

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

HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION NAME: Silesian University in Opava

COMPANY REGISTRATION NUMBER (CRN): 47813059

THE LIST OF EVALUATION UNITS IN MODULE 3:

Faculty of Philosophy and Science (FPS)

School of Business Administration (SBA)

Faculty of Public Policies (FPP)

Mathematics Institute (MI)

Institute of Physics (IP)

CHAIRPERSON OF INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION PANEL

Name and surname: **Jakub Fischer**

Phone number: [REDACTED]

E-mail: [REDACTED]

LIST OF INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION PANEL MEMBERS		
Name and surname	Position in IEP	Current position
Jakub Fischer	Chairman	Dean of the Faculty of Informatics and Statistics, Prague University of Economics and Business
Rudolf Freund	Member	Retired Professor, Faculty of Informatics, TU Wien
Eva Kopecká	Member	Univ.-Prof., Head of Department of Mathematics, University of Innsbruck
Iossif Papadakis	Member	Professor, Physics Department, University of Crete
Tomasz Przerwa	Member	Associate Professor, Faculty of History and Pedagogical Sciences, University of Wrocław
Maryna Z. Solesvik	Member	Professor of Innovation and Management, Western

		Norway University of Applied Sciences
Michal Šumbera	Member	Associate Professor, Senior scientist at Nuclear Physics Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences
Darina Tarsciová	Member	Vice-Dean for Science and Doctoral Studies, Faculty of Education, Comenius University in Bratislava
Harald Upmeyer	Member	Professor Emeritus, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Philipps-Universität Marburg
Petra Skoumalová	Secretary	Officer for Science and Research, Silesian University in Opava

PROVIDERS METHODOLOGIST

Name and surname: [REDACTED]

Phone number: [REDACTED]

E-mail: [REDACTED]

Date of on-site visit of higher education institution: 25. – 26. 6. 2025

In **Prague** date **29. 10. 2025**

Signature _____
(IEP chairperson)

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Philosophy and Science in Opava

FORD: 6 - Humanities and the arts

SOCIAL CONTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATED UNIT

3.1 Introductory information about the unit under evaluation

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

Commentary:

The Faculty of Philosophy and Science in Opava (FPS) is a highly diverse academic unit, which makes its evaluation particularly complex. While the authors of the self-assessment view this heterogeneity as an opportunity for interdisciplinary research, the results presented do not fully demonstrate that this potential has been effectively realised.

According to reported data, the R&D&I capacities are distributed as follows: Natural Sciences account for 12% (Computer and Information Sciences 9%, Physical Sciences 3%), Social Sciences 9% (Economics and Business), and Humanities and the Arts 79%, including History and Archaeology (19%), Languages and Literature (40%), and Arts (20%). However, the achievements highlighted by the faculty are distributed differently, as discussed in later sections.

The faculty plays a significant role in the scientific and social life of Czech Silesia. Staff members' scientific activities and collaborations should be considered in regional, national, and international contexts. In this regard, it is notable that the presentation of the Silesian University in Opava (SU) emphasised the challenges of its border location but did not address the potential advantages, such as opportunities for enhanced cooperation with Polish research institutions in fields like archaeology, history, and philology. This strategic asset is also not sufficiently reflected in the description of the faculty's achievements.

The self-evaluation report outlines recent organisational changes, including the establishment of the Institute of Physics (2020) and the closure of the Institute of Spa, Gastronomy and Tourism (2023). However, it does not provide a clear vision for the faculty's long-term strategic structure. The unit continues to exhibit substantial internal diversity, which may serve as either a strength or a challenge.

Statistical data indicate a recent increase in student interest, confirming the attractiveness of the faculty's academic programmes and its importance to the regional community. It is also commendable that the faculty has undergone a generational renewal in recent years, which bodes well for its future development.

It is necessary to strengthen staffing capacities at the level of associate professors and full professors. At most institutes, current holders of these positions are approaching retirement age, and suitable successors have not yet been identified. This poses a risk that certain disciplines may

face closure in the future. Therefore, it is essential to actively support younger colleagues in preparing for habilitation and career advancement.

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

Faculty members have received numerous prestigious awards, including medals awarded by Polish ministers. They are members of scientific societies and serve on the editorial boards of renowned journals, are regularly invited to international conferences and lectures abroad, and are actively involved in evaluation work on national grant committees.

Recommendations:

The faculty should support its staff in continuing to achieve success at the current level, both for established and young researchers.

RESEARCH PROJECTS

3.3 Research projects

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

Rating [1–5]:

3 - Average

Qualitative assessment:

The scientific projects presented are of considerable, and in some cases, outstanding, cognitive value and/or practical relevance. Most have already been completed and published—notably, one project led by doc. Martin Pelc received an award from the Chairman of the Czech Science Foundation (GAČR).

The ongoing grants fall into two main categories: History and Archaeology, and Computer and Physical Sciences. A concerning issue is the absence of projects from other disciplines—Economics and Business, Languages and Literature, and Arts—which together represent 69% of the faculty's

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.

scientific potential. This imbalance prevented the highest rating from being awarded in this category. There is significant fragmentation of research activities.

Only a relatively small number of projects were commissioned by external clients; the rest, due to the nature of the disciplines involved, were funded through public sources.

It is essential to emphasise the pioneering, interdisciplinary nature of three historical projects, which notably extend beyond the traditional scope of regional or even national history. Other projects focused on researching, documenting, and promoting the material and cultural heritage of the Czech lands, including the Moravian-Silesian Region, are similarly interdisciplinary and involve collaboration with other research institutions.

All these activities align with the university's mission in research, development, and innovation.

The IT4Innovations Excellence in Science project, initiated during the previous evaluation period, has delivered excellent results in medical applications and has been successful throughout.

Recommendations:

Securing external funding is understandably more challenging for staff at a smaller university, particularly in the faculty's primary research areas, as rightly noted in the self-evaluation. Nevertheless, this underscores the importance of renewing and intensifying efforts to obtain grants, including international ones, as they are essential for the continued development of research. The current list of projects at the Faculty of Philosophy and Science (FPS) indicates a decline in grant acquisition effectiveness and a persistent lack of funding in certain disciplines, notably Arts, Languages, and Literature. Targeted efforts to improve grant success in these areas are therefore strongly recommended.

In the field of Information Technology, given the limited resources of the Institute of Computer Science, future projects should ideally be pursued in collaboration with other institutes or faculties, particularly within the Czech Republic (e.g., Brno and Prague) or neighbouring countries. This approach follows the successful model of the IT4Innovations Excellence in Science project, conducted in cooperation with the IT4Innovation Research Institute.

3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society

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

Rating [1–5]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:

The research results presented attest to the high value of the submitted projects, as well as their sound planning and implementation. The in-depth, community-oriented justifications for the three submitted history books, the three specialised maps, the methodology for cultural heritage identification and documentation, and the history workshops all deserve special recognition.

Excellent justifications underscore the significance of humanities research conducted within the faculty, although the results themselves are, unfortunately, difficult to quantify.

At the same time, the diversity of outcomes is commendable: publications, cartographic aids, and materials useful for both research and teaching, which indicate the faculty's flexibility and its pursuit of a balance between theoretical and applied science. It is also important to emphasise that these achievements encompass both genders, various age groups, and multiple subject areas.

In the IT field, the Institute of Computer Science provides support to companies based on the current state of the art, which is the most effective way to have an impact on the regional economy where the university is located.

Overall, this body of work represents a broad research spectrum, a high standard of scientific activity, support for regional development, and the training of the next generation of researchers, all of which align closely with the mission and vision of SU.

Recommendations:

The findings presented only concern selected disciplines, mainly History and Archaeology (8 out of 10 results), to a lesser extent Natural Sciences (including Computer and Information Sciences and Physical Sciences). The other disciplines present in the faculty are not represented in this respect. Such apparent disparities (deficits) need to be carefully analysed, and corrective measures taken to increase the effectiveness or activity of the other disciplines.

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 results into practice is carried out in accordance with the mission and vision of SU, as well as the nature of the unit being evaluated. Within the humanities, the faculty has undertaken numerous initiatives to facilitate the transfer of knowledge. It strives to ensure that the results meet the expectations and needs of its audience, both locally and regionally, and achieve the broadest possible social impact.

Recommendations:

Irrespective of the above assessment, it is recommended that new methods be sought to transfer the results to potential customers, possibly also with commercial applications. In the IT field, company support could also be more commercialised.

POPULARIZATION OF VAVAI

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

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

Rating [1–5]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:

The heterogeneous nature of the faculty fosters a variety of initiatives for disseminating knowledge across the humanities, natural sciences, and the arts. This multidirectional activity demonstrates that the unit effectively leverages its strengths while maintaining strong connections with its social base. Although adequate tools to measure the effectiveness of these activities are lacking, the steady stream of students indicates that the faculty continues to attract significant attention. Notably, the unit is distinguished by its production of educational films, which exemplify successful intra-faculty collaboration.

Recommendations:

Educational films promote physics (astrophysics) and cultural heritage (culinary), which could be used more widely to promote other areas of science as well. Furthermore, it is worth considering the creation of 'academic classes' in secondary schools, i.e., classes under the auspices of individual institutes or departments, where schoolchildren would have contact with faculty members. Continue to offer IT support for regional companies and institutions. Modern multimedia tools could be used more to popularise research results.

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 recommendations from the previous evaluation (2020) were received with understanding by both the university and the faculty, and were thoughtfully considered. The university has convincingly explained why specific recommendations could not be implemented, while outlining approaches to others. Some recommendations were general in nature and commonly apply to research institutions across the board. It is important to note that both the university and the faculty operate under specific conditions, being located in a district town within a structurally disadvantaged border region between the Czech Republic and Poland. Despite these challenges, they have implemented measures that enhance their relevance and societal impact. The process of modernisation and adaptation to evolving needs is ongoing, and rightly so—it is both a prerequisite and a sign of vitality in academic institutions.

One of the 2020 recommendations called for the intensification and expansion of international cooperation, suggesting that the faculty broaden its focus beyond the Czech-Polish region to engage with partners across Europe. Importantly, this does not preclude continued close collaboration within the Czech-Polish context.

Other recommendations (such as increasing the number of projects with economic impact, applying for patents, supporting contract research, seeking alternative funding sources, and promoting technology transfer and commercialisation of R&D&I results) must be considered in light of disciplinary constraints. In the humanities, such outcomes are inherently limited, and in the IT sector, current human resources do not support the development of larger commercial ventures.

Nevertheless, the humanities disciplines are making commendable progress in presenting and popularising their research results more actively.

Recommendations:

Internationalisation—through collaboration with leading research centres across Europe and globally—is highly desirable and is reflected in the faculty’s activities. At the same time, the faculty’s proximity to Poland and its strong ties to Polish academia represent a significant asset, particularly in the humanities (history, archaeology, Czech and Polish philology) and the arts.

It is essential to strike a balance between these two strategic directions, as they are complementary. In recent years, the faculty has maintained active cooperation with Polish universities, especially within the Silesian region. However, this collaboration remains largely bilateral. To enhance the faculty’s international profile, it would be beneficial to leverage Czech-Polish synergies more effectively and integrate them into broader European research networks.

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

The faculty fulfils the mission and vision of SU, achieving significant scientific breakthroughs and striving to exert a positive influence on the region and society. The projects being carried out have high substantive value, and their results are appreciated, finding practical application. There appears to be an asymmetry in the activity of different disciplines. Notable achievements were demonstrated in the fields of history and archaeology, as well as the natural sciences. At the opposite end of the spectrum are the philologies (languages and literature). The best evidence of the importance of the art department is the awards given to filmmakers and photographers.

Summary recommendations:

The humanities should maintain their focus on preserving the cultural heritage of the region. Utilising the support of actual multimedia tools, the results of the main research areas can be made available to a broader audience, including future students and the public. While continuing its current activities, the faculty could strive for more balanced project and grant activities and seek more effective solutions for the internationalisation of scientific research, for example, in cooperation with universities, mainly from Poland and other neighbouring countries.

Given the current fragmentation of research, we recommend defining research priorities and focusing human and financial resources on them.

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: School of Business Administration in Karviná

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 School of Business Administration (SBA) is a faculty of the Silesian University in Opava, serving as a modern regional centre for education and research in economics, business, and management. It emphasizes the integration of theory and practice and maintains strong ties with both private and public sectors. Its mission is to deliver high-quality education that prepares graduates for the labour market and enables them to contribute to regional and societal development. The faculty is actively engaged in research with both academic and practical relevance.

SBA's vision is to foster an innovative academic environment that supports interdisciplinary collaboration and the transfer of scientific knowledge into education and practice, with a focus on regional challenges. Its long-term goal is to strengthen its position among leading economic faculties in the Czech Republic and internationally.

The faculty consists of five academic departments and the Institute for Interdisciplinary Research, which promotes collaboration across fields such as mathematics, statistics, and informatics. Its academic staff includes 3 Professors, 14 Associate Professors, 39–45 Assistant Professors, 6–7 Assistants, and 10–18 Doctoral Students, supported by research-active master's students. Between 2019 and 2023, SBA enrolled around 2,200 students annually (excluding lifelong learning), offering 11 Bachelor's, 5 Master's, and 1 Doctoral programme.

SBA has strong research, development, and innovation (R&D&I) capacity, supported by the Czech Science Foundation and the Technology Agency of the Czech Republic. Its projects span basic and applied research, including education reform, smart cities, and entrepreneurship, as well as contract research for public and private partners.

The faculty contributes to regional development in areas such as sustainability, the non-profit sector, youth retention, and innovation ecosystems. Since 2023, it has been a member of the European University Alliance STARS EU, enhancing its international and interdisciplinary cooperation.

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 School of Business Administration (SBA) has built a strong reputation within national and international research communities through strategic academic engagement, interdisciplinary collaboration, and internationalisation. Its faculty contribute to global discourse in economics, finance, management, tourism, and decision sciences. SBA organises several internationally recognised conferences, including the International Conference on Finance and Banking (ICFB), DEMSME (focused on decision-making in SMEs), and Economic and Societal Challenges of the European Economy. Since 1998, SBA has published the peer-reviewed journal *Acta academica karviniensia*, currently hosted on the SCIENDO platform and undergoing SCOPUS indexing. Faculty members are regularly invited as keynote speakers and guest lecturers, and their work is featured in international journals and conferences.

SBA's research profile is further strengthened by participation in EU-funded projects such as INNOSUP-05-2018-2020 and collaboration with the Czech Academy of Sciences. The faculty promotes cross-institutional authorship and supports academic mobility through its involvement in the STARS EU Alliance. Individual achievements, including Assoc. Prof. Iveta Palečková's Fulbright Scholarship and staff participation in editorial boards and international awards, reflect the faculty's academic standing. SBA's integration into global networks and its support for researchers at all career stages confirm its role in shaping regional and international research agendas.

Recommendations:

To further consolidate its strong national and international research standing, SBA should continue to prioritise strategic publication efforts, focusing on high-impact journals indexed in Scopus and Web of Science. Strengthening the editorial policy of *Acta academica karviniensia* and achieving Scopus indexing will enhance the faculty's visibility. SBA is encouraged to formalise its participation in international research consortia, particularly within Horizon Europe, by developing internal support for project coordination and proposal development. Sustaining the academic impact of flagship conferences such as ICFB and DEMSME through indexed proceedings, special journal issues, and follow-up research collaborations will also be essential.

Further recommendations include promoting academic mobility through Fulbright, Erasmus+, and STARS EU, while introducing postdoctoral and visiting researcher schemes to attract international expertise. Establishing a structured mentorship programme will support junior researchers in grant writing and publication strategies. Finally, SBA should deepen interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral cooperation with academic and industry partners, aligning its research agenda with European priorities in sustainability, digitalisation, and regional development.

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

RESEARCH PROJECTS

3.3 Research projects

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

Rating [1–5]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:

Between 2019 and 2023, SBA participated in several high-impact national and international research projects, demonstrating strong applied research capacity. Notable initiatives include the SMART Technologies for Cities and Regions project, which developed indicators for social efficiency and supported sustainable urban policy-making, and the COST Action CA18115, where SBA contributed to EU-level strategies on bullying, migration, and digital inclusion in education. In the EFFECT-SME project under Horizon 2020, the faculty helped refine innovation support tools for SMEs, with results disseminated across European business networks.

Further projects highlight SBA's expertise in data-driven decision-making and public policy. The GAČR-funded research on data mining and pairwise comparisons advanced methods applicable in business, public administration, and robotics. The TACR BETA2 project provided strategic recommendations for Czech education policy. Across these initiatives, SBA delivered tangible outputs—policy guidelines, methodologies, and strategic studies—confirming its ability to translate research into practice and contribute to societal development.

Recommendations:

To strengthen the impact and sustainability of its research, SBA should consolidate its project portfolio around key thematic areas such as data-driven decision-making, innovation, and regional development. Aligning research more closely with the faculty's mission will support knowledge transfer into teaching, public engagement, and policy-making. Formalising “research-to-policy” and “research-to-teaching” pathways would enhance institutional relevance and societal contribution.

SBA is encouraged to deepen interdisciplinary collaboration across departments and with external partners, particularly in fields like data analytics, education, and digital transformation. Establishing internal guidelines for project design and evaluation, expanding strategic partnerships, and improving dissemination through open-access channels will further increase visibility and impact. Transitioning into leadership roles within international consortia would reinforce SBA's position in the European research landscape.

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:

SBA has successfully translated research into practical outcomes, particularly in regional development, municipal governance, and entrepreneurship. Strategic planning projects in municipalities such as Bravantice and Petrovice u Karviné have improved infrastructure, social services, and resource allocation. The Financial Health Monitoring Tool, deployed across the Moravian-Silesian Region, supports evidence-based budgeting and enhances financial sustainability, demonstrating clear policy relevance.

These results reflect the faculty's capacity to deliver applied research with societal impact. With around 60 academic staff and support from the Institute for Interdisciplinary Research, SBA maintains a balanced and sustainable research environment. Its activities align with the institutional mission to foster regional engagement and evidence-based governance, reinforcing its visibility and relevance in public administration and cross-border cooperation.

Recommendations:

SBA is encouraged to formalize a structured framework for evaluating the societal impact of its applied research, including tools like strategic municipal plans and the Financial Health Monitoring Tool. Establishing an internal Impact Evaluation Framework and conducting longitudinal studies would enable systematic tracking of outcomes and strengthen evidence-based credibility. Broader dissemination through multilingual toolkits, training programs, and partnerships with national and EU-level institutions could enhance scalability and position SBA as a leader in governance innovation.

To further enrich societal relevance, SBA should promote interdisciplinary collaboration, integrating fields such as data analytics, social policy, and environmental studies. Applied research should explicitly address gender equality and sustainability to align with EU priorities and funding criteria. Strengthening stakeholder engagement through a dedicated Policy and Innovation Lab, increasing publication in high-visibility journals, and developing a comprehensive impact communication strategy—such as an annual Impact Report—would amplify visibility and foster trust across academic and public domains.

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:

SBA has established effective, proportionate, and mission-aligned mechanisms for transferring research results into practice. Through structured processes, successful commercialization efforts, and meaningful engagement with end users, SBA consistently translates academic knowledge into real-world impact. The faculty demonstrates increasing potential in generating non-grant income and in building strong relationships with new stakeholders across public, private, and non-profit sectors.

SBA has developed a strategically managed and well-structured system for research transfer, primarily coordinated by the Institute for Interdisciplinary Research. This institute plays a pivotal role in facilitating applied research collaborations with external partners (including businesses, public institutions, and academia), overseeing knowledge transfer activities, and providing legal and administrative support for contract research. It also manages intellectual property in line with international standards. The transfer process is underpinned by clear contractual frameworks, standardized approval procedures, and defined licensing terms, reflecting a mature and professional approach to intellectual property management.

Recommendations:

To sustain and further enhance SBA's achievements in knowledge transfer, it is recommended to formalize a comprehensive strategy that ensures coordination across departments and aligns with the school's long-term mission. This strategy should define clear objectives, responsibilities, performance indicators, and monitoring procedures. Strengthening intellectual property management through expanded training, advisory support, and the appointment of a Technology Transfer Officer would help identify commercialization potential early and support researchers throughout the process. Increasing collaboration with industry and non-academic partners—via co-funded research, innovation vouchers, and joint initiatives—would diversify funding sources and attract new users of applied research.

Further recommendations include developing new models of non-grant income generation, such as executive education and applied analytics services, with the Business Gate initiative evolving into a full-fledged innovation hub. SBA should also enhance the visibility of successful transfers through an annual Knowledge Transfer and Innovation Report, showcasing partnerships and societal outcomes. Promoting interdisciplinary application projects and fostering a culture of applied research and entrepreneurship—especially among academic staff and PhD students—will strengthen SBA's capacity to translate research into practice and align outputs with contemporary policy and market needs.

POPULARIZATION OF VAVAI

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

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

Rating [1–5]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:

SBA actively promotes science communication and public engagement through its Business Gate initiative, which regularly organizes public workshops and lectures on contemporary topics such as marketing, entrepreneurship, and emerging technologies. These events serve as a bridge between academic research and societal needs, making complex subjects accessible to a broader audience.

A notable example is the 2023 interactive cybersecurity workshop, co-hosted with the National Cyber and Information Security Agency, which equipped participants with practical strategies to address real-world digital threats. This initiative reflects SBA's commitment to leveraging its academic expertise for public education and demonstrates its proactive role in raising awareness of pressing societal challenges through research-based outreach.

Recommendations:

To enhance the visibility, coherence, and long-term impact of SBA's outreach activities, it is recommended to develop a formal Science Communication and Public Engagement Strategy. This strategy should define clear goals, target audiences, communication channels, and performance indicators, ensuring alignment with SBA's mission and research priorities. Expanding the thematic scope to include topics like sustainable entrepreneurship, financial literacy, and digital ethics, while engaging diverse audiences through partnerships with schools, NGOs, and municipalities, would strengthen inclusivity and societal relevance.

Further recommendations include institutionalizing media partnerships to increase public visibility, integrating outreach into student and academic life to build communication skills, and leveraging digital platforms for broader dissemination. Systematic monitoring of outreach outcomes—such as participant feedback and media reach—would support continuous improvement and reporting. Promoting interdisciplinary collaboration in public engagement initiatives would enrich content and enhance the practical value of SBA's science communication efforts.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module 3

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

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

Rating [1–5]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:

SBA has made notable progress in addressing previous evaluation recommendations by successfully completing four applied research projects funded by the Technology Agency of the Czech Republic (TAČR) between 2019 and 2023. These projects reflect a clear shift from purely academic research towards application-oriented outputs, directly responding to earlier feedback. The faculty has also maintained momentum by submitting several new project proposals, demonstrating a sustained commitment to applied research throughout the evaluation period.

In parallel, SBA has strategically improved its publication performance by targeting high-quality, indexed journals. This development signals both a rise in scholarly ambition and a more effective alignment with national and international academic standards. Together, these efforts indicate a thoughtful and proactive approach to implementing past recommendations and strengthening the faculty's research profile.

Recommendations:

We have no recommendations to this point.

EVALUATED UNIT RATING

Evaluation of unit

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

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

Summary assessment:

The evaluation of the School of Business Administration (SBA) at Silesian University in Opava highlights its transformation into a mature and well-structured academic institution with a clear strategic direction. Between 2020 and 2024, SBA has demonstrated consistent progress in research quality, internationalisation, and the integration of teaching and research. The faculty's internal organisation, particularly within the Department of Business Economics and Management, reflects a coherent academic identity focused on business process management, sustainability, strategic leadership, and consumer behaviour. SBA maintains a stable academic core, balanced staffing, and a functional system for career development and doctoral training. These elements collectively support a strong foundation for long-term academic excellence and societal relevance.

SBA's growing research reputation is supported by active participation in national and international projects, increased publication output, and successful organisation of scientific conferences. Its integration into the STARS EU alliance has further expanded opportunities for collaboration and mobility. The faculty's applied research portfolio, including projects like SMART Technologies and EFFECT-SME, demonstrates its capacity to combine methodological innovation with practical impact. Knowledge transfer is effectively managed through institutional platforms such as the Institute for Interdisciplinary Research and Business Gate. SBA also plays an important role in public engagement, offering workshops and educational events that promote scientific literacy and regional development. Overall, SBA successfully combines academic rigour with civic responsibility, positioning itself as a dynamic contributor to both the European Research Area and its local innovation ecosystem.

Summary recommendations:

To maintain its upward trajectory, SBA should focus on strategic consolidation and long-term planning across its core academic areas. Developing a structured publication and research strategy—emphasizing high-impact international outputs, interdisciplinary collaboration, and visibility in global rankings—will enhance competitiveness and academic recognition. Strengthening senior academic capacity and formalizing internal support structures for research would improve continuity, leadership stability, and mentoring for early-career researchers. In project development, SBA is encouraged to build on its success in externally funded initiatives by establishing unified project management standards, internal impact assessment procedures, and a coherent funding strategy. Deepening interdisciplinary cooperation and integrating research outcomes into teaching and policy practice will further increase the societal and educational relevance of its work.

In the area of knowledge transfer and public engagement, SBA should continue developing its mature mechanisms by formalizing a comprehensive strategy for innovation management and outreach. Enhancing intellectual property management, expanding commercialization capacity, and adopting new models for non-grant income generation will support sustainability and impact. Broader dissemination of applied results—through open-access formats, policy briefs, and media outreach—will strengthen SBA's visibility and regional leadership. A structured science communication strategy, combined with diversified public engagement activities and digital outreach, will consolidate SBA's role as a civic-minded academic institution. Encouraging student and staff participation and systematically evaluating outreach outcomes will ensure that SBA remains a dynamic bridge between academia, policy, and society.

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Faculty of Public Policies in Opava

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 Public Policies in Opava was established in 2008 and is founded upon three core pillars: high-quality education, applied research, and cooperation with professional practice. The faculty maintains a strong regional orientation to address issues in the fields of healthcare, public administration, social services, and informal pedagogy. It operates within a region characterised by specific challenges, including high unemployment, a shortage of qualified professionals, and the long-term impacts of structural transformations.

In terms of staffing, the faculty remains relatively small. During the period under review, the number of employees increased only modestly, from 37 to 46. However, the expanded involvement of external collaborators represents a positive development. The student population remained relatively stable over the same period. The faculty successfully expanded its academic portfolio by increasing the number of study programs, most notably at the bachelor's level (seven programs) and with the addition of one master's program. At the same time, the doctoral program offering remained unchanged, with a single program. Additionally, the faculty offers opportunities for lifelong learning.

The academic staff structure is predominantly composed of assistant professors. Over the monitored period, there were no substantial changes in either the proportion of professors and associate professors or in the age profile of the academic staff, where, apart from one individual, all members are over 60 years of age.

As a small and comparatively young institution, the faculty is expected to focus on several areas of development in the coming years, particularly the expansion and staffing of its study programs.

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 position of a university within the research community evolves in response to the orientation of its faculties. Established in 2008, the Faculty of Public Policy in Opava continues to consolidate its academic standing. Nevertheless, it has already established close cooperation with Polish scholars, a partnership that has been formally recognised by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Poland (Prof. Rudolf Žáček).

The submitted documentation indicates that faculty members are engaged in a variety of professional activities both domestically and internationally. Notably, five staff members serve on editorial boards of scholarly journals, and several hold memberships in national and international professional organisations, although the latter are not specified in detail. In addition, two faculty members have been invited to deliver lectures in the United States, Italy, and Switzerland.

International cooperation is further reflected in guest lectures delivered by experts from partner universities in Slovakia and Poland at the faculty.

Recommendations:

Given the faculty's areas of specialisation, it is evident that comparable issues—particularly in healthcare, public administration, social services, and informal pedagogy—are being addressed across many European countries. This creates opportunities for faculty staff to establish valuable international collaborations, for example, through participation in foreign editorial boards of professional and scientific journals. While lectures by international experts already represent a positive form of cooperation, such activities could be further expanded to include joint research projects, co-authored publications, and participation in research project evaluation processes.

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 evaluation unit is primarily oriented toward applied research, which aligns with the strategic objectives of both the faculty and the university. However, the submitted documentation does not specify the number of employees involved in individual research projects, making it difficult to assess the extent to which the faculty's research capacity has been utilised.

During the evaluation period, the faculty implemented two major TA CR projects that addressed practice-based research challenges. The first project emphasised close collaboration with

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.

practitioners. Subsequently, it ensured the direct application of research outcomes through the guarantor of implementation, thereby fulfilling the faculty's mission in the fields of public policy and regional development. The second project demonstrated a clear interdisciplinary orientation, addressing issues in social work, health sciences, and modern technologies. This project also involved cooperation with a regional organisation and declared the application of results in practice. Students actively participated in both projects. However, collaboration with other faculties was not reported, which may have been a limitation given the complexity of the research problems. Importantly, the outcomes of this project were integrated into the bachelor's study program, thus reinforcing the link between research and teaching.

Additionally, the faculty served as a cooperating partner in a NAKI II project led by Charles University in Prague. This interdisciplinary project held nationwide significance while also addressing social and cultural issues at the regional level.

Two smaller projects (SGS/11/2020 and SGS/13/2020), carried out within the framework of specific university research, focused on social work and the informal education of older adults. Both projects addressed societal needs with a regional focus, and their outputs—educational materials—were subsequently incorporated into teaching.

Finally, the evaluation unit implemented two contractual research projects aimed at addressing selected issues of local government.

Recommendations:

The documentation does not provide sufficient information regarding the number of projects submitted by the faculty during the monitored period. Consequently, it is unclear whether the limited project output reflects a low success rate or a small number of submissions.

To increase research activity and project success, it is recommended that the faculty and its departments adopt strategies that actively motivate staff to submit and execute projects. A practical approach may involve initial participation in smaller international initiatives, such as bilateral cooperation projects. Given the department's specialisation in social work and public policy, there is also potential to engage in projects funded by line ministries, thereby aligning research activity with both regional and national priorities.

3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society

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

Rating [1–5]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:

In this section, the evaluation unit reported eight scientific monographs and two specialised maps as research outputs. Each publication specifies its focus, the research results obtained, and potential applications in theory and practice. In some cases, the described applications are broad, such as potential changes in the field of social services, while in others they are more precisely defined—for

example, enhancing professional awareness of the Snoezelen concept or providing methodological guidance for working with at-risk families. In certain instances, the practical application of the research results is not explicitly documented; it can only be inferred from the description of the monograph, which indicates that the findings were or will be applied in specific projects, such as digital or Internet-based interventions.

It is not possible to fully assess whether the research outputs correspond to the faculty's research capacity, as the number of staff involved in the projects is not specified. Nonetheless, the research results are closely aligned with the mission of the evaluation unit, as they relate directly to its core areas of expertise.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the faculty enhance the promotion of its research results and their practical implementation through professional and scientific events. Additionally, faculty documentation should provide more detailed information on the impact of research outcomes across various organisations and target groups, including social service institutions, special education facilities, and other relevant stakeholders. This would improve transparency and demonstrate the practical relevance and societal contribution of the faculty's research activities.

TRANSFER OF RESULTS INTO PRACTICE

3.5 Transfer of results into practice

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

Rating [1–5]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:

The evaluation unit reports that its research activities are not commercialized but are applied directly in practice. These activities engage a range of state and public institutions, including educational institutions at various levels, public administration bodies, non-profit organizations, and healthcare facilities. Implementation of research findings occurs through published outputs as well as through workshops, discussions, and round-table events.

Recommendations:

The evaluation unit reports that its research activities are not commercialised but are applied directly in practice. These activities engage a range of state and public institutions, including educational institutions at various levels, public administration bodies, non-profit organisations, and healthcare facilities. The implementation of research findings occurs through published outputs, as well as through workshops, discussions, and roundtable events.

POPULARIZATION OF VAVAI

3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public	
Evaluate how active and successful the evaluated unit is in the field of popularisation of R&D&I and communication with the public.	
Rating [1–5]:	5 - Outstanding
Qualitative assessment: The transfer of research findings is a fundamental responsibility of universities and research institutions, and it is vital for the evaluation unit, which focuses primarily on applied research. The faculty has outlined multiple strategies for promoting scientific knowledge, including participation in conferences, professional workshops, roundtable discussions, and outreach initiatives targeting the general public at both national and regional levels. These outreach activities encompass prevention days, exhibitions, and lecture series on various topics. Moreover, engagement in national and regional events with substantial public participation, as well as appearances on radio and television, further support the dissemination of research findings. These approaches represent established practices for sharing knowledge in the social sciences and align with the methods employed by comparable institutions.	
Recommendations: It is recommended that the faculty continue its ongoing activities aimed at popularising research, development, innovation, and public engagement. These initiatives have already attracted attention from both professional and general audiences, and it is appropriate to expand them further. Where feasible, the faculty should also seek participation in activities with a supra-regional or international scope to broaden the impact of its work. Newly established facilities, such as the Snoezelen room, provide additional opportunities for public engagement and the practical demonstration of research outcomes.	

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 evaluation unit reported on several measures implemented in response to recommendations from the previous evaluation period. Regarding specific suggestions, such as commercialising research, it noted that the faculty's applied research focus limits opportunities in this area.	
Recommendations:	

Expanding international collaboration—with a total of 15 partner countries—could facilitate access to additional international projects. Furthermore, establishing partnerships with relevant civic associations within the broader region would effectively support the dissemination and practical application of research results.

EVALUATED UNIT RATING

Evaluation of unit	
Having evaluated the individual criteria of module M3, please summarise your evaluation in the context of the module, describing and justifying the strengths and weaknesses of the unit being evaluated.	
3.1 Introductory information about the unit under evaluation	NOT RATED
3.2 Recognition by the research community	4 - Very good
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	4 - Very good
3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public	5 - Outstanding
3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module	5 - Outstanding
Average rating [1–5]:	4 - Very good
Grade [A–D]:	B
Summary assessment: The Faculty of Public Policy fulfils the mission and vision of Silesian University, achieving notable scientific outputs while actively engaging with the region and society. The projects undertaken by the faculty are closely aligned with regional needs and consistently demonstrate practical application. Considering its relatively short history since 2008, it is evident that the faculty continues to develop its key areas. Future progress will depend on addressing personnel matters and expanding third-level education, which could further enhance research opportunities. The age and qualification structure of academic staff in 2023 is worse than in 2019. On the other hand, we appreciate that the FPP is trying to improve the structure of its staff, with six younger employees preparing for habilitation. The faculty demonstrates strong engagement in several research domains, with particular strength in social work and special pedagogy, where the practical application of research results is clearly evident.	
Summary recommendations: The faculty should maintain its focus on research that addresses specific regional challenges, including social work, national minorities, and special pedagogy, while also maximizing opportunities to disseminate results to students, professional bodies, and regional organizations.	

Interdisciplinary research should be further promoted, for example, in areas such as social work for families with children with health disabilities.

Efforts should be made to enhance the qualifications and career development of faculty staff and to improve the age profile of the academic workforce, which will positively influence scientific and research activities. We recommend strengthening personnel capacities at the associate professor and professor levels. It is also advisable to work more with talented master's students, motivate them to continue their doctoral studies at partner universities, and subsequently offer them the prospect of future employment at the faculty. In this way, the faculty can gradually train its own experts and ensure continuity and generational change.

The faculty should aim to increase the number and scope of project and grant activities and actively pursue opportunities for international collaboration with universities and professional organizations.

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Mathematics Institute in Opava

FORD: 1 - Natural sciences

SOCIAL CONTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATED UNIT

3.1 Introductory information about the unit under evaluation

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

Commentary:

The Silesian University in Opava (SU) is a regional university that faces stiff competition not only from scientific institutions in Prague, but also from larger regional universities in Brno and Ostrava. Therefore, SU must maintain a strong and attractive profile both within the region and nationwide. This applies in particular to the Mathematics Institute.

While in other disciplines, such as Public Policies or Economics, the Silesian University can maintain a high profile by concentrating on the region and the needs of regional businesses and government agencies, in mathematics, the situation is different. Mathematical science is completely international and, at least in research, there is no way to focus on regional needs. Given the limited resources of a relatively small institute, the best way to achieve excellence in mathematics, as pursued by the Mathematics Institute of SU, is to develop a few areas in mathematics to an international standard and make these areas prominent not only on the national level within the Czech Republic but also internationally.

RECOGNITION BY THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY

3.2 Recognition by the research community

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

Rating [1–5]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:¹

Among the three basic subdivisions of mathematics (algebra, geometry, and analysis), it is the vast field of (real, complex, and functional) analysis that has the closest connections to applied mathematics and other fields, such as mathematical physics and economics. In this respect, the

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.

Mathematics Institute has established an excellent research group in analysis, particularly in the two fields of "Complex and Harmonic Analysis" and "Completely Integrable Dynamical Systems."

The area of "Complex and Harmonic Analysis" has close ties to Mathematical Physics (Quantum mechanics and quantisation methods) and, in principle, could also be helpful in applied mathematics, for example, regarding convergence properties of numerical methods for partial differential equations.

"Completely integrable dynamical systems" is a very timely and future-oriented area of mathematics closely related to modern quantum field theory (solitons in quantum gravity and string theory) with close ties to topological properties.

In both areas, the Institute has a prominent research group with leading experts on an international level. This is supported by numerous research papers published in prestigious international journals, an active role on the editorial boards of mathematical journals, and honourable invitations to lecture at major foreign universities.

On the other hand, the field of Applied Mathematics is not well-developed at the Institute, as their own assessment indicates that there are not enough resources to build an active group in applied mathematics at the research level. Thus, in Applied Mathematics, the Institute is mainly engaged in active teaching and education, for example, by guiding bachelor's/master's theses in areas of applied interest.

A relatively small institute has quite an impact on scientific journals in mathematics and mathematical physics. Most prominent is Prof. Engliš as Chief Editor of the "Czech Mathematical Journal". Combined with a total of 14 involvements as editors or members of editorial boards, this is quite impressive.

Recommendations:

Try to build a broader base at the research level, say in completely integrable systems in relation to geometry and mathematical physics, or in differential equations and computer algebra, supported by significant research grants.

Continue cooperating with the Institute of Physics/Astronomy and seek new institutional partners outside SU.

Activating the Institutes' already established Erasmus cooperations might attract students from abroad to return to Opava, including for the Master's or PhD programs, thus strengthening the base of future young academics.

RESEARCH PROJECTS

3.3 Research projects

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

Rating [1–5]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:

In the period 2021-2023, the institute was the primary and sole implementer of the 3-year grant project from the area of basic research in mathematics (principal investigator Prof. M. Engliš), carried out by a team consisting of 2 faculty members, three postdocs from abroad selected in hiring calls, and one local doctoral student. The project's output consisted of 15 publications in high-end international mathematical journals. The project's content aligns directly with the institute's primary mission and scientific direction – high-quality basic research in selected areas of pure mathematics.

A small number of projects, totalling 22 – 30 thousand EUR annually, funded by the Student Grant Competition of the university (SGS SU), were carried out throughout the evaluation period by master's and doctoral students.

Recommendations:

The number of major national research grants should be increased, and faculty should be encouraged to prepare applications for such grants. For example, the subject of “Completely integrable systems” in relation to contact geometry in 4 dimensions is currently very active and timely; it should have a chance for a national research grant. This also applies to the newly hired director (2024) and his field of expertise in differential equations and computer algebra. Young workers should submit their own projects to a greater extent.

At the national level (GACR), the success rate for grants in mathematics is currently very low (3-4 projects for the whole Czech Republic). Therefore, we recommend joining forces with other institutions to prepare joint project proposals or to focus more on interdisciplinary projects at the intersection of mathematics, computer science, and applied sciences.

We recommend applying for bilateral grants with research partners from neighbouring countries. Such grants are offered, for example, in cooperation with the Czech and Austrian science foundations GACR and FWF. In addition to bilateral projects, we recommend focusing on European projects (ERC, Horizon), where MI is currently not active.

For a relatively small university, SU is fortunate to have two active Institutes, in Mathematics and Physics, which have the potential for close cooperation, both in teaching and research. During the previous evaluation period, the Mathematics Institute collaborated on a joint research grant with the Institute of Physics/Astronomy. Continued cooperation would benefit both sides.

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:

Highly qualified graduates with the ability to think critically have a crucial impact on the development of the industry, the public sector, and society.

Remarkably, more than half of the inscribed students are women. This is much more than the usual proportion in the mathematical curriculum.

As examples of the particular output with impact on society, let us mention the updated evacuation plan of the Senior Citizens' Home in Kravaře used by the Fire Rescue Service of the Moravian-Silesian Region, the Modelling of the leakage of a blast furnace gas from a pipeline in the ALOHA program, and determination of the impacts of selected emergencies on the health of the population.

Recommendations:

The annual bachelor/master/PhD graduates' output of the Mathematics Institute should be kept at a satisfactory level and if possible be increased.

We recommend to implement your strategies to increase the number of active and motivated students.

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:

For an institute predominantly focused on basic research, its practical output is more than relevant. Moreover, the cooperation mainly results in a bachelor's or master's thesis, which formulates the problem in mathematical language and solves it using mathematical methods. For example, let us mention our cooperation with the Fire Rescue Service of the Moravian-Silesian Region, the Opava City Magistrate, and private companies that require optimisation of their outputs, such as Model Obaly a.s., Opavia, and Kofola a.s.

Recommendations:

Continue and expand the Institute's active cooperation with regional businesses and government agencies at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

POPULARIZATION OF VAVAI

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

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

Rating [1–5]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:

The institute is actively engaged in popularising science and research for both young and old alike. It maintains a training program for talented high school students and simultaneously supports pupils struggling with basic school math. Of the broad spectrum of activities provided, let us mention a few examples. The institute organises regular mathematical competitions, Náboj and Pythagoriáda. The Brain Fitness Popularisation Centre of the Mathematics Institute offers the public the opportunity to try out various puzzles, cyphers or riddles. The institute organises visits to secondary schools with lectures designed to popularise and introduce higher mathematics.

Recommendations:

We recommend to carry on this way. The popularisation efforts could include local businesses and agencies to stress the role of mathematics in solving practical problems.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module 3

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

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

Rating [1–5]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:

Most of the recommendations of the previous evaluation committee have been successfully implemented.

Recommendations: For a relatively small university, SU is fortunate to have two active Institutes, in Mathematics and Physics, which have the potential for close cooperation, both in teaching and research. This applies in particular to the area of completely integrable systems, where both institutes have prominent experts. During the previous evaluation period, the Mathematics Institute collaborated on a joint research grant with the Institute of Physics/Astronomy. This also bodes well for the future.

EVALUATED UNIT RATING

Evaluation of unit	
Having evaluated the individual criteria of module M3, please summarise your evaluation in the context of the module, describing and justifying the strengths and weaknesses of the unit being evaluated.	
3.1 Introductory information about the unit under evaluation	NOT RATED
3.2 Recognition by the research community	5 - Outstanding
3.3 Research projects	5 - Outstanding
3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society	4 - Very good
3.5 Transfer of results into practice	4 - Very good
3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public	5 - Outstanding
3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module	5 - Outstanding
Average rating [1–5]:	5 - Outstanding
Grade [A–D]:	A
Summary assessment: Overall, the Mathematics Institute excels in carrying out its mission, with outstanding research performance and significant efforts to make a high impact on society and address the regional needs of businesses and government agencies.	
Summary recommendations: In research, the primary recommendation is to enhance research performance by taking a more active role in grant applications. Research cooperation with neighbouring countries, such as Austria, with the support of a joint FWF and GACR grant, should be actively pursued. Also, we recommend focusing on ERC and Horizon grants. The colleagues should apply for grants in at least three different areas, such as analysis, computer algebra, differential equations, or completely integrable systems. Young researchers should submit their own projects to a greater extent. We recommend strengthening personnel capacities, especially with young early-career researchers. In recent years, some assistant professors with the prospect of habilitation have left their positions to pursue other opportunities. We recommend bringing in new, young, talented workers with the potential to become top mathematicians in the future, not only in competition within the Czech Republic, but also globally. We recommend utilising Prof. Engliš's foreign contacts and attempting to recruit young workers from abroad, for example, by leveraging the MSCA PF grant scheme. In terms of teaching and impact on society, the primary recommendation is to enhance the role of applied mathematics, not only at the bachelor's/master's thesis levels, but throughout the entire curriculum. For example, you could incorporate methods from applied mathematics in advanced undergraduate courses such as discrete mathematics and differential equations.	

EVALUATION REPORT IN MODULE 3

NAME OF EVALUATED UNIT: Institute of Physics in Opava

FORD: 1 - Natural sciences

SOCIAL CONTRIBUTION OF THE EVALUATED UNIT

3.1 Introductory information about the unit under evaluation

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

Commentary:

The Institute of Physics (IP) of the Silesian University in Opava was established in 2020. It is a dynamic and active research institution. Research at the Institute is primarily organised into Research Centres, while educational activities are primarily conducted in Educational Centres. The Multimedia Centre organises outreach activities. Scientists from the Research Centres of the Institute are also involved in the educational programs of the Educational Centre for Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, which are related to the “academic study programs”. The Educational Centre for Applied Physics and General Physics is related to “professional study programs”. Faculty members of this centre are teachers who are not involved in the Research Centres (with some exceptions). Multimedia members and students are preparing programs to popularise science in general, with a special focus on the new results obtained at the Research Centres of the IP.

RECOGNITION BY THE RESEARCH COMMUNITY

3.2 Recognition by the research community

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

Rating [1–5]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:¹

The Institute of Physics is recognised by both the Czech and international communities, as evidenced by the awards received by its members, the membership of Faculty members on the editorial board of an international Astronomical journal, and the involvement of two IP staff members in the evaluation of national and European projects. In addition, the significant participation of international scientists in the RAGtime workshop organised by the IP, the high number of well-known international speakers in the IP seminars, as well as the significant number of invited talks given by IP members to universities and international conferences abroad, further testify to the recognition of the IP by the research community. The evaluation committee also believes that the

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.

participation of the IP in the preparation of significant future Astronomical missions (like eXTP and, mainly, Athena) and in other major research experiments (like LISA and FAIR) reflects the fact that the community well recognises the IP's scientific quality and capabilities at an international level.

In summary, the committee evaluates quite highly the evaluation of the IP by the research community.

Recommendations:

Recognition by the community depends on the quality of the research work produced by the Institute's members, as well as on the effective promotion of their research achievements. The committee suggests that Institute members actively promote the RAGtime workshops to a broader audience worldwide. If possible, the Institute could consider offering financial support to enable the participation of high-quality young scientists from abroad (PhD candidates and/or postdocs) in these meetings. These young scientists are likely to become future leaders in the field, and their participation in the RAGtime meetings could foster valuable collaboration with the IP members. Additionally, the Institute may consider putting effort into inviting eminent scientists who are involved in the planning and organisation of the future astronomical missions and major research infrastructures that IP wishes to be involved with. Inviting such scientists to the Institute's seminars and offering them the opportunity to stay for short periods could establish and strengthen existing collaboration with the Institute's members.

RESEARCH PROJECTS

3.3 Research projects

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

Rating [1–5]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:

Institute members led two research projects funded by the Czech Science Foundation and three more projects funded by the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS) during the evaluation process. They also participated as Co-Is in one more project funded by the Czech Science Foundation and five more projects funded by the MEYS. All the projects are relevant to the mission and purposes of the IP. The results achieved in many cases are significant, given the number of publications that resulted from the implementation of the projects. The committee particularly notices the Institute's participation in the CLAIRO (Clear Air and Climate Adaptation in Ostrava and Other Cities) project, which focuses on applied physics and environmental studies. The objective of the project is to improve the environment and optimise the quality of life, primarily for the citizens of Ostrava and the wider region. This project involves interdisciplinary research and, in addition to the essential results regarding the improvement of the air quality and climate adaptation strategies across the Silesian industrial agglomeration, the Institute can use it as a means to enhance its visibility to the

local community and as a solid example of its contribution to the advancement of the quality of the local society.

The committee highly evaluates the research activity of the Institute, given its research capacity, and in particular, the fact that this is a recently established Institute.

Recommendations:

The success rate in acquiring research projects depends on the number of proposals submitted. We believe it is essential that the Institute establishes a strong and active “research proposal” culture. The Institute could adopt strategies that actively encourage faculty members (particularly those early in their careers) to apply for research grants. This approach can help focus the Institute’s research on the most active areas worldwide, and it can also improve the success rate of the awarded projects. This is particularly true for the European research projects (i.e., ERC, Marie Curie individual projects, Marie Curie Doctoral Networks, etc.). We believe it would be helpful if the IP addresses this issue in its future self-evaluation reports and reports on the measures it may wish to consider to encourage faculty members to apply for research projects more effectively at home and abroad. We recommend starting to prepare ERC projects.

3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society

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

Rating [1–5]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:

The Institute of Physics focuses predominantly on basic research in Theoretical Physics. As such, its main impact on society in general is the increase of our knowledge on fundamental aspects of the natural World that we inhabit. Another primary criterion regarding the Institute's impact on society is the quality of education it offers at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels. Nevertheless, the IP in their self-evaluation report argues persuasively that several of their activities have contributed to society in accordance with the evaluation criteria stated above. For example, the publication of the book "Beyond Einstein Gravity: The Minimal Geometric Deformation Approach in the Brane-World" in 2020 by members of the Institute can lead to a positive impact on society. It can play an essential role in education and science communication as it can be used by advanced students in Physics Departments as well as by researchers in relevant fields. Furthermore, the self-evaluation report lists publications by members of the Institute which report efforts to transfer their expertise in astrophysical optical data processing methods to the analysis of medical observation data with possible effects on patient diagnostics and medical imaging, and a publication on optimising Fast Fourier computations, with possible implications in both scientific and industrial areas. We have already commented above on the results from the research program CLAIRO, which have had obvious and immediate effects on the residents of a vast area in the Czech Republic.

In summary, the Committee believes that, like other research Institutes on basic research worldwide, the Institute of Physics is producing research results which can have a profound impact

on society in the long run. These research activities can help us better understand the Natural World we live in, and as such, they play an essential role in shaping the beliefs and mentality of the society in which we live.

Recommendations:

Transferring knowledge to younger generations through educational activities (i.e., successful teaching of fundamental subjects like Physics and Astronomy) can be an essential part of the prospective impact of a research Institution on society in general. We recommend that the Institute report (briefly) on its educational activities in future reports.

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 IP is a research institute specialising in Theoretical Physics, as well as Experimental Physics to a lesser extent. The nature of most of the research results from the IP cannot be directly translated into commercialisation or other relevant activities, such as the establishment of spin-offs. Nevertheless, the self-evaluation report mentions (again) that members of the Institute have collaborated with researchers from other disciplines, leading to research results which can have direct applications to practical (and essential) societal problems.

Recommendations:

The Institute should excel in its scientific research activities. However, although funding from commercial entities is not readily achievable by research Institutes in Physics and Mathematics in Europe (at least), the committee suggests that the IP could consider the possibility of addressing local entities (like local businesses, for example) to provide funds to support its educational and outreach activities, at least. Physics and Astronomy have the power to inspire people, and this could be an advantage in their pursuit of obtaining additional funding from non-grant sources.

POPULARIZATION OF VAVAI

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

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

Rating [1–5]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:

As a research Institute with a focus on Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, disseminating scientific results to the public should be an essential objective. In fact, outreach activities constitute one of the most critical elements in transferring research results to society. The Committee is pleased to report that the Institute's outreach activities are exemplary compared to those of similar research institutes across Europe.

The IP is particularly (and successfully) active in this area. This is testified by important activities which include the weekly presentations of educational projections on Astronomy and Science (in general) in the planetarium of the Institute, the organisation of lectures for high school students twice per year, and the production of documentaries for the promotion of science and physics through a study programme on Multimedia Techniques. The Committee also notes the active participation of Institute faculty members in popular TV programs aimed at popularising science and in discussions regarding current scientific issues.

In summary, the Committee has a high opinion of the activities in the field of popularising science and communication with the public. The IP is very active and very successful in this topic.

Recommendations:

We do not have any recommendations to make. The work of IP in this field is outstanding.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module 3

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

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

Rating [1–5]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:

According to the self-evaluation report, the previous evaluation committee made one recommendation according to which the IP should participate in the preparation for the space X-ray Observatory ATHENA. This recommendation has been successfully implemented.

Recommendations:

We do not have any recommendation to this point.

EVALUATED UNIT RATING

Evaluation of unit	
Having evaluated the individual criteria of module M3, please summarise your evaluation in the context of the module, describing and justifying the strengths and weaknesses of the unit being evaluated.	
3.1 Introductory information about the unit under evaluation	NOT RATED
3.2 Recognition by the research community	5 - Outstanding
3.3 Research projects	5 - Outstanding
3.4 Research results with existing or prospective impact on society	5 - Outstanding
3.5 Transfer of results into practice	4 - Very good
3.6 The most important activities in the field of popularization of R&D&I and communication with the public	5 - Outstanding
3.7 Implementation of the recommendations in Module	5 - Outstanding
Average rating [1–5]:	5 - Outstanding
Grade [A–D]:	A
Summary assessment: The Institute of Physics (IP) has earned notable recognition both nationally and internationally, demonstrated through awards, editorial roles, and involvement in evaluating major research projects. Its active participation in global scientific initiatives, including future astronomical missions like Athena and eXTP, as well as large-scale experiments such as LISA and FAIR, highlights its scientific excellence. The Institute has successfully led and contributed to several research projects funded by Czech agencies, resulting in significant publication output and societal relevance, particularly through interdisciplinary efforts such as the CLAIRE project, which aims at environmental improvement. Despite its focus on theoretical research, the IP has made commendable strides in societal impact through education, science communication, and outreach, including public lectures, documentaries, and media appearances. Its efforts to apply astrophysical methods to medical data analysis and industrial computation further reflect its commitment to practical relevance. The evaluation committee also acknowledges the Institute's exemplary outreach activities and its successful implementation of previous recommendations, notably its involvement in the ATHENA mission.	
Summary recommendations: The evaluation committee encourages the Institute of Physics to enhance its international visibility and collaborative potential by actively promoting its RAGtime workshops to a broader global audience and considering financial support for the participation of promising young scientists. Inviting eminent researchers involved in major astronomical missions and infrastructures to seminars and short visits could further strengthen strategic partnerships. To improve its success in securing research funding, the Institute is advised to cultivate a proactive grant application culture, especially among early-career researchers, and to report on these efforts in future evaluations. Additionally, the committee recommends that the Institute highlight its educational activities and explore alternative funding sources, such as local businesses, to support outreach and teaching initiatives. Finally, we recommend strengthening the institute with new professors. These steps	

could amplify the Institute's societal impact and foster broader engagement with its scientific mission.

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 Philosophy and Science in Opava	B
School of Business Administration in Karviná	B
Faculty of Public Policies in Opava	B
Mathematics Institute in Opava	A
Institute of Physics in Opava	A
Summary grade	A

Summary quality assessment:

The Silesian University in Opava consists of 3 faculties and two independent institutes of Higher Education. Based on the individual evaluation reports for each of the University constituents, the overall evaluation of social relevance in Module 3 for the University is positive. However, the overall performance of the constituents in carrying out their research, development, and innovation activities is uneven. Their contribution towards the SU's vision to develop research and art centres that achieve international recognition is not the same.

The overall grade of the University in Module 3 was determined by the overall excellent performance of the Institute of Physics and the Mathematics, together with the fact that the Institute of Physics is one of the biggest constituents of the University (in terms of FTEs). The Institute of Physics and the Mathematics Institute excel in carrying out their mission with outstanding research performance. They have earned notable recognition both nationally and internationally. They have successfully led and contributed to several research projects, resulting in significant publication output and social relevance. Both institutes have made significant efforts to have a high impact on society through science communication and outreach activities, and to address the regional needs of businesses and government agencies.

However, the committee also noticed various weaknesses in the performance of the other three constituents. Although the activities of all constituents had many notable and positive elements and successes, there is room for significant improvement. For example, there were issues with the development of the research strategy in some cases, and there were difficulties in achieving and sustaining high-level project and grant activities, which could increase the national and international recognition of these constituents. In addition, a lack of effort towards international collaboration with universities and professional organisations was also evident in other cases. Overall, the committee believed that the international recognition of the research performance and activities, in some cases, was not of the highest possible level. Significant effort is necessary to improve the research capacity and performance of some constituents.

Summary recommendation:

The University should pay particular care in improving the age (as well as gender) profile of the academic workforce. This is an issue even for the most successful constituents of the University. The University should request that all its constituents prepare a strategic plan for the next few years, which will address this issue and include actions towards hiring young, talented, early-career researchers. This is a crucial task to strengthen the SU vision to achieve a level comparable to that of leading universities in the Czech Republic and worldwide. The University should set measurable targets for hiring new personnel across all its constituents, minimising the "in-breeding" as much as possible or at least mitigating its negative impact, as this will have a crucial and positive influence on the future scientific and research activities of the University.

Based on the results of the present evaluation, the University should develop a strategic plan to define and prioritise the most promising research areas and then focus human and financial resources on them. The plan should consider the various weaknesses identified in the performance of its constituents in many of their activities and adopt actions to improve their performance. For example, such a plan should endorse various recommendations to strengthen academic capacity and performance, increase the research capabilities of the various constituents, promote international visibility from internal support structures for research, expand commercialisation capacity (where possible), adopt measures for non-grant income generation, improve and expand international cooperation, and promote interdisciplinary research.

The adoption of a strategic plan for the improvement and development of the University constituents will significantly help the University to fulfil its mission. Such a long-term plan will be an essential pillar for the future development of the SU towards a leading University that can significantly contribute to the region's successful development, achieve internationally recognised research results, and prepare the next generation of researchers and experts.

EVALUATION REPORT FOR MODULES 4 & 5

HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION NAME: Silesian University in Opava

COMPANY REGISTRATION NUMBER (CRN): 47813059

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 Silesian University in Opava (SU) is well-defined and proportionate to its size and mission. Despite being one of the smallest public higher education institutions in Czechia and the only one not located in a regional capital, SU has established a clear and functional system of strategic, operational, and project management. The division of responsibilities between the rectorate, faculties, and independent institutes reflects a decentralised yet coordinated approach, which is appropriate for a university with diverse academic profiles and a strong regional identity. The existence of sectoral committees, particularly for science and international relations, supports cross-institutional dialogue and helps align research activities with broader institutional goals.

The setup of specialised research centres within faculties and institutes demonstrates a targeted effort to concentrate excellence in key areas. This is a commendable strategy for a university of SU's size, allowing it to compete in selected fields at both national and international levels. Compared to foreign universities of similar scale and regional focus—such as those in border regions of Poland, Slovakia, or Austria—SU's structure is comparable in terms of decentralisation and emphasis on interdisciplinary collaboration. However, the integration of artistic activities alongside scientific research is a distinctive feature that adds value to SU's profile and aligns well with its mission to serve both academic and cultural development.

There is very effective formal and informal communication within SU. Despite the complex organizational structure, we consider SU to be one team in which everyone respects their role and responsibilities.

On the other hand, the organizational structure is not entirely clear to an outside observer, in particular the mission of the FPS after the separation of the Institute of Physics is not entirely clear.

Recommendations:

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.

SU should enhance strategic coordination between its research centres and university-wide priorities or reconsider the overall structure of the university. While the decentralised model suits its size and diversity, clearer mechanisms for aligning research agendas could foster interdisciplinary collaboration and improve institutional coherence.

Benchmarking against similar European universities could help refine SU's internal processes. Learning from best practices in research support and innovation management would strengthen its competitiveness and reinforce its mission in a structurally disadvantaged region.

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:

SU has developed a robust and well-structured system for supporting a quality R&D&I environment, which is commendable given its size and regional context. The coordinated efforts of the Office for Science and International Relations and the Project Office at the Rectorate provide researchers with comprehensive support—from identifying funding opportunities to assisting with proposal preparation, budgeting, and compliance. This centralised support is effectively complemented by constituent-level departments, ensuring that researchers across faculties and institutes have access to methodological and administrative assistance. The integration of economic departments into the project management process adds a layer of financial oversight that helps mitigate risks and optimise resource use.

The university also demonstrates a proactive approach to internal motivation and capacity building. The regular Newsletter for Science and Research enhances awareness of funding calls and creative opportunities, while internal grant schemes—IGS, SGS, and SGF—offer targeted support for early-career researchers and students. Additional incentives such as publication rewards, salary bonuses based on R&D performance, and options for reduced teaching loads or sabbaticals reflect a thoughtful strategy to foster research excellence. Although SU does not have a university-wide framework for establishing new research teams, its flexible, constituent-driven approach allows for responsiveness to emerging research directions. The planned reform of the Internal Grant Competition to support interdisciplinary projects is a promising step toward breaking disciplinary silos and encouraging broader collaboration.

Recommendations:

SU would benefit from formalising its approach to establishing new research teams. A university-wide framework could help identify strategic growth areas and ensure long-term support for emerging initiatives, especially in interdisciplinary fields.

Improving visibility of internal incentive schemes—through showcasing successful projects and collaborations—could inspire broader participation. Aligning support mechanisms with European standards would further integrate SU into international research networks.

Several units of the Silesian University have a high teaching load which contradicts the idea of focussing more on research. Yet as indicated in the SER, the possibility of a temporary reduction of teaching loads could be a permanent incentive for more and larger research project applications.

4.3 Quality control system for R&D&I environment

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

Rating [1–5]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:

Silesian University in Opava (SU) has established a structured and transparent system for evaluating the quality of its R&D&I environment, which is appropriate for its institutional size and mission. The internal regulation requiring evaluation of each research unit at least once every five years ensures regular oversight and accountability. The combination of self-assessment and external expert review—preferably international—adds credibility and depth to the process. The publication of final reports and involvement of academic bodies such as the Internal Evaluation Board and Scientific Boards further reinforces transparency and institutional learning. The inclusion of infrastructure and support services in the evaluation scope reflects a holistic approach to quality assurance.

The evaluation of individual academic staff is similarly well-integrated into the university's career development framework. Regular assessments, tailored to the specific practices of each constituent, provide flexibility while maintaining consistency in standards. The link between evaluation outcomes and decisions on contract renewal, promotion, and salary adjustments demonstrates a meaningful connection between performance and career progression. Ethical oversight is also robust, with a revised Code of Ethics aligned with European standards, an active Ethics Committee, and the establishment of an independent University Ombudsman. The development of Good Research Practice Guidelines further supports a culture of integrity and professionalism, particularly for early-career researchers.

Recommendations:

SU should consider more standardised and harmonised evaluation procedures across its constituents to ensure consistency and comparability. The newly developed manual is a good step toward harmonising expectations and strengthening institutional learning.

4.4 Sustainability and resilience of R&D&I

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

Rating [1–5]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:

Silesian University in Opava (SU) demonstrates a proactive and multifaceted approach to sustainability and resilience in its R&D&I environment. The adoption of the Sustainability Strategy 2030 in 2024 formalises and strengthens efforts that have been ongoing since 2020. These include practical measures such as waste sorting, energy-saving renovations, water efficiency upgrades, and the introduction of shared mobility options. SU also supports social sustainability through counselling services, an ombudsman, and scholarship programmes for socially responsible student activities. Its participation in national initiatives like UNILEAD and INCIEN further reflects a commitment to aligning with broader sustainability goals and engaging with external stakeholders.

In terms of resilience and knowledge transfer, SU is developing a university-wide Centre for Technology and Knowledge Transfer to complement its existing decentralised system. While the university's disciplinary focus—primarily in humanities, social sciences, and arts—limits the relevance of patents and spin-offs, SU has nonetheless demonstrated meaningful engagement with external partners across its faculties. Examples include contract research in informatics, social care, public administration, and municipal development. These activities show that SU is capable of translating academic expertise into societal impact, even in fields where commercialisation is less typical. The decentralised model allows for tailored approaches across faculties, though a more integrated strategy may enhance visibility and coordination.

Recommendations:

SU should continue developing its centralised knowledge transfer infrastructure to complement existing faculty-level initiatives. A unified strategy could improve coordination, visibility, and access to external partnerships, especially in interdisciplinary and applied research.

To further strengthen sustainability, SU could consider integrating sustainability metrics into its internal evaluation processes and research planning. This would help ensure that environmental and social responsibility remain embedded in the university's long-term R&D&I development.

PERSONEL POLICY

4.5 Structure of human resources

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

Rating [1–5]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:

Between 2020 and 2024, the structure of R&D&I personnel at SU remained relatively stable, with a balanced distribution across academic ranks. However, the age profile of full professors is concerning, as the majority are over 70 years old. While there has been a modest increase in younger professors aged 40–49, the lack of generational continuity poses a risk to long-term sustainability in key disciplines. Gender balance is satisfactory among assistant professors and other staff, but remains significantly skewed at higher academic levels, particularly among full professors. SU

acknowledges these disparities and has taken initial steps to address them, though further systemic efforts are needed to ensure equitable representation and succession planning.

The presence of foreign nationals in R&D&I roles has remained relatively stable, with a slight increase over the evaluation period. While this reflects a degree of internationalisation, the overall numbers remain modest. For a university aiming to strengthen its global research profile, more active recruitment and integration of international researchers could enhance diversity, collaboration, and resilience. The current personnel structure, while functional, requires strategic attention to ensure long-term viability, especially in light of demographic trends and the evolving demands of the research environment.

Recommendations:

SU should prioritise generational renewal by supporting early-career researchers in their progression toward habilitation and senior academic roles. Targeted mentoring and career development programmes could help mitigate the risk of future gaps in leadership.

Efforts to improve gender balance and increase international staff should be expanded. Proactive recruitment strategies and inclusive policies can strengthen the university's research capacity and resilience in the long term.

SU should continue developing its infrastructure and ensure it supports non-Czech-speaking researchers and PhD students. Improvements to IT systems and administrative processes could help foster a more inclusive research environment.

To address academic inbreeding, SU is encouraged to mitigate its effects by promoting external mobility, international cooperation, and diverse hiring practices. These steps will strengthen institutional resilience and broaden academic perspectives.

4.6 Academic and Research Careers

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

Rating [1–5]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:

The institution has made notable progress in aligning its HR policies with European standards, particularly through the implementation of the HR Excellence in Research Award framework. The adoption of the OTM-R policy and revision of the Selection Procedure Regulations reflect a strong commitment to transparent and merit-based recruitment. These efforts are supported by internal methodologies and standardized tools that promote fairness and consistency. The Career Regulations further enhance this framework by outlining clear pathways for professional development, supporting work-life balance, and enabling career progression through sabbaticals, skill-building, and international mobility.

Support for onboarding and reintegration is also well-developed, especially for postdoctoral researchers. The adaptation process includes practical tools like checklists and mentorship, ensuring smooth integration into the academic environment. The example of international postdoc recruitment illustrates the university's ability to provide comprehensive administrative and social

support. Measures for reintegration after career breaks or international stays are flexible and inclusive, contributing to a supportive and competitive research environment.

Recommendations:

To further strengthen its HR strategy, the institution should consider implementing centralized monitoring mechanisms to evaluate the effectiveness of career development and adaptation processes across all constituents. This would help ensure consistency, transparency, and continuous improvement.

Incentives such as reduced teaching loads for early-career and newly hired faculty who have successfully secured research grants could enhance research productivity and motivation. Additionally, senior-level research positions (e.g., department heads or institute directors) should be advertised more broadly and for longer periods. Publishing calls in widely read professional society journals—such as the *Notices of the American Mathematical Society*—would increase visibility and attract high-quality candidates.

For young researchers, assigning a mentor for the habilitation process—similar to PhD supervision—could provide valuable guidance and support. Moreover, sabbatical opportunities should be more actively promoted and systematically organized to encourage academic renewal and international collaboration.

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:

SU has demonstrated a clear institutional commitment to gender equality and non-discrimination across all areas of academic and administrative life. This is reflected in its Equal Opportunities Policy, which was developed as part of the HR Excellence in Research Award process and serves as a comprehensive framework for fostering a respectful and inclusive work environment. The policy is actively supported by measures embedded in recruitment, promotion, evaluation, and remuneration procedures. Despite this strong foundation, SU acknowledges existing gender imbalances in senior positions and certain job classifications, and has begun implementing corrective actions.

Efforts to harmonize professional and family life are evident in the Career Code, which promotes flexible working arrangements, part-time options, and remote work—particularly for staff returning from parental leave or caring for family members. The institution also maintains a robust system for addressing workplace misconduct, including the Ethics Committee, Ombudsman, and anonymous reporting channels such as “Don’t Let It Be.” The implementation of a secure whistleblowing system in line with national legislation further strengthens protections for staff. Additionally, the creation of the *Respect! to the Campus...* handbook reflects SU’s proactive approach to preventing and responding to sexual harassment, offering practical guidance and support resources.

Recommendations:

To improve gender balance in senior roles, SU should consider targeted recruitment strategies and leadership development programs for underrepresented groups.

Further promotion and regular training on the Equal Opportunities Policy and the *Respect!* handbook could help reinforce awareness and encourage a culture of accountability and inclusivity.

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:

SU has developed a comprehensive and forward-looking strategy to promote academic and research mobility, recognizing its importance for scientific excellence, international collaboration, and interdisciplinary innovation. The institution actively supports both outgoing and incoming mobility through flexible teaching arrangements, targeted funding, and administrative assistance. Special emphasis is placed on early-career researchers and PhD students, ensuring their exposure to international standards and research environments. The combination of financial resources—from Erasmus+ to national and regional programs, and SU's participation in the STARS EU alliance—demonstrates a strategic and sustainable approach to funding mobility.

The University also addresses potential barriers to mobility with thoughtful measures. Financial constraints are mitigated through diversified funding streams, while flexible formats and family-inclusive support help balance personal commitments. Gender equality is actively promoted in mobility programs, and administrative complexity is reduced through dedicated support teams. The encouragement of visiting scholars and the development of strategic partnerships with leading institutions further enhance SU's international profile and contribute to a vibrant academic ecosystem.

The examples cited are evidence of the effectiveness of these measures, but it is worrying that only representatives of mathematics, physics, computer science and economics were mentioned.

Recommendations:

To further enhance mobility, SU could expand its support for long-term stays abroad, especially for early-career researchers, by simplifying grant procedures and increasing promotion of available opportunities.

An effective way to foster mobility, both for PhD students and young researchers, is via a long-lasting professional cooperation of some senior faculty member, such as a director, with an established researcher from a respected University abroad. This could lead to a partnership that benefits both sides (there are also some negative examples of such a partnership, for instance with certain Chinese Universities). SU should be encouraged to ask their senior research faculty to establish such long-lasting research cooperations.

Additionally, strengthening intersectoral mobility—particularly with industry—could foster innovation and broaden career pathways for researchers.

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:

SU has demonstrated a strategic and well-structured approach to the development and renewal of its research infrastructure, aligning investments with long-term institutional goals. Between 2020 and 2024, the University invested approximately €13 million in infrastructure, with the majority allocated to land, buildings, and equipment. Although total expenditures have decreased compared to the previous evaluation period, the distribution of funds reflects a balanced focus on both physical assets and technological resources, including software and maintenance. Funding is sourced from a combination of EU operational programs, national development schemes, ad-hoc projects, and internal investment reserves, ensuring financial flexibility and sustainability.

The University also promotes shared access to specialized facilities through regional collaboration, notably via the “Agent” project. This initiative has led to the creation of a detailed inventory of core research infrastructure, although its availability only in Czech may limit broader accessibility. SU’s infrastructure portfolio includes high-performance computing systems, advanced 3D technologies, and unique facilities such as the Unisphere digital projection centre. Participation in external platforms like the FAIR laboratory in Darmstadt further enhances SU’s research capabilities and fosters inter-institutional cooperation. These efforts contribute to a robust and modern research environment that supports scientific excellence and innovation. Researchers also appreciate the cooperation with IT4Innovations in Ostrava.

Recommendations:

To improve accessibility and visibility, SU should consider translating its infrastructure inventory into English. Additionally, increasing investment in digital infrastructure and software tools could further support cutting-edge research and interdisciplinary collaboration.

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:

SU's financial strategy for supporting research, development, and innovation (R&D&I) is primarily based on public funding, with significant contributions from national grant agencies and ministry subsidies. The institution places a strong emphasis on basic research, which constitutes the majority of its scientific activity, while applied research accounts for up to 30%. This balance reflects SU's commitment to advancing fundamental scientific knowledge while maintaining relevance to societal needs. In addition to public grants, SU leverages other financial sources—including funds for educational activities, strategic management support, and income from its own operations and private contributions—to sustain R&D&I efforts. Although these additional sources are difficult to quantify precisely, they play an important role in maintaining research capacity.

The diversity of funding sources contributes to the resilience of SU's research ecosystem. The institution has successfully secured support from major national agencies such as the Czech Science Foundation (GA ČR), the Technology Agency of the Czech Republic (TA ČR), and relevant ministries. This multi-source approach enables SU to maintain continuity in research activities and provides flexibility in responding to emerging opportunities. However, the lack of detailed financial tracking for non-grant sources may limit strategic planning and transparency in resource allocation.

However, the various institutes and faculties show very different degrees of involvement in obtaining external funding, with the sciences and history with archaeology being the most successful.

Recommendations:

SU has sufficient potential to secure at least two major national research grants for the Mathematical Institute, as well as a significant interdisciplinary grant in collaboration with the Institute of Physics—such as a project focused on mathematical approaches to strong gravity phenomena in physics. Targeted efforts should be made to pursue these opportunities, as they would significantly enhance the institution's research profile.

Expanding support for applied research could also strengthen SU's connections with industry and increase the societal relevance of its scientific output. Furthermore, it would be beneficial to conduct a thorough analysis of why certain scientific disciplines at SU have not been successful in securing research grants. Notably, SU has not yet participated in foreign-funded projects that could be pursued in cooperation with other universities, and this represents an untapped opportunity for international collaboration.

4.11 Rules for the use of institutional support for the LCDRO

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

Rating [1–5]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:

SU has established a structured and transparent system for managing institutional support for Long-Term Conceptual Development of Research Organizations (LCDRO), governed by Rector's Directive No. 2/2020. The directive ensures that at least two-thirds of the annual subsidy is distributed to

individual constituents—such as faculties and the Mathematical Institute—using the same methodology applied by the Ministry at the national level. This alignment guarantees consistency with national funding principles and supports equitable allocation across the University. The remaining one-third of the subsidy is reserved for strategic initiatives, including internal grant schemes and motivational tools, subject to approval by relevant academic bodies.

At the constituent level, the same proportional distribution applies, with departments receiving at least two-thirds of the faculty's LCDRO funding. The remaining portion is allocated based on medium-term R&D&I plans, which are reviewed and approved every three years by the Scientific Board. This dual-level system allows SU to balance centralized funding logic with local strategic priorities. Notable examples of effective use of LCDRO include the SU Impact Fund, which rewards high-quality publications in impact-factor journals, and bonus schemes for principal investigators of major research grants. These incentives have contributed to strengthening research performance and motivation, with total bonuses amounting to €61,000 for publications and €46,000 for grant-related rewards between 2020 and 2024.

Recommendations:

SU should consider formalizing the evaluation of the strategic impact of the one-third discretionary LCDRO funding to ensure alignment with long-term institutional goals and measurable outcomes.

Additionally, expanding awareness and accessibility of motivational tools—such as the SU Impact Fund—could further encourage research excellence across all departments.

One of the challenges for SU is to revise the allocation of LCDRO funding in a way that more effectively supports scientific excellence and helps overcome issues related to research fragmentation within certain university constituents.

NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

4.12 Significant collaborations in R&D

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

Rating [1–5]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:

SU has demonstrated strong engagement in both national and international R&D&I collaborations between 2020 and 2024, with particularly notable achievements in physics and astronomy. Long-term partnerships with institutions such as the Astronomical Institute of the Czech Academy of Sciences, the University of Oxford, and Harvard University have resulted in high-impact publications and advanced research in relativistic astrophysics, observational astronomy, and computational methods. These collaborations have enabled SU researchers to contribute to frontier topics such as accretion physics, gravitational wave modelling, and the discovery of complex stellar systems, while also participating in European space missions through the PRODEX program.

In addition to academic excellence, SU has fostered applied regional partnerships, including with the Fire Rescue Service and the Moravian-Silesian Innovation Centre (MSIC), which support student engagement and innovation in public services and SME development. However, while these

examples are undeniably significant, they remain concentrated within selected university units—particularly in the natural sciences. SU collaborates with many national and international partners, but it would be desirable to broaden and strengthen these relationships across the entire institution, including in the humanities and social sciences. Doing so would enhance interdisciplinary research and ensure that all academic areas benefit from external collaboration and visibility.

Recommendations:

SU should actively support the expansion of R&D&I collaborations beyond the natural sciences, with a particular focus on developing partnerships in the humanities and social sciences.

Additionally, increasing institutional coordination and visibility of existing collaborations could help integrate best practices across departments and foster a more inclusive and interdisciplinary research culture.

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]:

4 - Very good

Qualitative assessment:

Doctoral studies at SU are organized in a decentralized manner, with each constituent faculty managing its own programs. Despite this structure, the University has taken steps to unify support for PhD students through a dedicated section within its employee education system. This section offers targeted seminars and workshops focused on academic writing, research ethics, language skills, and the use of modern tools such as AI and citation management. The individual study plan, developed jointly by the student and supervisor, ensures a personalized and research-driven approach, with regular consultations and active participation in seminars and conferences.

SU offers accredited PhD programs across a wide range of disciplines, including Mathematics, Physics, Historical Sciences, Archaeology, Artistic Photography, Computer Science, and Economics and Management. Several programs are available in English, although the number of international PhD students remains relatively low. Collaboration with institutes of the Czech Academy of Sciences enriches the academic environment through joint supervision and research projects. Students are encouraged to engage in international mobility, and most spend significantly more than the required one month abroad. While collaboration with the application sphere is limited in some disciplines, there are meaningful partnerships in areas such as archaeology, computer science, and economics. SU also provides comprehensive support services, including dedicated spaces, equipment, and career counselling. The University has recently developed a methodology for tracking PhD alumni, which will help strengthen long-term engagement and evaluate program outcomes.

During the PhD session of the on-site visit, doctoral students expressed strong appreciation for the support provided by their supervisors, noting that for some, the supervisor was the primary reason for choosing to pursue their studies at SU.

Recommendations:

SU should intensify its efforts to attract international PhD students, particularly to its English-language programs, through targeted promotional activities and the development of broader international partnerships. Increasing visibility on global academic platforms and strengthening recruitment strategies could help diversify the doctoral student body and enhance the international profile of SU's research.

Additionally, doctoral programs in the humanities and arts would benefit from stronger integration into international research networks and more structured support for mobility and collaboration. This could include dedicated funding schemes, joint supervision arrangements, and participation in international consortia.

Some doctoral students have reported difficulties in securing accommodation in university dormitories, which poses a barrier to their access to study. It is therefore recommended that SU prioritize PhD students when allocating dormitory spaces, ensuring that their housing needs are adequately met.

Finally, expanding the number of courses taught in English at the master's level would support incoming mobility students (e.g., through Erasmus), who may later choose to pursue doctoral studies at SU. This would create a more coherent and attractive academic pathway for international students and strengthen SU's position in the global academic landscape.

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

4.14 Implementation of recommendations in Module 4

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

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

Rating [1–5]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:

SU has made substantial progress in implementing the recommendations outlined in Module 4, particularly in the area of personnel policy. The awarding of the HR Excellence in Research distinction in August 2021 marked a turning point, leading to the development and adoption of key strategic documents and practices. These include the Equal Opportunities Policy, the establishment of an independent Ombudsman office, and the implementation of the OTM-R policy, which provides a comprehensive framework for recruitment, evaluation, career development, and work-life balance. Revisions to the Selection Procedure Code, Career Regulations, and Wage Regulations have further reinforced transparency and fairness in employment practices. The creation of a welcome package and methodological guidelines for employee adaptation, including the role of mentors, reflects SU's commitment to supporting staff from the outset of their employment.

In addition, SU has introduced new training programs through the Academy of Professional and Personal Development (APOR), launched in 2023. These programs focus on pedagogical skills, academic competencies, artificial intelligence, and personal well-being. The University has also adopted international standards for classifying academic and research roles and published Good Research Practice Guidelines to address ethical and legal challenges. A notable area of improvement

is the systematic support for ERC proposal preparation, including the appointment of a dedicated contact person, the creation of a quick guide, financial support through the Internal Grant Competition, and mock interview arrangements. Although no ERC proposals were submitted during the 2020–2024 period, one is currently in preparation for submission in January 2026, indicating positive momentum in this area.

Recommendations:

SU should continue to build on its ERC support system by promoting success stories and encouraging broader participation across disciplines, including the humanities and social sciences.

To ensure long-term impact, it is recommended that SU regularly evaluate the effectiveness of newly implemented personnel policies and training programs, adjusting them based on staff feedback and evolving institutional needs.

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	5 - Outstanding
4.4 Sustainability and resilience of R&D&I	5 - Outstanding
4.5 Structure of human resources	4 - Very good
4.6 Academic and Research Careers	4 - Very good
4.7 Gender equality measures	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	5 - Outstanding
4.12 Important collaborations in R&D&I	5 - Outstanding
4.13 Doctoral studies	4 - Very good
4.14 Implementation of recommendations in Module 4	5 - Outstanding
AVERAGE RATING	4 - Very good
GRADE [A–D]	B
Summary assessment: SU has developed a well-structured and proportionate organizational framework that reflects its size, regional context, and academic diversity. Despite being one of the smallest public universities in Czechia, SU demonstrates strategic coordination across its rectorate, faculties, and institutes, supported by sectoral committees and specialized research centres. The integration of artistic activities alongside scientific research adds a unique dimension to its institutional profile. SU's internal communication is notably effective, fostering a collaborative atmosphere. However, certain structural elements, such as the role of the Faculty of Philosophy and Science post-reorganization, remain unclear to external observers. The university has made commendable progress in strengthening its research, development, and innovation (R&D&I) environment. Centralized support structures, internal grant schemes, and performance-based incentives contribute to a culture of excellence and motivation. SU has	

implemented transparent evaluation mechanisms for both research units and individual staff, aligning with European standards and ethical principles. Its commitment to sustainability is evident through strategic initiatives and infrastructure investments, while knowledge transfer activities—though limited by disciplinary focus—demonstrate meaningful societal engagement. The university’s financial strategy, based on diversified public and private sources, supports resilience, although disparities in external funding success across faculties suggest room for improvement.

Human resources development at SU has seen significant advancement, particularly through the HR Excellence in Research framework. Policies promoting equal opportunities, career progression, and work-life balance are well-established, supported by onboarding tools and training programs. While gender and age imbalances persist at senior academic levels, SU has initiated corrective measures. Internationalization efforts, including mobility support and strategic partnerships, enhance the university’s global profile, though the presence of foreign researchers and international PhD students remains modest. Doctoral education is decentralized but well-supported, with personalized study plans and growing alumni tracking. Overall, SU has responded effectively to previous recommendations, especially in personnel policy, and continues to build a competitive and inclusive research environment.

Summary recommendations:

Strategic and Structural Development

SU is encouraged to improve strategic coordination between its research centres and university-wide priorities, possibly by refining its decentralized structure. Benchmarking against similar European institutions and formalizing the creation of new research teams could enhance coherence and competitiveness. Greater visibility of internal incentive schemes and harmonized evaluation procedures across faculties would support institutional learning and motivation.

Human Resources and Career Development

To ensure generational renewal and gender balance, SU should expand mentoring, sabbatical opportunities, and leadership development programs. Centralized monitoring of career development processes and broader advertising of senior research positions are recommended. Measures to counter academic inbreeding—such as promoting external mobility and diverse hiring—should be strengthened. Continued promotion of the Equal Opportunities Policy and inclusive recruitment strategies will support a resilient and diverse research environment.

Research Support and Internationalization

SU should enhance support for early-career researchers, including incentives like reduced teaching loads for grant holders. Strengthening the ERC support system and expanding international partnerships—especially in humanities and arts—will improve global visibility. Increasing the number of English-taught courses and prioritizing PhD students in housing allocation are key steps toward attracting international doctoral candidates. Long-term collaborations between senior faculty and foreign institutions are also encouraged.

Infrastructure, Funding, and Knowledge Transfer

SU should continue developing centralized knowledge transfer infrastructure and translate its research inventory into English to improve accessibility. Investments in digital infrastructure and interdisciplinary collaboration tools are recommended. Formal evaluation of discretionary LCDRO funding and broader promotion of motivational tools like the SU Impact Fund would enhance

strategic alignment. Expanding applied research and analysing grant success disparities across disciplines could strengthen societal impact and funding competitiveness.

MODULE 5 – STRATEGY AND POLICIES

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

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

Rating [1–5]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:

SU has articulated a clear and ambitious mission and vision for its R&D&I activities, aiming to develop high-quality research across selected scientific, social, economic, and pedagogical fields. The University emphasizes the development of human resources, integration with educational activities, and active engagement with both domestic and international partners. Its vision to reach a level comparable to leading Czech and European universities is supported by strategic efforts to contribute to the transformation of the Moravian-Silesian region and to promote sustainable development at multiple levels.

As a relatively small regional university, SU successfully implements its mission in two complementary ways: by developing selected areas of basic research—particularly in Mathematics and Theoretical Physics—to international standards, and by serving the needs of the region through cooperation with businesses, government agencies, and the public sector. The Institute of Physics and the Institute of Mathematics have a clear and convincing research focus, and with further joint projects, their profile could become even more attractive. Importantly, SU is composed of diverse and differently aged constituents, each with slightly distinct missions, yet all contributing meaningfully to the fulfilment of the University's overall mission and vision. A notable strength of SU is the effective integration of its educational, research, and societal roles, which reinforces its relevance both locally and internationally.

SU's involvement in national strategic projects and international scientific missions (e.g., XIPE, ATHENA, STROBE-X) demonstrates its responsiveness to both local and global challenges. Membership in STARS EU and the European University status further reinforce SU's international standing. However, while these collaborations are undeniably significant, they remain concentrated within selected university units. To fully realize its mission and vision, it is essential to broaden participation across all faculties, including the humanities and social sciences, and to ensure that all disciplines are actively engaged in collaborative research and strategic development.

Recommendations:

SU should continue to strengthen its international partnerships and ensure that all academic disciplines—including the humanities and social sciences—are actively involved in collaborative research initiatives and strategic networks.

Given SU's human and financial capacity, it is commendable that the University pursues ambitious goals in science and education. To build on this success, SU is encouraged to promote

interdisciplinary research, enhance internal coordination, and support broader institutional participation in national and international projects across all faculties. Special attention should be paid to ensuring that the diverse constituents of SU, each with their own unique profile, remain well-integrated and aligned with the University's overarching mission and vision.

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:

SU has formulated a comprehensive set of R&D&I objectives that reflect both its academic strengths and its regional responsibilities. The University aims to consolidate its position as a globally relevant research institution in selected fields, particularly mathematics and theoretical physics, where it has already demonstrated international competitiveness. At the same time, SU seeks to strengthen its role as a nationally and regionally significant educational centre in disciplines such as history and economics. This dual focus reflects SU's balanced approach to excellence in both research and education.

The University also places strong emphasis on interdisciplinary research, especially in areas such as small and medium-sized enterprises, applied social sciences, informatics, robotics, and artificial intelligence. These priorities align well with societal needs and regional development goals. SU's commitment to promoting R&D&I across all areas of creative activity—including professionally oriented fields and entrepreneurship—demonstrates its responsiveness to the evolving demands of the Moravian-Silesian region. Plans to establish new systems for commercialization, knowledge transfer, and intersectoral mobility, as well as to implement a strategic open science policy, show that SU is actively preparing for future challenges and opportunities. These objectives are ambitious yet realistic, and they build on SU's existing strengths while addressing areas for growth.

Recommendations:

SU should ensure that the implementation of its R&D&I objectives is supported by clear timelines, measurable indicators, and regular evaluation to track progress and adjust strategies as needed.

To maximize impact, SU is encouraged to involve all faculties in the development of commercialization and open science initiatives, ensuring that diverse disciplines contribute to and benefit from these strategic goals.

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:

SU has developed a robust and multi-dimensional framework for implementing its research and development strategy, encompassing planning, collaboration, internationalisation, funding acquisition, and career development. The periodic medium-term updates of R&D&I plans allow the University to respond effectively to evolving research trends and priorities, both nationally and internationally. Regular evaluations of research activities at the institutional and individual levels, combined with internal support systems and infrastructure development, ensure that SU maintains a dynamic and responsive research environment.

Collaboration is a central pillar of SU's strategy, with strong emphasis on partnerships with domestic and international institutions, participation in scientific networks, and mobility programs. The University leverages its membership in STARS EU to promote cross-border cooperation and joint research initiatives. SU also actively supports the recruitment and integration of highly qualified foreign researchers, using LCDRO and other resources to enhance its international profile. Measures to reduce administrative burdens for grant applicants and to support ERC project preparation further strengthen SU's capacity to secure external funding. Career development is supported through targeted tools such as reduced teaching loads, creative leave, and reintegration support after career breaks. Importantly, SU promotes the involvement of doctoral students and postdoctoral researchers in R&D&I activities, contributing to the sustainability and renewal of its research workforce.

Recommendations:

SU should continue to strengthen its internal coordination mechanisms to ensure that institutional instruments are consistently applied across all faculties and aligned with strategic goals.

It is also recommended to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of support measures—particularly those related to internationalisation, mobility, and career development—to ensure they meet the evolving needs of researchers and contribute to long-term institutional growth.

5.4 Implementation of recommendations in Module 5

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

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

Rating [1–5]:

5 - Outstanding

Qualitative assessment:

SU has made meaningful progress in implementing the recommendations from Module 5, particularly in consolidating research units with strong potential and expanding collaboration with regional entities. Between 2020 and 2024, all university constituents strengthened existing partnerships and initiated new ones, notably through the STARS EU European Universities Alliance. SU played an active role in establishing the Seed Grant Scheme, which supports the development of international research projects among partner institutions. Investments in laboratory modernization and equipment upgrades have further enhanced research capacity, while departments have actively supported the professional development of young researchers and opened their work to the public through conferences, workshops, and seminars.

Collaboration with regional stakeholders has been notably strong, with SU staff participating in cultural and social events and serving on local government committees, contributing to strategic development in the Moravian-Silesian region. However, SU continues to face challenges in attracting foreign researchers for long-term stays. While SU's prominence in selected areas of basic research—particularly mathematics and theoretical physics—offers a compelling reason to join, additional strategies may be needed, such as targeting senior but still active visiting scholars. The University has taken proactive steps, including participation in the Voucher Program for Universities, which enabled the creation of three postdoctoral positions for excellent foreign graduates. One postdoc has already joined SU, with two more expected in 2025. Despite expanded support for ERC grant preparation, no proposals were submitted during the 2020–2024 period. This raises questions about the effectiveness of the implemented instruments and suggests a need for critical reflection on why these tools have not yet translated into concrete outcomes.

Recommendations:

SU should continue its efforts to attract foreign researchers by enhancing support services, promoting regional strengths, and developing targeted strategies for international recruitment—particularly by engaging experienced visiting scholars.

It is also recommended that SU critically assess the reasons behind the limited use of available instruments, such as ERC support mechanisms, and ensure that barriers to their effective implementation are identified and addressed.

MODULE 5 RATING

MODULE 5 – SUMMARY EVALUATION

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

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

INDICATOR	RATING [1–5]
5.1 Mission and vision of the evaluated institution in R&D&I	5 - Outstanding
5.2 Research and development objectives	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	5 - Outstanding
AVERAGE RATING	5 - Outstanding
GRADE [A–D]	A

Summary assessment:

SU has articulated a clear and ambitious mission for its research, development, and innovation (R&D&I) activities, aiming to achieve excellence in selected scientific and societal fields while contributing to regional transformation and sustainability. The university successfully balances its dual role as a centre of internationally competitive basic research—particularly in mathematics and theoretical physics—and as a regional partner addressing local needs through applied research and

cooperation with public and private stakeholders. The integration of educational, research, and societal functions across its diverse faculties reinforces SU's relevance and impact both locally and internationally.

SU's strategic objectives reflect a thoughtful alignment between academic strengths and regional responsibilities. The university promotes interdisciplinary research in areas such as informatics, robotics, and social sciences, while also preparing for future challenges through initiatives in commercialization, open science, and intersectoral mobility. Its implementation framework is robust, combining medium-term planning, international collaboration, infrastructure development, and career support. SU's participation in the STARS EU alliance and its efforts to attract foreign researchers and support ERC grant preparation demonstrate a proactive approach to enhancing its research profile, although broader engagement across all disciplines remains a priority.

Between 2020 and 2024, SU made tangible progress in consolidating research units, expanding regional partnerships, and supporting young researchers. Investments in infrastructure and the launch of the Seed Grant Scheme have strengthened its capacity for international collaboration. The university's active role in cultural and strategic regional initiatives highlights its societal engagement. However, challenges persist in attracting long-term foreign researchers and converting ERC support mechanisms into successful proposals. While SU's strengths in basic research offer a solid foundation, further reflection and targeted strategies are needed to ensure that institutional tools effectively translate into measurable outcomes and broader participation across all academic areas.

Summary recommendations:

SU is encouraged to broaden international partnerships and ensure inclusive participation across all academic disciplines, including the humanities and social sciences. Promoting interdisciplinary research and enhancing internal coordination will help align diverse faculties with the university's strategic mission. Clear timelines, measurable indicators, and regular evaluations are recommended to support effective implementation of R&D&I objectives.

To maximize institutional impact, SU should involve all faculties in commercialization and open science initiatives, ensuring strategic goals benefit the entire academic community. Strengthening internal coordination and consistently applying institutional instruments across faculties will reinforce coherence and strategic alignment. Monitoring the effectiveness of support measures—especially in mobility, internationalisation, and career development—is essential for long-term growth.

SU should intensify efforts to attract foreign researchers by improving support services and leveraging regional strengths. Targeted recruitment of experienced visiting scholars is recommended. Additionally, SU should critically assess the limited uptake of instruments like ERC support mechanisms, identify barriers, and take steps to improve their implementation and effectiveness.

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

Qualitative assessment:

The Silesian University in Opava (SU) is one of the smallest among the 26 higher education institutes in Czechia. It is the only one not located in the capital of one of the 14 regions into which the country is divided. Despite these somewhat unfavourable facts, SU has developed a well-structured and proportionate organisational framework that supports its vision to be a modern and open scientific research institution, highly competitive not only within Central Europe but also on a global scale (in selected fields).

According to the results from the evaluation of the "Quality of Selected Results" (Module 1) and Research Performance (Module 2), SU's performance is rather average, acquiring a combined grade of "C". We notice that a grade of 3, as is the case with SU, in Module 1, is considered positive in the context of an organisation's mission (as written in the evaluation report on Modules 1 and 2 that was available to the Committee). However, based on the SU's self-evaluation report as well as the visit of the Committee's members on site, the Committee has a positive view of the overall SU performance in research, its policies on research and development, as well as its strategy for the materialisation of its vision for the future.

Regarding the research performance and contribution to society of the SU constituents (Module 3), the Committee's findings are in line with the results from the evaluation of Module 2: the performance of the Institutes of Physics and Mathematics is excellent, and on par with high-quality international Institutes. They excel in almost all parts of the evaluation fields, like recognition by the research community, the number and importance/significance of the research projects they implement, and in research results with existing or prospective impact on society and in outreach activities. On the other hand, the other constituents do not perform equally well, although the overall impression of their activities is positive (despite individual malperformances). The other constituents need to improve their performance in fields like the number and quality of research projects, recognition by the research community (on a national and international level), and the number of research projects with an impact on society. Nevertheless, the performance of all the constituents in the field of outreach was excellent. This is significant as it demonstrates the University's commitment to engaging with the local community. Equally good was the performance

of the constituents in addressing the comments from the previous evaluation, which underlines the University's commitment to improving its performance.

Regarding the organisation and management of research and development (Module 4), the University has made significant progress in strengthening its research, development, and

innovation, and continues to build a competitive and inclusive research environment. To some extent, the improvement was facilitated by the practical and conscious response of the University to previous recommendations, especially in personnel policy. There are many aspects of the University organisation that the Committee considers as positive, such as the centralised support structures, internal grant schemes, and performance-based incentives, which significantly contribute to a culture of excellence and motivation, as well as the transparent evaluation mechanisms for both research units and individual staff. The Committee also notices the significant advancement of the Human Resources development at SU, particularly through the HR Excellence in Research framework, and the commitment of the University to sustainability, through its strategic initiatives and infrastructure investments. It is also essential that the University actively supports and participates in transfer of knowledge activities, which demonstrates a meaningful and vital societal engagement, and that policies promoting equal opportunities, career advancement, and work-life balance are well-established. Last, but not least, it is essential that the University's financial strategy, based on diversified public and private sources, supports resilience.

The Silesian University has articulated a clear and ambitious mission for its research, development, and innovation activities (Module 5). SU's strategic objectives reflect a thoughtful and balanced alignment between academic strength and regional responsibility. The implementation framework for the fulfilment of its strategic mission is robust, combining medium-term planning, infrastructure development, and personnel support. SU made substantial progress in consolidating research units between 2020 and 2024 and in expanding regional partnerships. The SU aims at becoming a centre of internationally competitive basic research, and has made substantial progress towards this objective, particularly in mathematics and theoretical physics and astrophysics. Investments in infrastructure and the launch of the Seed Grant Scheme have strengthened its capacity for international collaboration.

At the same time, it is highly positive that the University also aims to contribute significantly to regional transformation and sustainability. It is very important that the University aspires, and has largely achieved, to be a significant regional partner addressing local needs through applied research and cooperation with public and private stakeholders. The University's active role and involvement in cultural and strategic regional initiatives highlight its societal engagement.

Recommendations:

The Committee suggests that the University should work towards developing a strategic plan with two main components: first, the University should consider and address the improvement of the age (as well as the gender) profile of its academic workforce, across all its constituents. The University should set measurable targets for the hiring of young, talented, early-career researchers. This should be one of the most critical tasks for the future development of the University, as hiring young, talented, early-career researchers can significantly strengthen the SU's vision to achieve excellence at an international level.

Secondly, the plan should identify and prioritise the most promising research areas and then focus human and financial resources on them. While SU's strengths in basic research in the fields of Theoretical Physics and Mathematics offer a solid foundation, further reflection and targeted

strategies are needed to ensure that institutional tools effectively translate into measurable outcomes and broader participation across all academic areas. This part of the strategic plan is vital as it should address the various weaknesses that have been identified in the performance of its constituents in many of their activities and should adopt actions to improve their performance. The plan should also include measures for monitoring the effectiveness of support measures, especially in mobility and career development.

The preparation of such a strategic plan is essential to improve the University's research performance in the near future, and for its long-term Growth.

Promoting interdisciplinary research and enhancing internal coordination will help align diverse faculties with the University's strategic mission. In addition, such actions will enhance inclusive participation across all academic disciplines, including the humanities and social sciences.

The University should enhance its internationalisation efforts, including support for mobility and efforts to increase (and strengthen) its strategic partnerships. Additionally, SU should intensify efforts to attract and hire foreign researchers by improving support services. Targeted recruitment of experienced visiting scholars is recommended. SU is also encouraged to broaden international partnerships and increase the enrolment of international PhD students. These actions will significantly boost the University's global profile.

Along similar lines, the Committee notices that challenges persist in converting ERC support mechanisms into successful proposals. It suggests that SU intensify its efforts in supporting ERC grant preparation. This would constitute a proactive approach to enhance its research profile on an international level.

SU should ensure that additional efforts are taken to increase external funding success across all its constituents. To maximise institutional impact, SU should involve all faculties in commercialisation and open science initiatives. In doing so, it should ensure strategic goals benefit the entire academic community, and it should foster the broader engagement across all disciplines, which should remain a priority.

To maximise the effect of all its efforts and support the effective implementation of its R&D&I objectives, it is recommended that SU implement clear timelines, measurable indicators, and regular evaluations.