



Evaluation is based on the evaluation matrix. Items 1-4 are evaluated on the basis of the applicant's academic portfolio (and any appendices). The overall evaluation is based on items 1-5.

Items and Level	Excellent	Very good	Good	Satisfactory	Passable
1. Experience in teaching and evaluation as well as the development of one's own teaching	<p>The applicant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •has extensive teaching experience. •has been responsible for courses or larger teaching modules. •has supervised several completed theses and dissertations. •has examples of systematically using collected feedback to develop teaching. •has provided proof of developing his/her teaching and its evaluation in a pedagogically motivated way. •is pedagogically motivated regarding his/her own teaching innovations or experiments. 	<p>Does not meet the criteria in the excellent level, but exceeds the good level.</p>	<p>The applicant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •has experience of a variety of teaching situations and target groups. •is familiar with a variety of teaching methods which support learning and can produce examples of their appropriate application in his/her teaching. •has supervised several completed theses. •has participated in the guidance of postgraduate students (specialising veterinarians, doctoral students). •has provided examples of using feedback in his/her teaching. •has concrete plans to develop his/her teaching. •has other teaching, supervision or public speaking experience (e.g., conference presentations, orientation of new employees). 	<p>Does not meet the criteria in the good level, but exceeds the passable level.</p>	<p>The applicant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •has some teaching experience. •is supervising or has supervised some theses. •has participated in student assessment, but not in the planning of it. •has experience of different teaching methods and/or situations. •has experience in giving presentations on topics relevant to the field. •has collected some feedback but has not provided concrete examples of using it.
2. Pedagogical training and pedagogical thinking	<p>The applicant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •has completed training in university pedagogy equivalent to or more than 25 ECTS credits. •has proof of maintaining and developing his/her teaching skills in a goal-oriented manner. •has a clearly formulated and pedagogically motivated conception of teaching and learning and proof of applying it. 		<p>The applicant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •has completed training in university pedagogy equivalent to or more than 10 ECTS credits. •has made concrete plans to develop his/her teaching skills. •has a pedagogically motivated conception of teaching and learning. 		<p>The applicant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •has completed some pedagogical training (short courses, individual events), ICT and/or leadership training. •has presented a feasible plan for participating in pedagogical training. •has expressed his/her thoughts on teaching and learning. •has examined his/her strengths and development challenges as a teacher.
3. The ability to use and produce learning material	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The learning material supports teaching and learning, and its selection and use are pedagogically explained. •The applicant has proof of producing learning material for wide use (e.g., for a textbook or on the internet) and has taken a major role in the process. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The applicant has described how to use and adapt learning material to individual situations. •The material and any electronic learning platforms support teaching and learning, and their selection and use are explained, but only based on the applicant's own experience. •The applicant has provided examples of learning material he/she has produced for courses (e.g., course handouts, videos), and/or he/she has participated in the production of published learning material (e.g., as one of the authors of a textbook chapter). 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The applicant has provided examples of using teaching materials in his/her teaching. •The teaching materials produced by the applicant are limited to illustrative teaching aids used in individual teaching situations.

Items and Level	Excellent	Very good	Good	Satisfactory	Passable
4. Other teaching merits (examples)	<p>The applicant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •has held expert or elected positions related to teaching, training or their evaluation at a faculty, university and/or an international level. •has organised training across faculty borders or participated in cross-faculty teaching collaboration. •has participated in international teaching cooperation (e.g., in teacher exchange). •has received awards for his/her teaching. •has publications in the field of university pedagogy. 	Does not meet the criteria in the excellent level, but exceeds the good level.	<p>The applicant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •has participated actively in teaching-related development or quality work at the department or unit level. •has provided examples of good feedback on his/her teaching. •has participated in teaching cooperation or in organising training events. •has held expert or elected positions in his/her field. •has provided examples of making research more accessible to a general audience (science popularisation). •has been invited as a speaker to (national/international) training events. •has conducted teaching also in a second language. 	Does not meet the criteria in the good level, but exceeds the passable level.	<p>The applicant</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •has participated in the development of teaching in individual disciplines and courses. •has participated actively in teachers' meetings and teaching development events at the department and faculty levels.
5. Demonstration of teaching skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The target audience and learning outcomes of the demonstration were taken into account throughout the demonstration, and the realisation of the learning outcomes was assessed. •The latest research was integrated meaningfully into the demonstration, the sources were mentioned, and information was critically discussed. •The demonstration was motivating and inspiring, and encouraged independent thought. •The material was supportive of learning. •The demonstration was clearly interactive and engaging. •The applicant communicated clearly and was persuasive. •The summary of the demonstration corresponds to the learning outcomes and crystallises the main points. •The applicant used the allocated time meaningfully from a learning point of view. •The applicant displayed expertise throughout the demonstration. •The demonstration was motivating, inspiring and encouraged thinking for oneself. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The target audience and learning outcomes of the demonstration were taken into account throughout the demonstration. •The demonstration corresponded to the topic and formed a balanced whole supportive of learning. •Research was integrated meaningfully into the demonstration, and the sources were mentioned. •The material was illustrative, of a high quality and used in a manner that supported the presentation. •The demonstration featured some interaction. •The applicant communicated clearly, and the demonstration was easy to follow. •The summary of the demonstration corresponds to the learning outcomes. •The applicant used the allocated time efficiently and did not exceed it. •The answers to the questions posed were well grounded. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The target audience and learning outcomes were defined. •The demonstration corresponded to the topic, but did not form a balanced whole. •Research was integrated only to a small extent. •The material made the demonstration easier to follow. •The demonstration was not particularly interactive. •The communication was understandable. •The demonstration included a summary. •The applicant clearly fell short or exceeded the time allocated for the demonstration or rushed through the demonstration. •The applicant was able to answer the questions posed.

•The applicant must describe his/her teaching qualifications in the academic portfolio in such a way that they can be evaluated according to items 1 through 4 of the matrix. The recommended maximum scope of the academic portfolio is seven (7) pages. Consequently, the portfolio provides a summary of the facts, and any required details can be included as enclosures. The date and scope (preferably as ECTS credits) as well as the organiser of the completed training and given teaching must be indicated. Any supervised theses and participation in the supervision of postgraduate students as well as produced learning material must be itemised. Concrete examples of collected feedback and its application must be provided. The target group of any published learning material must be indicated.

•The duration of the demonstration is 30 minutes, 10 of which must be reserved for discussion and questions from the audience. The target audience should be defined at the beginning of the lecture (such as undergraduate students of a particular year). If the target audience is the Teaching Skills Evaluation Committee, the applicant should take into account that it includes representatives ranging from students to professors of different fields within veterinary medicine.

•For items 1–3 and 5 in the evaluation matrix, the lower-level requirements are presumed to have been fulfilled at the higher levels, so the criteria are not repeated (e.g., in order to be evaluated as Good, the applicant must also fulfil the requirements for Passable). Not all of the criteria of a particular level need to be met. Instead, some of them may compensate for others. If the criteria for Passable are not met, items 1 through 4 will be evaluated as inadequate or having not been demonstrated, and item 5 (the teaching demonstration) as a fail.