

Faculty Visitation Report

Department of Philosophy

California State University Sacramento

Please fill out this report completely and send it as an e-mail attachment to (a) the instructor, (b) the chair of the department and (c) the chair of the faculty visitation committee. **Your visitation should normally take place by mid semester, and should always be submitted no later than two weeks after the agreed upon visitation date.** For online courses, the visitation date corresponds to the date upon which you request access to the online environment. **For face to face courses, please request an appointment at least a week in advance of your preferred date, and be sure to secure access to all online materials.** Note that this report is not simply an evaluation of a single teaching performance, but of the professional conduct of the teacher and the administration of the class as a whole. Please remember that this report will become a permanent part of the instructor's file and that it is essential evidence for ARTP decisions at every level. If you are uncertain about the appropriateness of any remark you make below, consult the chair for guidance prior to giving it to the instructor. Delete this note prior to submission. You may delete the explanatory notes as well.

Instructor:

Course:

Visiting professor:

Classroom visitation date:

- Term, month, date and year.

Type of course:

- Lecture, seminar, hybrid.

Accessibility

- Was the instructor responsive to your request for a visitation date?
- Did the instructor provide you with full access to online resources?
- Is the instructor's website up to date with all current syllabi?
- Are the online resources easily accessed and well-organized?

Syllabus and requirements:

- Is the course designed to include the best practices encouraged by the [Philosophy Department AI Course Design Recommendations ?](#)
- Are the syllabus and the work schedule for this class clear and in conformity with the requirements of the syllabus checklist?
- Are the course requirements clear?
- Are the assessment methods appropriate and transparent?
- Are the readings and other course material commensurate with the course description?
- Are the readings and other course material appropriate to the level and content of the course?

Faculty Visitation Report
Department of Philosophy
California State University Sacramento

- Is the list of topics, readings and philosophers studied sufficiently diverse for a course of this type?
- Are the requirements and assessment tools adequate to a course of this type?
- Are there appropriate safeguards against academic misconduct?
- Other relevant observations

Course management:

- Does the course appear to be proceeding on schedule?
- Is there evidence of regular communication with the students, e.g., regarding upcoming due dates and minor changes to the schedule?
- Are assignments being graded and returned in a timely manner?

Environment:

- Building and classroom or alternative remote visitation mode
- Number of students in attendance compared to number enrolled
- Punctuality of instructor
- Presence or absence of distractions or distracting behaviors in students or instructor
- General level of readiness and attentiveness in students or instructor
- Other relevant observations.

Presentation Type:

- Lecture, discussion, group work, presentational technologies employed (i.e, black or whiteboard, clickers, slides, video, etc.)

Topics:

- The general topic or topics of the day.
- Does the topic appear to be on schedule?

Summary of presentation:

- This section is non-evaluative. Carefully summarize the material presented during this class meeting.

Quality of presentation:

- Was the presentation clear, interesting, well-structured and appropriate to the level of the class?
- Were there any notable omissions, errors, misrepresentations or over-simplifications in the presentation of the topic?
- Was the technology employed competently?
- Did the instructor skillfully cultivate student interest in the subject?

Faculty Visitation Report
Department of Philosophy
California State University Sacramento

- Was the presentation especially creative in any way?
- Was the instructor attentive to the general level of student comprehension?
- Were any student comprehension assessment methods employed during class?
- Were students clearly held responsible for reading or other preparation?
- Did the instructor deal helpfully and effectively with student questions?
- Was the time used completely and efficiently?
- Other relevant observations.

Student-teacher relationship:

- Did the instructor treat the students with respect?
- Did the students treat the instructor with respect?
- Was the social atmosphere in the course generally positive?
- Other relevant observations.

Notable Strengths:

- On the basis of this and any previous visitations, what are the instructor's best qualities, both as a teacher and designer of courses?

Recommendations for improvement:

- On the basis of this and any previous visitations, what are the instructor's main weaknesses? If you detect no actual weaknesses, please try to identify ways in which the instructor can nevertheless improve.

Representativeness

- If you have observed this instructor in the past, how does today's performance compare to past performances?
- Were there any unusual circumstances in virtue of which you would recommend this evaluation to be given less than normal importance?

Summary Evaluation

Provide a summary evaluation of the quality of (1) course design and implementation; (2) class meeting.

In each case select the evaluative term below that is most compatible with the evidence you have provided above and provide any additional justification of this choice if necessary. Please pay careful attention to the rubric.

- Unacceptable
 - means there were very serious problems with the class meeting or the course design is seriously out of compliance with departmental guidelines or catalog requirements. These problems have been documented above.
- Poor

Faculty Visitation Report
Department of Philosophy
California State University Sacramento

- o means the class meeting or course design was not competent. The instructor should not be assigned to this course again without prior evidence of having addressed the issues documented above. Future work should be granted only under conditions of closer supervision.
- Competent
 - o means the class meeting or course design met but did not exceed basic expectations. Significant improvement is required and other more competent instructors should be assigned to this course unless clear evidence of commitment to such improvement is demonstrated.
- Good
 - o means class meeting or course design is competent in every significant way, and significantly exceeded minimal expectations in **at least some ways** documented above. This term is not an expression of general dissatisfaction, but an acknowledgement that there are some significant ways that the instructor can improve the course.
- Very Good
 - o means class meeting or course design is competent in every significant way and significantly exceeds minimal expectations in **many ways**. This term indicates a very high skill level, with no significant weaknesses, and only minor suggestions for improvement.
- Excellent
 - o means class meeting or course design is competent at every level, significantly exceeds minimal expectations in **several ways, and was exceptional in one or more way**. This term indicates a quality level that one would normally expect to see in less than 10% of courses taught.