



April 2026

**Riga Technical
University
Consolidated
Institutional
Assessment**



Final report



April 2026

Riga Technical University Consolidated Institutional Assessment

Final report



Table of Contents

1	Summary of Unit-Level Performance	2
2	Institutional Context	2
3	Overall Institutional Score and Rationale	3
4	Recommendations	4
	Appendix A FTE academic and research staff at units as reported in the self-evaluation reports	5
	Appendix B Unit scores assigned by disciplinary Expert Groups and Institutional Score	6

1 Summary of Unit-Level Performance

International evaluation covered five units of the RTU. Three units, together employing 75% of the FTE staff, were each given an overall score of 'very good' (4), namely the Institute of Architecture and Design and the Faculties of Computer Science, Information technology and Energy, and Natural Science and Technology. None of their more detailed scores was below 4. The Institute of Architecture and Design was scored 'outstanding' (5) for its development potential while the Faculty of Computer Science, Information technology and Energy achieved ratings of 5 for economic impact, research environment and development potential.

The Faculty of Civil and Mechanical Engineering and the Faculty of Engineering Economics (representing the other 25% of the FTE staff) were scored 'good' (3) overall, as well as for research quality, impact on the discipline and research environment. The Faculty of Civil and Mechanical Engineering scored 4 on the other dimensions (social impact and development potential), while the Faculty of Engineering Economics and Management was rated at 3.

As is normal in research evaluation, the quality and scientific impact scores set the tone for the overall judgement. The very high economic and social impact scores underline the important role of RTU in Latvia, while the 4s and 5 scores for research environment confirm the importance of investment in both physical and organisational infrastructure. The mostly-high development potential scores confirm that continued investment will be rewarding for the Latvian economy and society.

Overall, the fact that the lowest scores are 'good' (3) is very positive. The units involved are in various degrees succeeding; none is failing. The presence of as many as four 'outstanding' (5) scores is both unusual in this International Evaluation and encouraging.

Full details on unit FTEs and scores are in Appendices A and B.

2 Institutional Context

RTU is the only full-scale polytechnic university in Latvia, and has about 14,000 students and 400 PhD candidates. Five units were submitted to the International Evaluation:

- The Institute of Architecture and Design
- The Faculty of Civil and Mechanical Engineering
- The Faculty of Computer Science, Information technology and Energy
- The Faculty of Natural Science and Technology
- The Faculty of Engineering Economics and Management

RTU has implemented a series of strategic measures in response to the recommendations of the previous evaluation, with particular emphasis on advancing doctoral education. Restructuring from nine faculties into four faculties and one institute has fostered greater efficiency, thematic focus, and interdisciplinary synergy. Targeted initiatives have been undertaken to develop human capital, expand research infrastructure, promote international collaboration, and refine the publication strategy. Collectively, these actions have significantly reinforced RTU's research capacity and elevated its international competitiveness.

RTU's mission and vision have been developed through bottom-up processes, and the strategy is aligned with Latvia's and Europe's development priorities. Key elements are academic excellence, education, innovation and technology transfer especially in technical sciences. As



a result, 13 KPIs were created and are being used to monitor progress in the period up to 2027. The Vice-Rector for Development and Finance oversees the implementation of other changes. This arrangement also enables the creation of new research openings and the modification of existing ones. The allocation of funding is tied to the strategy and provides the basis for budget planning and investment decisions, hence every structural academic unit has a defined strategy with specific goals, KPIs and tasks for the coming year.

RTU is producing an impressive flow of PhD graduates. Doctoral training is coordinated across all faculties by the Doctoral School, supporting PhD students throughout their studies, with this centralised support aiming to ensure consistency, transparency, and academic excellence. RTU recognises the importance of providing PhD training relevant to wider society, not only to academic careers. For example, it has an Industrial Doctorate programme where the academic supervisor, PhD student and industry collaborate closely.

RTU's development of its strategy and organisation has been accompanied by investments of over €20m in infrastructure and in more than ten new tenured professorships. A new publication strategy has been developed, focusing on more prestigious publication channels (well-established international journals and publishers with strong peer-review standards) and providing support to authors to improve their publication skills (e.g., training in academic writing and publication strategies). Publication now forms part of the performance-based appraisal and reward system for staff members. Teaching loads have been reduced by consolidating some courses, to create more research time.

The individual unit evaluation reports are generally very positive about performance, and there is evidence of new research opportunities being created by some of the organisational mergers, but there is more to do. There are cases where RTU faculty win ERC grants or lead international research consortia, but more often where colleagues are internationally engaged, this is as partners rather than thought-leaders or coordinators and the number of ERC grants to date is modest. The unit reports confirm the importance of RTU's new publication policy. RTU's industrial engagement is strong, and there are commendably many spin-offs, as should be the case in a technical university. However, the size and shape of the Latvian economy limits the number of large companies with the absorptive capacity needed to be good research partners, implying a need not only to seek out such partners at home but also abroad.

3 Overall Institutional Score and Rationale

Assigned overall score: **4 (very good), a strong international player.**

The overall score of 4 is justified both by the unit scores discussed above and the systemic nature of the university's response following the last International Evaluation. The great majority of the staff work in units given an overall score of 4, where some 'outstanding' (5) scores were present and where no score on any dimension was less than 4. The Faculty of Civil and Mechanical Engineering was rated 'good' (3) overall but 'very good' for economic and societal impact as well for development potential. The Faculty of Engineering Economics and Management was clearly judged to be 'good' – which itself is a commendable result – but is an outlier, accounting for only 7% of employment. The centre of gravity is clearly on the side of a 'very good' (4) score. At the same time, RTU's self-assessment shows that it well understands its development needs and is already working towards further improvement.

4 Recommendations

While RTU's performance is strong and the university is taking the right actions to improve it further, RTU should also recognise that a score of '4' covers a broad range of performance. Making further improvements within that range (and increasing the count of 5's over time) depends on consolidating RTU's position in the international research and industrial landscape. The university should aim to address at least the following recommendations – and embed its responses to them in the research strategies it develops and monitors annually.

- Continue to seek membership of international research networks and consortia, and increasingly to take positions of intellectual and consortium leadership
- Set specific targets to achieve prestigious positions in international research communities in areas such as ERC grants, publications in specific leading journals (more narrowly defined than 'Q1'), seek editorships of leading journals, identify and target specific leading conferences
- Seek more industrial relationships and partnerships not only in Latvia but also abroad, especially in R&D consortia and centres of excellence
- Offer more support to the less well-performing units identified in this report through measures such as the writing and doctoral schools but also through mentorship by senior people in 'very good' units



Appendix A FTE academic and research staff at units as reported in the self-evaluation reports

Unit	FTE academic and research staff at units as reported in the self-evaluation reports																	
	2019			2020			2021			2022			2023			2024		
	Academic	Research	Total	Academic	Research	Total	Academic	Research	Total	Academic	Research	Total	Academic	Research	Total	Academic	Research	Total
Institute of Architecture and Design	9.23	12.61	21.84	9.77	10.98	20.75	9.85	12.44	22.29	9.78	13.05	22.83	9.9	12.37	22.27	8.38	7.29	15.67
Faculty of Civil and Mechanical Engineering	26.26	81.89	108.15	26.4	90.01	116.41	23.86	98.89	122.8	24.29	99.13	123.42	26.71	90.98	117.69	26.5	62.52	89.02
Faculty of Computer Science, Information technology and Energy	44.66	131.99	176.65	47.27	152.74	200.01	42.22	157.55	199.8	43.43	161.15	204.58	45.93	162.9	208.83	48.25	145.44	193.69
Faculty of Natural Sciences and Technology	8.85	152.92	161.77	10.32	172.63	182.95	10.55	196.36	206.9	9.96	189.37	199.33	11.44	180.94	192.38	13.74	153.49	167.23
Faculty of Engineering Economics and Management	15.4	25.6	41	15.12	27.11	42.23	13.92	29.57	43.49	15.13	22.69	37.82	18.37	20.77	39.14	21.72	12.52	34.24



Appendix B Unit scores assigned by the disciplinary Expert Groups and Institutional Score

Unit	Unit scores assigned by the disciplinary Expert Groups						
	Overall score	Quality of research	Impact on the discipline	Economic impact	Social impact	Research environment & infrastructure	Development potential
Institute of Architecture and Design	4	4	4	4	4	4	5
Faculty of Civil and Mechanical Engineering	3	3	3	4	4	3	4
Faculty of Computer Science, Information technology and Energy	4	4	4	5	4	5	5
Faculty of Natural Sciences and Technology	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Faculty of Engineering Economics and Management	3	3	3	4	3	3	3

Assigned overall score: **4 (very good), a strong international player.**