a rich career behind them so that they can enrich scientific teams, bring new topics and help solve projects, as well as involve students
- to conduct a personnel audit and identify where there is a risk of a shortage of qualified experts (associate professors, professors) in the future to ensure the guarantee of study programs, respond to the results with specific measures to ensure succession
- to motivate younger staff to work on their qualification careers, more actively offer forms of support (sabbatical leaves) in order to create space for foreign internships, preparation of habilitation theses, involvement in international projects and other cooperation across the Czech Republic and with international partners
- to create and implement a clearly transparent wage policy - the personal bonus must be composed of components that employees can influence through their performance. The amount of the personal bonus must be high enough to have a motivating effect.

4.6 Academic and Research Careers

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

Rating [1–5]:

3 - Average

Qualitative assessment:

VŠE has developed a structured and transparent system for the recruitment and career development of academic and research staff. This system is grounded in national legislation, particularly the Labour Code and the Higher Education Act, and is further specified through internal regulations and institutional documents such as the Job Catalogue and habilitation guidelines.

The recruitment process at VŠE is open and merit-based. All job advertisements are published without reference to gender, nationality, or race, and selection criteria are based solely on qualifications, expertise, and competencies. The university emphasizes transparency in hiring, including clear information on job responsibilities, working hours, and expected start dates. This approach supports equal opportunity and aligns with the principles of open, transparent, and merit-based recruitment (OTMR).

Career development is structured around academic progression from doctoral studies through habilitation to full professorship. The Job Catalogue defines the requirements and responsibilities for each academic and research position, including qualification levels and salary grades. In 2024, VŠE introduced new university-wide criteria for habilitation and professorship that emphasize research quality over quantity, international engagement, and societal relevance. These criteria allow for a degree of flexibility, such as recognizing contract research with societal impact as part of academic advancement.

Support mechanisms for career development include financial incentives through the LCDRO budget, sabbatical opportunities, and mentoring for early-career researchers. The university also provides support for reintegration after maternity or parental leave, as well as after research stays abroad. However, while these measures are in place, the report does not provide detailed data on

their uptake or effectiveness, nor does it mention a formal Career Code or HR Excellence in Research (HR Award) certification.

In conclusion, the recruitment and career development system at VŠE is well-structured and aligned with national and European standards. It promotes transparency, meritocracy, and academic excellence. Nonetheless, the absence of a formalized career development strategy or HR Award recognition may represent a missed opportunity to further enhance the institution's attractiveness and competitiveness in the international academic labor market.

Recommendations:

- to adhere to individual career plans of academics, consistently require career advancement (PhD/Associate Professor/Professor) where this process is planned; at the same time, clearly define what will happen if the process is not fulfilled
- to conduct an analysis of the attractiveness of VŠE as an employer and, based on the results, proceed to eliminate problems so that VŠE becomes a good employer for existing and potentially new employees
- to financially motivate faculties to pursue these overall university goals (due to the autonomy regarding HR they have)

4.7 Gender equality measures

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

Rating [1–5]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:

VŠE has implemented a set of measures to promote gender equality in recruitment, career development, and the overall working environment. These measures are grounded in compliance with national legislation, particularly the Labour Code and the Higher Education Act, and are further supported by internal regulations that define transparent procedures for hiring and evaluating academic staff.

The recruitment process at VŠE is formally gender-neutral. Job advertisements are published without reference to gender, nationality, or race, and selection criteria are based solely on qualifications, expertise, and competencies. Selection committees evaluate candidates exclusively on the basis of these criteria. This approach reflects a commitment to equal opportunity and fairness in hiring practices.

In terms of career development, the university does not report a dedicated Gender Equality Plan or strategic document aligned with EU-level frameworks. While the institution ensures that gender is not a factor in promotion or evaluation, the absence of a formalized strategy or action plan may limit the visibility and systematic implementation of gender equality goals.

VŠE also supports work-life balance through flexible working arrangements, including part-time contracts and parental leave. However, the report does not provide specific data or examples of how these measures are used in practice or how effective they are in supporting gender equality. Similarly, while the university states that it has mechanisms in place to address workplace misconduct such as mobbing or harassment, no concrete cases or procedures are described, which limits the ability to assess the robustness of these protections.

Regarding leadership and decision-making roles, the report does not include data on gender representation in senior positions or professional bodies. This lack of transparency makes it difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of gender balance efforts in governance and institutional leadership.

In conclusion, while VŠE demonstrates compliance with legal standards and a general commitment to gender equality, the absence of a dedicated strategy, limited monitoring data, and lack of targeted measures suggest that the current system could be strengthened. Introducing a formal Gender Equality Plan, collecting and publishing gender-disaggregated data, and implementing proactive measures to support women in leadership and research careers would enhance the quality and effectiveness of gender equality at the institution.

Recommendations:

- to find and apply appropriate measures to empower women in management positions
- to continuously evaluate the Gender Equality Plan and take appropriate measures

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:

VŠE has developed a mobility strategy that supports both outgoing and incoming academic and research staff. The system is aligned with the university's broader goals of internationalization and research excellence, and it includes a range of financial and organizational measures to facilitate mobility.

The university sets clear objectives for mobility, including increasing the number of international research collaborations, enhancing the international visibility of its researchers, and supporting the professional development of early-career academics. These objectives are appropriate for a research-oriented institution with ambitions to strengthen its international profile.

To achieve these goals, VŠE provides targeted financial support for mobility through its internal budget (LCDRO), including funding for short-term and long-term research stays abroad, participation in international conferences, and sabbaticals. The university also supports reintegration after mobility, such as return from maternity or parental leave or from international research stays. These measures are complemented by mentoring and administrative support, which help reduce barriers to mobility.

The report highlights that mobility is not only encouraged but also rewarded through performance-based evaluation systems. Researchers who engage in international activities receive recognition in the internal performance appraisal system, which links mobility to career progression and financial incentives.

However, while the system is well-structured and includes a variety of supportive measures, the report does not provide detailed data on the actual number of mobilities, their duration, or the proportion of staff benefiting from these opportunities. Moreover, the degree of incoming mobility—particularly the recruitment of foreign researchers—remains relatively low, as noted in

other sections of the report. This suggests that while the strategy is sound, its implementation may face practical limitations, such as administrative complexity, language barriers, or limited international visibility in certain disciplines.

It is necessary to point out the gap in supply and demand for mobility and support for academics. VŠE offers a number of options, which, however, probably seem extremely unattractive to academics. Here it is necessary for university and faculty management to look for more attractive forms of support, to be helpful to those who want to, for example, take advantage of sabbatical leave.

In conclusion, the mobility system at VŠE is of high quality and strategically aligned with institutional goals. It includes effective tools to support outgoing mobility and professional development. Nevertheless, the absence of detailed monitoring data and the relatively low level of incoming mobility indicate areas where further improvements could enhance the system's overall effectiveness and impact.

Recommendations:

- to introduce detailed monitoring data and the relatively low level of incoming mobility indicate areas where further improvements could enhance the system's overall effectiveness and impact
- to analyze the demand for support among academics, identify attractive forms and reform the current offer

To support transparent system of sabbaticals, including the financial support.

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]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:

VŠE has established a decentralized yet functional system for the acquisition, optimization, and renewal of research infrastructure, including expensive instruments and equipment. This system is primarily managed at the faculty level, with strategic investments coordinated by the Rectorate to support university-wide needs.

The acquisition and renewal of research infrastructure are funded through a combination of institutional support (LCDRO), targeted project funding (e.g., GAČR, TAČR, Horizon Europe), and strategic development programs (e.g., OP VVV, OP JAK). Faculties are responsible for identifying their infrastructure needs and allocating resources accordingly. This decentralized approach allows for flexibility and responsiveness to the specific research priorities of each faculty.

The system includes mechanisms for the optimization of existing equipment, such as upgrades and shared use across departments and faculties. However, the report does not explicitly mention the existence of centralized “core facilities” or a formalized system for sharing high-cost instruments across the university or with external research entities. While some examples of shared use are

implied, the absence of a structured sharing policy or platform may limit the full utilization and cost-effectiveness of the infrastructure.

The effectiveness of the system is demonstrated through several examples of successful infrastructure investments, including the development of data laboratories, upgrades to IT infrastructure, and the acquisition of specialized software and analytical tools. These investments are aligned with the university's research priorities in economics, informatics, and quantitative methods, and they support both basic and applied research.

In conclusion, the system for acquiring and renewing research infrastructure at VŠE is effective and well-suited to the institution's decentralized structure. It enables faculties to respond to their specific research needs while benefiting from strategic investments at the university level. However, the lack of a formalized system for sharing expensive equipment and the absence of clearly defined core facilities suggest an opportunity for further optimization and coordination, particularly to enhance interdisciplinary collaboration and external partnerships.

Recommendations:

- to find suitable partners who are interested in using research infrastructure to increase efficiency and reduce costs
- to ensure a continuous system of renewal of research equipment for scientists, including equipment used by students, to acquire the necessary skills for the job market

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:

VŠE demonstrates a well-structured and appropriate financial resource system that aligns with the institution's size, type, and strategic focus on research, development, and innovation (R&D&I).

The university's R&D&I budget for the period 2020–2024 is diversified across multiple sources, including institutional support (LCDRO), national competitive grants (e.g., GAČR, TAČR), international projects (e.g., Horizon Europe), and contract research. This structure reflects a balanced approach to funding, combining public and non-public sources. The data in the annexed tables (4.10.1–4.10.5) show that public funding remains the dominant source, which is typical for a public higher education institution in the Czech Republic. However, the university has also made notable progress in increasing revenues from contract research and international projects, which enhances financial resilience and strategic autonomy.

The allocation of institutional support is performance-based, with 90% of the LCDRO budget distributed according to the previous year's research performance and 10% based on current achievements. This model incentivizes continuous improvement and aligns financial planning with research excellence. Faculties are responsible for managing their budgets, which allows for flexibility and responsiveness to specific disciplinary needs.

In terms of attracting prestigious research projects, VŠE has demonstrated growing success. The university has secured funding from Horizon Europe and other international sources, and several faculties have been involved in high-profile national and international research collaborations. The presence of excellent research teams and targeted support for project development have contributed to this success.

Overall, the financial resource structure at VŠE is appropriate and effective. It supports the university's strategic goals, encourages high performance, and provides a stable foundation for long-term research development. While public funding remains central, the increasing share of competitive and contract-based funding reflects a healthy diversification and a proactive approach to financial sustainability.

Recommendations:

- to ensure that all faculties participate in submitting projects and obtaining external (project) resources (the goal is a more balanced share of individual faculties with an emphasis on obtaining the most prestigious projects)
- to support the involvement of academics from individual faculties in co-investigator roles with a financial contribution
- to increase the number of international excellent science projects

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:

Rather than relying on outdated or static funding models, VŠE has adopted a dynamic and strategically driven approach to managing its institutional support for long-term conceptual development of research organizations (LCDRO). This updated system, described in section 4.11 of the self-evaluation report, reflects a clear shift toward performance-based allocation and strategic prioritization, ensuring that financial resources are aligned with the university's mission to foster research excellence, societal relevance, and innovation.

Since 2022, VŠE has significantly updated its internal rules for distributing LCDRO funds to faculties. The revised model places a stronger emphasis on current research performance, including not only traditional academic outputs but also applied and contract research. This shift reflects a broader understanding of research excellence that values both scientific quality and societal impact. The allocation is updated annually based on recent research outcomes, ensuring that the system remains dynamic and responsive to performance.

The strategy also includes the identification of priority research areas and excellent research teams. These teams receive tailored support, including financial resources, project development assistance, and science communication support. This targeted approach enhances the university's ability to concentrate resources on high-potential areas and to build internationally competitive research capacity.

In addition, VŠE has introduced new budgetary rules for doctoral study programs (effective from January 2025), which link funding to successful PhD completions and overall research performance. A further reform is planned for the internal grant system supporting doctoral research, which will

incorporate criteria based on research outcomes. These measures are expected to improve the efficiency and impact of doctoral training and to better align it with the university's research strategy.

The university also supports applied research through co-financing of projects funded by the Technology Agency of the Czech Republic (TAČR) and recognizes societal impact through initiatives such as the Rector's Award for Societal Impact, introduced in 2024. Furthermore, VŠE has prioritized the popularization of research by hiring new PR staff and enhancing science communication efforts.

In conclusion, the strategy and rules for the use of LCDRO at VŠE are well-conceived, performance-driven, and aligned with the institution's mission and vision. They effectively support both research excellence and societal engagement, while also fostering the development of young researchers and strategic research areas. The system is flexible, regularly updated, and designed to evolve in response to the changing research environment, which enhances its long-term effectiveness and relevance.

Recommendations:

- to continue to strive for the most efficient use of LCDRO funds
- to focus on distributing these funds according to the results and outputs delivered

To systematically evaluate what are the quantitative and qualitative results of the internal support system and why/where there are blind spots

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:

Unlike many institutions that struggle to translate collaboration into tangible outcomes, the VŠE has demonstrated a strategic and effective approach to building both national and international R&D&I partnerships. Section 4.12 of the self-evaluation report presents several examples that reflect the university's ability to establish meaningful, mission-aligned collaborations that enhance its research capacity, visibility, and societal relevance.

One of the most prominent examples is the Centre for Workplace Research (CWER) at the Faculty of Business Administration, which has developed a strong international network with leading institutions such as Politecnico di Milano, TU Eindhoven, BI Norwegian Business School, and others. This collaboration has resulted in 25 joint publications in high-impact journals, three edited volumes, and a widely downloaded monograph. The centre has also secured five international grants, including Horizon Europe and Erasmus+, and has hosted international events that position VŠE as a European hub for workplace innovation research. This example illustrates a highly effective and proportionate collaboration model that aligns with VŠE's mission to be a leader in management and economics education and research in Central Europe.

Another example is the Data Science and Explainable AI (DSXAI) team at the Faculty of Informatics and Statistics, which has engaged in international research consortia and contributed to the

university's success in securing Horizon Europe projects. The team's work in machine learning and knowledge representation has led to impactful publications and the development of tools with real-world applications, further reinforcing VŠE's interdisciplinary and applied research profile.

At the national level, VŠE researchers have contributed to policy-relevant outputs, such as the OECD Framework for the Evaluation of SME and Entrepreneurship Policies and Programmes, and expert studies for the European Commission on VAT and IFRS. These collaborations demonstrate the university's capacity to influence policymaking and regulatory frameworks, which is highly appropriate for an institution with a strong focus on economics, business, and public policy.

In summary, the described collaborations are not only effective in terms of research output and funding acquisition but are also well-aligned with the university's strategic goals. They reflect a mature and targeted approach to partnership-building that enhances VŠE's academic reputation, societal impact, and integration into the European Research Area. The proportionality and relevance of these collaborations to the university's profile and mission are clear strengths of its R&D&I strategy.

Recommendations:

- to stabilize the number of key partners of individual faculties and the university so that cooperation with them brings targeted effects, both in the field of research and teaching
- to focus on cooperation at the inter-faculty level of the VŠE, as well as support cooperation with external universities in the country and abroad

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:

The organization of doctoral studies at VŠE, as described in section 4.13 of the self-evaluation report, reflects a structured and evolving system that is aligned with the university's academic profile and strategic goals. VŠE currently offers 14 doctoral study programmes across its faculties, with most available in both full-time and part-time (combined) modes. These programmes cover a broad range of disciplines, including finance, international relations, management, informatics, statistics, and economic policy.

The structure of doctoral studies is supported by a formal system of cooperation between PhD students and their supervisors. Supervisors are selected based on their research expertise and are responsible for guiding students through their research projects, publication efforts, and academic development. VŠE has also introduced a training programme for supervisors to enhance the quality and consistency of supervision.

In terms of effectiveness, the university has made notable progress in improving doctoral completion rates. The success rate increased from 31% in 2020 to 45% in 2024, which indicates a positive trend and suggests that recent reforms—such as revised funding models and performance-

based incentives—are having a measurable impact. However, the drop-out rate remains relatively high, and further efforts may be needed to address this issue, particularly in terms of student support and workload management.

The university supports doctoral students through various services, including counselling, career guidance, and access to research infrastructure. There is also growing emphasis on internationalization, with efforts to build open programmes for foreign nationals and to participate in international networks. While the report does not mention formal joint degrees or cotutelle arrangements, the direction toward greater international engagement is evident.

Tracking of graduate careers is acknowledged as an area of development. Although some data are collected, a systematic and comprehensive alumni tracking system is not yet fully in place. This limits the university's ability to evaluate the long-term impact of its doctoral programmes and to adapt them based on labour market outcomes.

To increase the efficiency and success of doctoral studies, it is necessary for the university to create a strict standard for the supervisor. For all faculties, it must apply that the supervisor of a doctoral student must be successful in science and be able to publish high-quality papers (the condition may be, for example, publication in a journal with AIS at the Q3 level in the last 5 years, a certain number of citations, etc.). This will ensure that doctoral students will be guided to quality, as we call for in this report above.

To be successful, it is necessary to manage to apply a new method of financing doctoral students. That is, to set the expected result and output of their studies for the scholarship they receive. Their primary motivation should be their studies and their successful completion, job-outs should be completely eliminated. Higher doctoral income can mean higher demand, i.e. the ability of faculties to select the best candidates.

The overall effect of the above measures is to accept a smaller number of students with an overall higher success rate.

Recommendations:

- to introduce a new system of financing doctoral studies in accordance with new national rules, emphasizing the orientation towards quality and excellent performance
- to adopt a university strategy regarding the required performance and outputs of doctoral students during their studies
- to create and continuously evaluate an alumni tracking system that will enable monitoring the “placement” and subsequent career of doctoral graduates. The results must be continuously implemented into doctoral study programs

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]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:

VŠE responded to the recommendations from the previous evaluation of the International Evaluation Panel for the entire Module 4. In the previous round of evaluation, six major

recommendations were presented, four of which were addressed in this section as they fit more with Module 4. Here is their summary and evaluation:

1) Harmonize faculty management practices while dealing with specific identities of individual faculties

VŠE implemented several key harmonization actions. The new scheme for the allocation of LCDRO, described in detail in section 4.11, serves as a crucial tool for harmonizing faculty management practices related to R&D&I. This scheme is based on the performance evaluation of R&D&I at individual faculties and enables comparison of performance among faculties. Faculties are motivated to manage R&D&I in a way that helps achieve VŠE's strategic goals.

2) Support the involvement of researchers in applied research projects

VŠE supports the involvement of researchers in applied research projects, such as those funded by TAČR, through collaboration with external research teams. Faculties are motivated to manage R&D&I in a way that helps achieve VŠE's strategic goals.

3) Support international cooperation

In 2022, VŠE increased the capacity of its research department, leading to an increase in the number of projects submitted at the European level. Faculties were encouraged to submit projects at the European level, resulting in the acquisition of several significant projects, including a Horizon project, an EIT Culture & Creativity project, and several Erasmus+ projects.

4) Support gender equality in recruitment and career development

In the area of human resource management, VŠE respects the Labour Code in force and the Higher Education Act. In connection with these legislative standards, the VŠE internal regulations set out a precise framework for filling academic staff positions. At VŠE, professional experience, education, previous publishing and grant activities, and managerial experience are taken into account in the selection process. All selection procedures are announced regardless of gender, nationality, and race. Similarly, other advertisements concerning hiring new employees are advertised without any gender specification; the criteria are set only in the field of education, expertise, skills, and abilities. When selecting from the applicants, the committee evaluates applications only in terms of the fulfillment of specified criteria. When recruiting new staff for vacant positions, information is provided concerning the date of commencement of work and the extent of working hours.

Overall, it can be stated that VŠE has successfully reflected the recommendations from the previous evaluation of the IEP and implemented key instruments and measures that contribute to the fulfillment of R&D&I objectives. However, some areas could be further strengthened to ensure even higher efficiency and quality of research activities.

Recommendations:

- be more consistent in implementing the measures already taken in order to increase their effectiveness

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	4 - Very good
4.4 Sustainability and resilience of R&D&I	4 - Very good
4.5 Structure of human resources	3 - Average
4.6 Academic and Research Careers	3 - Average
4.7 Gender equality measures	4 - Very good
4.8 Mobility of academic and research staff (including sectoral and inter-sectoral mobility)	4 - Very good
4.9 Research infrastructure	4 - Very good
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	4 - Very good
AVERAGE RATING	4 - Very good
GRADE [A–D]	B

Summary assessment:

VŠE is a viable university that has a clear place in the educational space of the Czech Republic and certainly in the international framework. The university has a standard organizational structure and functioning management structures. VŠE has created strategic materials, support systems for high-quality science, uses internal and external evaluations to identify weaknesses and continuous improvement.

Good conditions have been created for the existence and functioning of the university and its faculties. However, there is room for development and improvement. In the individual criteria, we have described the path to achieving better results through the effective use of human potential and Ph.D. candidates.

Overall, we recommend that the university management actively focus on creating a favourable and attractive environment for students, academics, researchers and doctoral candidates, set clear

priorities, systematically approach the implementation of a strategy aimed at achieving high quality outputs, excellence, and quality cooperation with significant domestic and foreign partners. The university management must not be afraid to be innovative, creative and consistent.

Summary recommendations:

- to support cooperation across the university, with other faculties in the Czech Republic and abroad (in pedagogical, scientific and other areas)
- to eradication of lock-in and focus only on oneself and a narrow social bubble. Such people have difficulty recognizing that they are lagging behind in development
- to focus on foreign workers (including Czechs who have gone to pursue a career abroad) who have already proven through their performance that they are excellent scientists
- to be an attractive employer, an excellent place for excellent pedagogy and science
- ensure that all faculties are heading in the same direction in their strategies as the university
- to take advantage of the fact that you have to introduce a new system of financing doctoral students to change the conditions and rules of their orientation towards quality performance, not quantity. Since the number of doctoral students will be lower, introduce a strict standard of supervisor and let only the best scientists of the university supervise doctoral students. Create space for the work of supervisors, conditions and financial support for them.

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:

The vision and mission of the university are clearly defined and focus on connecting education, research, and innovation with the needs of practice and society. The university aims to be a top institution in the fields of informatics and quantitative sciences, providing modern education and contributing to the dissemination of knowledge in society. This vision aligns with the long-term strategy of the Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sports of the Czech Republic, which emphasizes the connection between research and practice and the support of innovation.

In the past five-year period, the university has demonstrated its ability to fulfill its mission. The number of staff and students has increased, indicating growing interest in studying and researching at this institution. The university actively engages in international research cooperation, which is crucial for maintaining a high level of research and innovation. Significant projects funded by the Technology Agency of the Czech Republic and the Czech Science Foundation confirm the university's ability to obtain and effectively utilize research funding.

The university has achieved significant success in both basic and applied research. Research teams focus on current topics such as machine learning, data mining, econometric models, and efficiency analysis. These activities align with the university's vision of being a leader in informatics and

quantitative sciences. Collaboration with practice, such as with KPMG, and the implementation of the MBA program demonstrate the university's ability to transfer research results into practice.

The vision for the next five-year period is realistic and adequately set. The university plans to continue developing interdisciplinary collaboration and connecting education with practice. The emphasis on applied research and collaboration with industry aligns with current trends in higher education and research. Planned activities, such as strengthening research teams and expanding international cooperation, are realistic and achievable.

Overall, the university successfully fulfils its mission and vision and has well-set goals for future development. Recommendations for the next five years should focus on strengthening interdisciplinary collaboration, supporting young researchers, improving infrastructure, expanding collaboration with practice, and increasing international visibility.

Recommendations:

- to increase Interdisciplinary Collaboration (Although the university has achieved significant success in both basic and applied research, it is necessary to strengthen interdisciplinary collaboration between faculties and research teams. This could lead to more innovative and comprehensive solutions to current problems)
- to support for Young Researchers and PhDs (It is important to focus on supporting young researchers and doctoral students to ensure they have sufficient opportunities to develop their research activities. This includes increasing financial support, mentoring, and opportunities for international cooperation)
- to improve Infrastructure (The university should invest in modernizing research infrastructure, including laboratory equipment and software tools. This could increase research efficiency and attract more talented researchers)
- to increase International Visibility (The university should continue its efforts to increase its international visibility through publications in prestigious international journals, participation in international conferences, and involvement in international research projects)

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]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:

The goals of VŠE in the area of research, development, and innovation and the development of the institution are clearly defined and correspond to the size and type of the university, as well as its mission and vision. The university aims to be a top institution in the fields of informatics and quantitative sciences, providing modern education and contributing to the dissemination of knowledge in society. These goals are realistic and achievable within the proposed timeframe.

In the area of R&D&I, the university focuses on basic and applied research, funded from various sources, including the Czech Science Foundation and the Technology Agency of the Czech Republic. Research teams concentrate on mostly current topics. These activities align with the university's vision.

In the area of institutional development, the university focuses on increasing the number of students and staff, modernizing research infrastructure, and strengthening international cooperation. The number of students and staff has increased in the last five years, indicating growing interest in studying and researching at this institution. Planned activities, such as strengthening research teams and expanding international cooperation, are realistic and achievable.

The university also has clearly defined goals in the area of cooperation with public administration, entrepreneurs, and non-profit organizations. These goals include increasing knowledge transfer through applied and contract research, which aligns with the university's mission to contribute to the dissemination of knowledge in society. The university plans to strengthen the support system for obtaining national and international projects, which includes administrative support and consultancy for research projects.

Another important goal is the development of human potential, which includes support for students and early-career researchers. The university plans to introduce a support system for excellent science, which includes support for outstanding researchers, research teams, and doctoral students. This system should include financial support, mentoring, and opportunities for international cooperation.

The university also emphasizes adherence to ethical principles, scientific integrity, and good practice. It plans to introduce a support system for interdisciplinary research and collaboration, which should lead to more innovative and comprehensive solutions to current problems.

Overall, it can be stated that the university has well-established goals in the area of R&D&I and institutional development, which are realistic and achievable within the proposed timeframe. These goals align with the university's mission and vision and correspond to its type and size.

Recommendations:

- to be more ambitious in your goals in terms of gaining the best possible image
- to continue to attract renowned experts for science and research, as well as pedagogical work; increase the share of foreign experts in the school's governing boards
- to ensure that all faculties aim for international activities, international projects and cooperation as a regular part of their functioning

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

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

Rating [1–5]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:

The institutional and strategic instruments described in section 5.3 are well-designed and have the potential to significantly contribute to the fulfilment of research and development objectives. The tools and measures are divided into several key areas that cover a wide range of activities necessary to achieve research goals.

Defining and calibrating the scope of VŠE's research activities is a crucial step to ensure that research activities and results are recognized, supported, and rewarded. Identifying excellent, internationally competitive research teams and supporting them through media support, project support, and other tools is another important step towards achieving research excellence.

The introduction of standards for supervisors and guidelines for habilitation and professorial procedures contributes to ensuring high quality doctoral studies and academic advancement. These tools help increase the efficiency and quality of research and development at VŠE.

The talent management strategy, including mentoring and the new career system, is an important tool for human potential development. The implementation of a performance appraisal system, including career planning and continuous education, contributes to the development and retention of quality researchers.

The gender equality plan and sustainability strategy are key tools for ensuring institutional resilience. These tools support an inclusive and sustainable environment, which is essential for the long-term success of research activities.

The introduction of guidelines for the evaluation and adherence to ethical principles, scientific integrity, and good practice in R&D&I is essential for ensuring the credibility and quality of research.

Recommendations:

- Financial Support for Young Researchers: Increasing financial support for young researchers and doctoral students could contribute to their greater motivation and involvement in research activities.
- Financial Certainty for Senior Researchers: It is necessary to ensure financial certainty for senior researchers through basic salaries. Today they have a low basic salary, and the rest of the salary is a performance component. However, this is uncertain and often not in their hands (typically success in grant competitions).
- Adjust Performance Requirements for Academics and PhDs - policy needs to prioritize quality over quantity. Focus on minimizing publication outputs in Q4, adjust minimum numbers of outputs per time period, focus on quality outputs for PhD students and don't teach them to satisfy supervisors/faculty with a high number of low-quality outputs
- International Cooperation: Although international cooperation is mentioned, specific tools and measures to support it could be more elaborated.
- Technological Infrastructure: Investment in modernizing technological infrastructure, including laboratory equipment and software tools, could increase the efficiency and quality of 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:

The self-evaluation report shows how the VŠE has reflected the recommendations from the previous evaluation of the International Evaluation Panel. In the previous round of evaluation, six major recommendations were presented, four of which were addressed in section 4.14 as they fit more with Module 4, and two recommendations are addressed here in section 5.4 as they fit more with Module 5.

Review disciplines across VŠE and prioritize research themes in each faculty

In 2022, VŠE defined its R&D&I capacities based on VŠE strategic goals and actual research outcomes and decided which fields of research to abandon. It was decided that some outcomes, such as in clinical medicine, would not be internally assessed and rewarded, as they are out of scope. As the prioritization of research themes has been a key strategic goal at VŠE, faculties were encouraged to identify their priority themes and create or support research teams focusing on them. For instance, FBA allocated part of LCDRO support to four teams that showed promise to excel in research between 2021 and 2023. One of them, CWER, was established in 2022 to explore contemporary transformations in work environments and achieved significant success. Similarly, FIS emphasizes the topic of AI, which led to the creation of the Data Science and Explainable AI (DSXAI) team, which has already achieved significant success.

Support gender equality in recruitment and career development

In the area of human resource management, VŠE respects the Labour Code in force and the Higher Education Act. In connection with these legislative standards, the VŠE internal regulations set out a precise framework for filling academic staff positions. At VŠE, professional experience, education, previous publishing and grant activities, and managerial experience are taken into account in the selection process. All selection procedures are announced regardless of gender, nationality, and race. Similarly, other advertisements concerning hiring new employees are advertised without any gender specification; the criteria are set only in the field of education, expertise, skills, and abilities. When selecting from the applicants, the committee evaluates applications only in terms of the fulfilment of specified criteria. When recruiting new staff for vacant positions, information is provided concerning the date of commencement of work and the extent of working hours.

Increase the proportion of publications in prestigious international journals

VŠE changed its internal rules for allocating LCDRO to faculties in 2022, which now places much greater emphasis on the current research excellence of individual faculties, including applied and contract research. Budget allocation is updated annually based on recent research results. Priority research areas were defined. First, eligible research areas were defined at the university level, corresponding to accredited study programs and sufficient capacities at VŠE. Then, excellent research teams were identified, receiving tailored support in the form of financial support, project support, and support in scientific communication.

Support the involvement of researchers in applied research projects

VŠE supports the involvement of researchers in applied research projects, such as projects funded by TAČR, through collaboration with external research teams. Faculties are motivated to manage R&D&I in a way that helps achieve VŠE's strategic goals.

Support international cooperation

In 2022, VŠE increased the capacity of its research department, leading to an increase in the number of projects submitted at the European level. Faculties were encouraged to submit projects at the European level, resulting in the acquisition of several significant projects, including a Horizon project, an EIT Culture & Creativity project, and several Erasmus+ projects.

Overall, it can be stated that the university has successfully reflected the recommendations from the previous evaluation of the IEP and implemented key instruments and measures that contribute to the fulfilment of R&D&I objectives. However, some areas could be further strengthened to ensure even higher efficiency and quality of research activities.

Recommendations:

- to continue to implement ambitious strategies, obtain feedback from cooperating entities, as well as students and your own employees, including IEP recommendations

MODULE 5 RATING

MODULE 5 – SUMMARY EVALUATION

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

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

INDICATOR	RATING [1–5]
5.1 Mission and vision of the evaluated institution in R&D&I	4 - Very good
5.2 Research and development objectives	4 - Very good
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:

VŠE has a clearly set strategy, which it continuously updates and changes according to the requirements of practice, society, and the latest research results. The evaluation did not find that any of the strategies were missing. The only area for improvement is the possibility of greater efficiency in implementing the strategy at the university level, as well as at the individual faculties. It is always possible to be more efficient, have a greater reach of its activities, attract a greater number of scientists, and obtain more projects. We recommend that the university management clearly determine priorities (a smaller number of goals) in the strategy and focus its attention on them, significantly improving them in a short time horizon. There is a chance that this small change will achieve greater results with clear positive impacts on the university.

Summary recommendations:

- we recommend focusing on highlighting current social challenges
- to focus on increasing visibility in an international context
- to improve your marketing presentation, your image
- to be ambitious in obtaining additional financial resources, especially in international competition

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: Self-evaluation documents were prepared in accordance with the requirements and guidelines for IEP evaluation. The documents clearly covered all areas of the activities of the VŠE and its faculties. Based on them, it was easier to get a picture of the VŠE, but also of the internal environment, the quality of work of the VŠE, as well as internal processes, methods of communication, etc. The VŠE management presented the strategy, the method of its creation, continuous checks and updates. These procedures are functional and provide management with an important management tool for further development and viability. These documents are not just formal papers, they are a real management tool. During the onsite visit, it was possible to gain insight into the VŠE management thinking, as well as individual faculties thinking about fulfilling the university's vision and strategy. The presentation was prepared responsibly and honestly informed about the results achieved, as well as the challenges that the VŠE is facing and will face in the future. The presentation included several steps that had been taken towards the development and transformation of the VŠE as a modern university that wants to keep up with prestigious foreign universities. It was not obscured, and it was admitted that the VŠE faces several internal and external problems, which is understandable and is a sign of the management's honest approach to the IEP evaluation. The basic organizational system of the university is functional and guarantees clear strategic and operational management. Individual bodies function properly and provide feedback to the management of the university and the faculties, act preventively, bring new ideas and development initiatives. IEP members appreciated the friendliness of the university management and the faculties, which radiated from all speeches and presentations during onsite visit. A spirit of unity and willingness to work to improve every part of the VŠE was felt from all meetings. Special thanks go to the non-academic staff of various centres, the library and other support components, who try to make the work of all employees and students easier. It is possible to state unequivocally that (if we compare the current state with the state assessed by the last IEP five years ago) VŠE has undergone significant development, is using its strengths and is trying to take advantage of the ahead challenges. They are pleased that the entire VŠE is aware of		

the need for continuous and dynamic transformation so that VŠE is able to keep up with prestigious workplaces in the Europe, as well as to be a partner to public administration and governmental bodies, a good employer and a great university providing competitive education.

IEP members express gratitude to all who work for VŠE and try to make it even better than it is today.

Recommendations:

Based on the IEP Panel's evaluation, the following strengths and challenges of the Prague University of Economics and Business can be identified:

Strengths and strong points:

- VŠE is university with a strong image, solid infrastructure, and notable alumni.
- The VŠE's allocation in Prague is attractive for both students and staff, and this advantage should be actively leveraged.
- The university/most of faculties benefit from synergies in cooperation among faculties — in teaching, research, and project applications.
- International recognition of the university, including accreditation achievements and progress toward international standards (labels).
- A group of world-renowned, excellent researchers.
- Strong support infrastructure for project applications, international collaboration, and doctoral studies.
- Recognition of the university as a partner for cooperation by reputable businesses, public administration bodies, and national media.
- A strong focus on quality and excellent outputs, perceived across most faculties.
- Interest from high-quality doctoral candidates.

Challenges and opportunities:

- More effectively utilize grant schemes, with a particular focus on securing prestigious international projects.
- Strengthen research collaboration among faculties and engage in partnerships with other economics faculties in the Czech Republic and abroad.
- Establish unified rules and internal policies focused on quality, which are accepted and implemented across all faculties.
- Identify strategic priorities, update them regularly, and respond flexibly to challenges and changes in the economy and society.
- Focus on personal succession planning to ensure the sustainability of quality in research, collaboration, and teaching processes.
- International staff are a source of inspiration, new insights, and research culture — their perspectives should be heard and embraced.
- Doctoral students are drivers of breakthrough ideas; it is essential to create a stimulating environment for them, clarify expectations, and define measurable, quality-oriented outputs.
- Step out of routine and established practices; do not hesitate to implement radical changes — in structure, organization, and research focus.

- Take advantage of evolving trends, multi-thematic approaches, cross-disciplinary and interdisciplinary opportunities.
- Improve online and social media presence, and proudly communicate achievements to social partners, researchers, and students.

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: Recorded in the table above.		
Recommendations: Recorded in the table above.		