

(Tabled September 21, 1981)

TO: The Indiana Faculty Senate  
The Purdue Faculty Senate

FROM: The Faculty Affairs Committees  
Mary Helen Thuente, IU Chairperson  
David A. McCants, PU Chairperson

DATE: March 13, 1981

The Faculty Affairs Committees would like to amend Indiana FWSD 80-4 and Purdue FWSD 80-7 by adding the following recommendation to the end of the document:

In addition, the Committees believe that the development of a systematic and uniform program for assessing teaching should be accompanied by similar developments in the areas of research/scholarship/creative endeavor and service. To effect this end the Committees recommend that

1. the Senates elect two five-member committees of faculty which are representative of the disciplines at IPFW, one charged with recommending to the Senates a plan for the evaluation of research/scholarship/creative endeavor and the other charged with recommending to the Senates a plan for the evaluation of service; and, further, that

2. both committees be subject to the following charge:
- a. to investigate evaluative techniques utilized at other universities;
  - b. to recommend procedures for establishing a specific faculty appraisal system to be determined by faculty within each discipline and consistent with established university-wide criteria;
  - c. to integrate the appraisal system to a university-wide supported faculty development program;
  - d. to relate the faculty appraisal system to formal reappointment, promotion and tenure procedures.

Approving:

D. Chowdhury

D. McCants

R. Pippert

C. Poston

Z. Shipchandler

M. H. Thuente

B. Bulmahn

Disapproving:

L. Smith

Abstaining:

J. Giusti

Senate Document SD 81-6

(Indiana FWSD 80-4)

(Purdue FWSD 80-7)

(Amended February 19, 1981)

(Tabled September 21, 1981)

TO: The Indiana Faculty Senate

The Purdue Faculty Senate

FROM: The Faculty Affairs Committees

Mary Helen Thuente, IU Chairperson

David A. McCants, PU Chairperson

DATE: December 3, 1980

SUBJECT: Recommendations on the Report of the Task Force on Faculty Assessment,  
Part I: Teaching

During the winter and spring of 1979-80, the Faculty Affairs Committees, meeting jointly, considered the "Report of the Task Force on Faculty Assessment, Part One: Teaching" (commonly referred to as the Harroff Report). The discussions, which occurred at several lengthy meetings, were based upon questions formulated by members of the Faculty Affairs Committees. Among the issues examined in these meetings were:

1. the validity of the Task Force's assertions about the state of assessment of teaching at Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne;
2. the problems inherent in relating statistical data about teaching to evaluations of teaching for faculty review and reward purposes;
3. the professional ethic of mandatory participation by students or faculty in student evaluations of teaching;
4. the merits of the specific instruments and procedures suggested in the Task Force's Report.

Although the members of those Committees registered clear and strong divisions of opinion on numerous aspects of the issue, the Committees do support, in principles, the "Report of the Task Force on Faculty Assessment, Part I: Teaching."

Specifically, the Committees recommend that an ad hoc committee consisting of two members of each university affiliation be selected by the Senates and charged with recommending within one year to the Senates instruments and procedures for evaluation of instruction that are consistent with the following guidelines:

1. that separate systems of assessment of teaching should be devised for purposes of improving teaching and making personnel decisions;
2. that the promulgation of such systems be part of a commitment to recognize effectiveness in teaching as an important factor in promotion and in merit pay consideration;
3. that any statistical system of assessment of teaching be in accordance with generally accepted measures of validity prior to its use for making personnel decisions;
4. that uniform procedures and instruments for assessing teaching should be available but participation should not be mandatory;

5. that the entire faculty be encouraged to participate in a one-time campus-wide collection of data (to establish a data base) for the purpose of making uniform student evaluation procedures and instruments more useful tools for improving teaching of individual members of the faculty or for making personnel evaluations.

Approving

B. Bulmahn

D. Chowdhury

D. McCants

R. Pippert

C. Poston

Z. Shipchandler

M. H. Thuente

Disapproving

L. Smith

Abstaining

J. Giusti

## Report of Task Force on Faculty Assessment

### Part One: Teaching<sup>1</sup>

The Task Force on Faculty Assessment, having studied faculty development systems and instruments from numerous colleges and universities and from such agencies as Educational Testing Service (Princeton), and the Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development (Kansas State University), strongly recommends that Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne implement a uniform campus-wide program for the assessment of teaching and for instructor self-improvement. We wish to emphasize that this institution should combine any system of faculty assessment with a comprehensive plan for faculty development and with a publicly announced commitment to recognize effectiveness in teaching as an important factor in promotion and in merit pay consideration.

Heretofore, it has been rather difficult to prove cases for promotion in rank based primarily on excellence in teaching. In part, the reasons for this reticence to promote on the part of committees and administrators are the natural result of our generally haphazard methods for evaluating teaching. We must have a mechanism for obtaining reliable data in order to be able to state unequivocally that a candidate for promotion or tenure is indeed an effective, even an outstanding teacher. Our report thus recommends a uniform procedure and several standardized instruments for use at Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne in assessing the teaching of its faculty members for merit increases, for promotion and for tenure.

Faculty development opportunities, too, have occurred rather incidentally on this campus. We view the need for development opportunities as a concomitant of any assessment procedures and, at appropriate points in our report, we will make recommendations about ways in which assessment and development can proceed together.

#### A. Methods of Assessing Teaching

We recommend that the following primary methods be used for assessing teaching at this institution:

1. An in-class student evaluation of instruction.
2. Evaluations by colleagues and peers both within and outside this institution.
3. Evaluations by recent graduates of this institution.

Normally any file prepared for merit salary consideration or for promotion or tenure would include information garnered by each of the primary methods enumerated above. In addition to these primary methods, the following supplementary methods might also be used for assessing teaching:

1. Peer evaluation through classroom observation.
2. Evaluation of textbooks and/or supplementary course materials.
3. Evaluation of contributions to curriculum and course development.
4. Evaluation of academic advising activities.
5. Awards for outstanding teaching.

6. Performance of students on professional examinations or in graduate studies (where the student's performance can be directly attributed to having worked with the faculty member).
7. Evaluation of activities in guiding the work of Teaching Associates or intern teachers.
8. Evaluation of contributions to workshops, practica, or other pedagogical seminars.

We recognize that this list cannot and should not be definitive. Rather, it is meant to indicate areas which might be used to present supplementary evidence.

The acceptability of any of the methods outlined above (either primary or supplementary) will be directly affected by the procedures used to garner the information. Accordingly, we will recommend for each primary method and of many supplementary methods an objective, uniform, standard format for administration and collection; in some cases we will recommend a single instrument or type of instrument for gathering the information.

## B. Detailed Recommendations Concerning Primary Methods

### For Assessing Teaching: Instruments and Procedures

In this section of our report we will bring the detailed recommendations for instruments and procedures in the three primary methods.

#### In-class Student Evaluations of Instruction

During the past several years, promotion and tenure committees have been asked to view, evaluate, and consider between fifteen and twenty widely differing instruments for classroom evaluation of instruction. Some of these instruments were highly individualized and designed primarily for the use of the instructor for diagnosis and development. Some contained primarily open-ended questions which were answered by the student in paragraph form, others were



computer scored; some were typed, others were handwritten; some were administered during class, others were sent home with the students. In short, there was a perplexing variety of instruments and procedures used to garner student opinion.

The Task Force on Faculty Assessment recommends that the following principles be applied concerning in-class student evaluations of instruction:

1. The student evaluation system must utilize one standard instrument.
2. The instrument must be quantitative and yet must retain some flexibility for the individual faculty member.
3. A core of standard questions should be included for the entire campus, and this set of standard questions should be established by the Faculty Affairs Committee of the respective Faculty Senates meeting jointly; furthermore, it should be reviewed by that group every three years.
4. Schools and departments should adopt groups of standard questions relating to their particular missions and disciplines, and each school and department should establish or utilize a standing committee for this purpose and for review of the questions on a regular basis.
5. There must be no cost to the faculty member, to the department, or to the school from the use of the student evaluations.
6. Student responses should be anonymous and safeguards should be built into the evaluation system to assure the complete anonymity of the student.
7. The administration of the student evaluation in the classes must be done by an unbiased and neutral party and this person's signature must accompany the evaluations.
8. These evaluations should be administered each semester in all classes.

9. Data norms will be generated for each course; ad data summary should be made available to the participating instructors of a course provided that information concerning three or more instructors is included in the data base.
10. General summaries of the evaluations should be available to the administration at least once per year with no identification of individual faculty members: each department would have its own summary of data, each school would have its own summary, and the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs would have the campus summary. Copies of these unit summaries would be available to all faculty members within their respective units.
11. Only in individual merit cases or in promotion and tenure cases will administrators or faculty committees outside the department be given specific information concerning a particular individual and this information will be available only as part of the candidate's case.
12. The in-class student evaluations are also intended to be used for faculty self-evaluation and development. Departments and/or schools should be encouraged to develop Effective Teaching Committees whose sole function would be to provide collegial assistance to those who feel that their teaching could be improved. Furthermore, the campus should establish an Office of Teaching Resources as outlined later in this report (Section E).

### Colleague Evaluations of Instruction

The colleagues with whom we teach regularly with whom we plan curricula and courses, and with whom we determine course assignments, are often those persons who can best comment on whether our teaching methods are suited both to the class constituency and to the subject matter. Accordingly, colleague evaluation (either as individuals or as a group) should be a primary method of teaching assessment. Although the Task Force on Faculty Assessment does

not wish to prescribe a rigorous format for such evaluations, we do recommend the implementation of the following general guidelines:

1. All evaluations by colleagues should be signed and dated.
2. Evaluators should clearly state whether the evaluation is the result of:
  - a. A specific in-class observation or series of observations (if so, give date, course number and title, approximate number of students, and whether the observation was made alone or as part of a group).
  - b. A video-taped or filmed presentation (if so, was the class session a “special” presentation or part of the normal schedule; was the instructor present when the tapes were viewed).
  - c. The evaluator’s having worked generally with the individual in departmental responsibilities such as counseling, curriculum planning, teaching multiple-section courses, etc.
  - d. Workshop presentations observed outside the regular schedule.
  - e. The evaluator’s having utilized texts and/or supplementary materials prepared by the candidate.
3. Evaluators and committees should be rigorous in their choice of terms to describe their colleagues’ teaching. We prefer that the following terms be used:
  - a. Outstanding – the top 5%\* of our teachers; their teaching would be recognized as distinguished at this institution or other institutions and they would probably be the recipient of some teaching award.
  - b. Superior – the next highest 10%\* of our teachers; these persons may not yet have the experience necessary to be an outstanding or distinguished teacher, but they show definite signs of attaining that recognition.

- c. Competent – at least 80% of our teachers would be in this category; it is important to recognize that this term should apply to most of our teachers and that it is the term used by our institution to denote the teaching of those who attain tenure.
- d. Below expectations – this term would describe the teaching of those who, if they were to make a concerted effort to improve some aspect(s) of their teaching, would be able to gain recognition as competent or even superior or outstanding teachers.
- e. Incompetent – this term would be used to describe the teaching of a person who is incapable of performing the classroom obligations assigned.

\*This percentage figure is arbitrary and might be increased slightly, but the combined total of the top two categories is not intended to be more than 25%.

- 4. Colleague evaluations should be solicited through and/or by the chairperson of the department/academic unit, and the faculty member evaluated should have the opportunity of appending written clarification or rebuttal to the statement of any evaluator(s).
- 5. Colleague evaluations should be solicited regularly, and must be solicited at least once prior to the preparation of a tenure case.

#### Evaluations by Graduates

Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne has not yet undertaken any systematic solicitation of the opinions of its graduates about the quality of the instruction they received at this institution. We propose that each department distribute the form listed as Appendix A to its graduating seniors during the month of May prior to final exam week. The following general guidelines would obtain:

- 1. This form would be distributed each year by all departments/academic units.
- 2. The form would be distributed only to graduating seniors.

3. All information obtained would be considered confidential and only in individual merit cases or in promotion and tenure cases would administrators and committees outside the department be given specific information concerning a particular individual and this information would be available only as part of the case.
4. None of the information gathered would be distributed to the faculty member until after graduation.
5. Accurate records must be maintained by the department concerning the number of evaluations distributed and the total number returned in any given year so that the percentage can be included in the candidate's case.
6. Because of the possibility of a rather poor sampling return, we further recommend that a return of 67% or above would be required before the results would be considered conclusive. Any percentage below 67% would allow the candidate to exclude all comments and to state instead that the results were inconclusive because of a (given) percentage return.
7. If any comments obtained using this primary method are included in the case, all comments must be included.
8. The faculty member evaluated must have the opportunity of appending written clarification or rebuttal to the statement of any evaluator(s).

We feel that the primary methods enumerated above for the assessment of teaching present a good balance of empirical and of testimonial evidence, of colleague and of student responses, of non-directed and of controlled questions, and of regular and also of periodic evaluation.

### C. Detailed Recommendations Concerning Certain Specific

Supplementary Methods for Assessing Teaching:

Instruments, Procedures, and General Guidelines

We wish to stress again the fact that the supplementary methods discussed below do not represent a definitive list. Rather, they are meant to describe general areas which the faculty member might wish to consider, and to give guidelines for administering and/or for collecting the information.

### Peer Evaluation Through Classroom Observation

The general statements which apply to colleague evaluation of instruction (pg. 6) would of course also apply for this more specific method of evaluation. The following general guidelines should apply to any peer evaluation procedures used on this campus:

1. The selection of peer evaluators should occur within the discipline.
2. The evaluators would normally be either:
  - a. Peers from within a teaching team.
  - b. Work groups of three faculty members.
  - c. Two evaluators selected by the instructor.
3. All those involved in the classroom observation group should be evaluated and all should serve as evaluators.
4. The time of the observation should be determined in advance by the instructor and the evaluator(s).
5. The evaluator(s) should review the course objectives and/or the outline, and the reading list or daily assignment for the class session which will be observed.
6. There should be a minimum of two observations per semester.
7. A post evaluation session between the instructor and the evaluator(s) should follow immediately after the class session or, if that is not possible, the same day.

8. The process should be confidential, and the instructor would be the person to decide whether to share this information with the department chairperson or to include it in a case prepared for merit increases, for promotion, or for tenure.
9. Written remarks by both the evaluator(s) and by the instructor should be included as part of the evaluation.
10. Information concerning the size of the class, the level of the learners, and whether the course is required or an elective should be included as part of the evaluation.
11. The areas to be evaluated might include, but not be limited to, the following questions:
  - a. Is the teaching method appropriate to the level of the student and to the complexity of the material presented?
  - b. Does the instructor's method seem to foster learning? If lecturing, does the instructor summarize and clarify? If working with small group learning, does the instructor encourage comments and questions?
  - c. Does the instructor adequately deal with irrelevant comments made by students?
  - d. Is the material organized in a logical way, and does it build on previous learning?
  - e. Does the instructor convey an interest in the subject and familiarity with it?
  - f. Do the instructor's method and presentation suit the stated goals for the course?

The two forms included as Appendixes B and C might be used for evaluation of instruction by this supplementary method.

Evaluation of Textbooks and/or Supplementary

Course Materials Prepared by the Instructor

In general, the method of evaluating textbooks should not differ from that for evaluating books or articles of a more esoteric nature as outlined in Part Two of our report (forthcoming). This section of the report will recommend instruments and procedures for such evaluation, and it will ask for, among other things, information about the publisher, information about the reviewer or evaluator, and information about the value of the publication to the profession.

If the textbooks and/or supplementary course materials have not yet been published, they should nonetheless be reviewed by at least one faculty member within this institution and by one person outside this institution. Again, the guidelines and instruments to be presented in Part Two of our report will be used to complete this section.

### Evaluation of Contributions to Curriculum and Course Development

The development of vital, rigorous curricula and courses is an important aspect of the teaching function of this institution. Accordingly, those faculty members who have contributed to this facet of teaching should be recognized for their contributions. We recommend that the following format be utilized when information from this area is submitted to committees and administrators:

1. A narrative summary of the course/curriculum contribution(s) as well as the rationale for its development should be presented as part of the dossier.
2. An evaluation of the significance of the contribution(s) should be requested from another member of the faculty of this institution.
3. Any other institutions which have implemented or are studying this new curriculum or course should be listed and the name of the person who might be contacted for an additional evaluation should be included.

### Evaluation of Academic Advising



Although each department and school may differ in its policies about those to whom academic advising is assigned, the faculty members who do regularly advise students should receive consideration for this aspect of their teaching. The following procedures are recommended for assessing academic advising:

1. The candidate should include a summary by class standing of how many students were counseled per semester.
2. The department chairperson and/or the dean should append a brief statement explaining why these advisees were assigned to the instructor.
3. Each Fall Semester when counseling is to be undertaken for the following semester, departments and/or schools should include with their informational mailings to students a copy of the appended evaluation form (Appendix D) with explicit instructions to return the form to the departmental/school office at the time when they make an appointment to be advised.
4. If this aspect of teaching is to be included for consideration in a dossier, all responses from the advisor's students are to be included in summarized form, with the individual comments appended in typed form. The department/school will be responsible for keeping an annual tally of these responses and comments for each faculty member to whom advisees have been assigned.
5. It will be the privilege of the candidate to decide whether this supplementary method (if applicable) will be used for assessing the candidate's teaching in reviews for merit, for promotion, or for tenure.

We recommend that the instrument included as Appendix D be used for assessing academic advising.

#### Awards for Outstanding Teaching

As institution of higher learning should be proud of those teachers among its faculty who have been declared outstanding teachers. In recent years, faculty committees and administrators

have not always been adequately informed about the selection process for each award. Accordingly, we recommend that the agency or committee assigning the award be asked to respond to the following questions and that the response be appended with the award for consideration:

1. What was the composition of the committee which considered candidates for this award?
2. How many candidates were considered and how many selected?
3. Is this award campus-specific or is it an award based on competition throughout the greater university system?
4. What information was requested and/or submitted as evidence of this person's outstanding teaching?

#### Performance of Graduates on Professional

#### Examinations and in Graduate Studies

This method of assessing teaching should only be included in dossiers where ample and compelling evidence has been submitted that the student's performance can be directly attributed to the student's having worked with the faculty member. Such evidence could take the form of a departmental statement that only this faculty member has developed the area of expertise tested or otherwise referred to; it might also include letters from former students who affirm that it was this faculty member's teaching which decisively shaped their preparation in the area of proficiency. We feel constrained to mention again the caveat that this method brings compelling evidence for teaching effectiveness only when a definite correlation is established between the success of the student and the teaching of this particular faculty member.

#### D. General Principles Applying to Any Additional

#### Supplementary Methods for Assessing Teaching

It is not the intent of this Task Force to give detailed recommendations for every conceivable supplementary method of assessing teaching. Rather, we have discussed several typical methods in detail, and we now recommend a series of general principles which should be adhered to by any candidate for promotion, for tenure, or for merit pay consideration who wishes to include information gathered by using a supplementary method.

1. Candidates should carefully and completely describe the teaching activity which is being evaluated and the assessment procedure utilized.
2. Candidates should also ensure that a representative sampling of opinion is obtained under the auspices of a neutral party.
3. Requests for evaluation should be made by the department or academic unit rather than by the faculty member whose teaching is to be assessed.
4. Complete information about the number of opinions solicited and the number received should be included.
5. Where possible, candidates should include evaluations solicited from both persons directly associated with this institution and those who are not directly associated with this institution.

#### E. Faculty Development: Office of Teaching Resources

Recent scholarship has acknowledged that many large institutions of higher learning have for so long placed their highest priority on published scholarship that a significant commitment will be required from those institutions which intend to convince their faculty members that they should take a renewed interest in teaching excellence. Clark and Gorman, for example, have emphasized the need for realistic expectations about the level of faculty commitment to teaching:

The ethos of research will continue to dominate, strongly buttressed by /senate-dev . a reward system that encourages successful research. Accepting this as the continuing mode of operation, a realistic goal for a faculty development program is to strive for an increase in the commitment of the faculty to instructional improvement.<sup>2</sup>

If we desire such an increased commitment we will need to make instructional improvement materials and advice readily accessible to faculty members, and we will further need to ensure that instructional improvement materials are relevant to the specific needs and rigors of each discipline. In addition, the institution must make an unequivocal commitment to support the teaching mission through, among other things, its promotion and tenure practices.

Attempts to encourage excellence in teaching heretofore have been sporadic and relatively unpublicized within our academic community. The Task Force on Faculty Assessment recommends that such efforts now be strengthened and coordinated at this institution through a proposed Office of Teaching Resources.

The Office of Teaching Resources would be staffed by one faculty member (with a one-quarter load reduction) who would establish a library of materials, and who, in consort with faculty members working in the various disciplines on our campus and with the Faculty Development Offices in Bloomington and Lafayette, would schedule symposia on various aspects of teaching. We further recommend that secretarial assistance be provided for this faculty member through the secretarial pool as needed. Finally, we recommend that office space for this person and for the library of materials on faculty development be provided in the Helmke Library and Learning Resource Center.

Appendix A:

Evaluation of Instruction by

Graduating Senior

\_\_\_\_\_ Department

In our continuing efforts to serve the students who attend Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne with programs of high academic quality we earnestly solicit your opinion about the instruction which you received. Our concern is to identify the following “kinds” of teachers:

1. Those who are clearly outstanding and who should be recognized for their distinguished teaching.
2. Those whose teaching is quite competent and who therefore enhance the faculty of this institution.
3. Those whose teaching, in your opinion, was not adequate. (Please be kind enough to give specific major areas which need improvement.)

Listed below you will find the names of all of the faculty members of this department. Restricting yourself to the categories delineated above, please make a comment about any of the teachers with whom you have studied. Please date and sign the report and return it to the departmental office during final exam week. The comments will not be distributed to your instructors until after graduation day. Thank you for your careful consideration.

Professor A

Professor B

Professor C

---

---

## Notes

1. This report addresses only the area of teaching. Subsequent reports will bring detailed recommendations concerning research and service.
  2. D. Joseph Clark and Neil B. Groman, "A Discipline-Oriented Model for Faculty Development at a Research-Oriented University," Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education, II, 3 (Fall, 1976), 17.
- 
-



Appendix A

Professor D

Professor E

Professor F

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Date  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix B

### Peer Observation: Interest and Selection

This form should only be completed by those who wish to participate in peer observation this semester.

1. I would prefer being in an observation group with

\_\_\_\_\_.

2. I do not wish to be in a group this semester with

\_\_\_\_\_.

3. I would like to be evaluated in the following course(s):

\_\_\_\_\_.

4. My schedule this semester is:

\_\_\_\_\_

Signature

---

---

## Appendix C

### Peer Observation: Evaluation

Instructor evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_.

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of observation: \_\_\_\_\_.

Class observed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Is this \_\_\_\_\_ the first evaluation, or \_\_\_\_\_ a subsequent evaluation?

Approximately how many students were present? \_\_\_\_\_

Were the students primary \_\_\_\_\_ beginning, \_\_\_\_\_ intermediate, \_\_\_\_\_ advanced?

Is this class \_\_\_\_\_ an elective, or \_\_\_\_\_ required for most students?

You may wish to address yourself in your comments to the following questions?

What method did the instructor use in teaching this class? Was the method appropriate to the level of the student and to the complexity of the material presented? Does the instructor's method seem to foster learning? Is the material organized in a logical manner? Does the material build on previous learning? Does the material convey and interest in the subject?

## Additional Comments

---

---

Appendix D

STUDENT EVALUATION OF FACULTY ADVISING

Adviser's name \_\_\_\_\_

How many semesters has this person served as your adviser? \_\_\_\_\_

What do you expect from a faculty adviser? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Please evaluate your adviser on any or all of the following characteristics. If you wish to make comments on any area, please use the back of this sheet.

(Specific examples are most helpful.)

	No	RATING SCALE	Points
--	----	--------------	--------

CHARACTERISTICS	Opinion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Given
Was this person accessible to you and willing to make enough time available?		not available or willing		satisfactory			always available and willing		
Did this person take an interest in you and your educational plans and problems?		no; completely disinterested		satisfactory			yes; was very aware of my progress and gave helpful suggestions on problems		
Was this person well informed about her/his specific area of advising?		no; in fact, the adviser was confused		satisfactory			exceedingly; able to explain clearly		
Was this person able to answer questions about general graduation requirements?		no; adviser was not able to help		satisfactory			yes; actively discussed them with me regularly		
Was this person able to get information about requirements at other campuses in the system?		no; adviser uninformed and not interested in getting information		satisfactory			yes; either knew the requirements or phoned an adviser there		
Did this person ever mistakenly advise you to take a course which was not acceptable within your program?		yes; one or more times		satisfactory			never; was careful to check this area		

7. If you could choose between this adviser and others in a further semester, how would you rate your present adviser?

\_\_\_\_\_ Would prefer her/him to most advisers I have had at IU-PU.

\_\_\_\_\_ Would be pleased to have her/him again.

\_\_\_\_\_ Would rather not have her/him again.

\_\_\_\_\_ Would not have her/him again under any circumstances.