

Periodic Assessment of Research, Development, Artistic and Other Creative Activities VER 2026

Final Report of the Civil Engineering, Architecture, and Transport Sub-panel

All the items subjected to evaluation, namely *Outputs*, *Social Impact* and *Creative Environments*, were assessed and scored as follows:

OUTPUTS

- A) World leading quality
- B) Internationally excellent quality
- C) Internationally recognised quality
- D) Nationally recognised quality
- E) Below the standard of nationally recognised work

All the *Outputs* were evaluated in the terms of originality, significance, and scientific rigour. More specifically, relevance of the scientific themes, quality of methodological approach and research design, value of discussion and interpretation, overall placement of the research within the national/international context, even related to international collaborations, were considered to achieve a final score for each *Output*.

The *Outputs* that have provided an exceptionally broad and relevant advancement in the corresponding scientific theme were scored as B, while those which, in terms of objectives, methodology, and results, have fairly contributed to improve the current knowledge about a scientific topic in the international context were scored as C. The *Outputs* mostly focused on national themes but carried out with a solid scientific background in terms of careful deployment of local knowledge, deep engagement with

national/local heritage, and high-quality documentation were scored as D. Finally, Score E was intended for *Outputs* failing to match the requirements expected even for Score D, while Score A was assigned exclusively to those *Outputs* that, in terms of significance, methodology and scientific achievements, represent (or potentially might be) a global benchmark in relation for a specific scientific topic.

SOCIAL IMPACT

- A) Excellent
- B) Very good
- C) Good
- D) Satisfactory
- E) Unsatisfactory

The *Social Impact* was scored assessing how the research findings have resulted in practical solutions/policies as well as measurable improvements for the society/communities also identifying the specific mechanisms or pathways connecting the research activities to the observed social outcomes upon a qualitative/quantitative robust and independently verifiable evidence demonstrating the social impact. Hence only potential/unproved social impacts as well as purely academic impacts were scored as E.

CREATIVE ENVIRONMENT

- A) Excellent
- B) Very good
- C) Good
- D) Satisfactory

E) Unsatisfactory

The *Creative Environment* was scored assessing the strategic direction and scientific profiling of the submitting institution in the scientific activity and social impact as well as its workplace conditions, including local/national/international collaboration, national/international fundings and the overall sustainability of the institution.

At the end, significant strengths and a significant contribution to infrastructure safety and resilience were identified in the field of *Civil Engineering, Architecture, Transport*. A rich, broad and diverse body of work that reflects strong academic engagement, methodological care, social awareness, and a commendable breadth of expertise was found in the presented *Outputs*. They span architecture, built-environment, planning, transport, heritage, fine arts, sustainability, pedagogy, and technical engineering (structural mechanics, material science, heat transfer, acoustic, lighting, energy systems, hydraulics), demonstrating a mature ability to work across disciplines and address complex, systemic challenges. This diversity shows a sustained commitment to producing work that is both intellectually grounded and connected to real-world issues. Furthermore, they reflect a productive, reflective, and socially attuned scholarly trajectory for Slovakia. They show technical competence, intellectual curiosity, and a clear commitment to addressing local and global challenges with integrity. Even conceptual or pedagogical works tend to exhibit systematic thinking and reflective practice. However, some scientific *Outputs* were limited to technical or mainly disseminated locally studies, generally executed with remarkable rigour, sensitivity, and craftsmanship, resulting in some difficulties related to the international dissemination of results and the measurability of social impact. For example, some outputs were only in Slovak language, while English is recommended to broaden their impact. After all, all the *Outputs* were scored at least as D as they demonstrated to be well-structured,

intellectually grounded, articulating scientific gaps/objectives clearly and engaging with literature rigorously and to have a general good quality.

Social Impact and *Creative Environment* were all scored at least as D. In the *Social Impact* it was encouraging to see the role of citizen participation, various forms of decentralised decision-making, and intentional inclusion of youth, marginalized groups, and community voices, however a metrics-based tool with follow-up evaluation or user-centred evidence (e.g., post-occupancy insights, stakeholder feedback, or performance metrics) could have been useful for quantitative assessment of the *Social Impact*, while for the *Creative Environment*, in some *Applications* the description of the institution was mainly qualitative and the international collaborations should have been better highlighted.

Sub-panel members

Gabriela Baron, The University of Auckland

Dora Foti, Politecnico di Bari

Carlo Gualtieri, Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II (Sub-panel Chair)

Marco Liebscher, Technische Universität Dresden

Francesco Minichiello, Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II