BOARD POLICY LETTER

Remimeo
Academy Students
SH Courses
Tech Sec Hat
Qual Sec Hat
Dir Validity
Dir Correction
Student Examiner Hat
Cramming Officer Hat
Supervisor Hat

16 MARCH 1965R
Reissued 13 September 1967
Revised & Reissued 12 August 1975 as BPL

CANCELS
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 16 MARCH 1965
SAME TITLE
(Revision in this type style)

TRAINING DEPT – DIV IV
DEPT OF VALIDITY – DIV V

All student examiners are to be star checked on this.

FURTHER MATERIAL ON STUDY – EXAMINATIONS

Progress in study can be inhibited through the usage of a poor system of examination. By asking of questions irrelevant to the material covered and by failing to ensure that the student is fully aware of exactly what question is flunked, the student can be given sufficient losses to slow down his rate of learning and to cause ARC breaks.

A misunderstanding comes about in the first instance purely on the basis that the student understood that he was studying a given subject. An irrelevant question asked by an examiner indicates to the student that such an understanding was false or that no basic agreement existed on the subject in the first place. An example of this would be to ask a student of a French language course to give the main historic dates and their significance to Eighteenth Century France. The original understanding was that the student was learning to speak and read French, not to learn the history of France.

In Scientology an example of an irrelevant question would be to ask the student to give the distribution of a bulletin. The understanding of the student is that he is there to learn Scientology, its theory and application, not to learn the internal administration of organizational communication lines. A further example would be to ask a Level II student a question concerning data and material covered in Level IV.

Frequently enough a Supervisor has to cope with a student who has come into Scientology to study the law of Karma or to study sociology or some other previous misconception without adding to the difficulties by asking irrelevant questions. Knowing what we now know about study we can handle earlier misconceptions, but a Supervisor must never ask a question of a student which is irrelevant to the subject or level. We must ourselves be careful not to add to student confusion. Therefore, any Supervisor tendency to ask irrelevant questions must be firmly restrained.

In the second instance of the unknown question, a student can be given a verbal question on which he is flunked. In most cases, the student will not be able to remember the question asked as he would not have flunked it in the first case if he had not already failed to understand the material covered by the question. Failure to remember the question asked or a Supervisor's refusal to give him the question asked reacts upon the student as an unanswered question, and therefore an uncompleted communication cycle, but also as an unknown question. The student will ARC break. You can easily demonstrate this by mumbling a question which is not clear enough to be understood and then insist upon an answer. You will soon enough have a very upset person on your hands.

This is what happens when a student is asked a question, flunked, and then not given to clearly understand the question asked. Therefore Ron now requires that *any examiner must always write down verbal questions asked before asking them, and when a student flunks, hand him the written question which he flunked.* The student will then be able to know what he didn't know and be able to look up the material and

clear up what it was that he had not understood. Further, this will enable him to complete the communication cycle.

If tape examinations are addressed to a class as a whole, these questions must be posted and the examination papers returned to the student. The student can then see what it was that he missed and what question was missed.

Many people have had experience of such poor systems of examination which failed to follow the above. It is common practice in universities not only not to give students the questions asked, but also never to return examination papers. Most frequently all the university student is given is a grade. If that grade is not 100%, then the student never knows what it was he didn't know and so can not look it up to know it. This leaves him in the uncertain condition of insecurity about his data on a particular subject. And if the student flunks the subject and has to re-take it, he cannot comfortably study the subject because the *whole* of the subject has now become a complete mystery to him. Thus, the subject is set up as an ARC Break.

Universities probably do this to be sure that their examinations do not get out to students, but then one can only state that this is laziness or lack of ability on the part of professors to think of different questions, or perhaps even a professor's own lack of understanding of his subject sufficient to enable him to be able to think of enough questions to ask. It also could be that there is a complete lack of worthwhile material in more primitive subjects than Scientology on which to ask questions, in which case it should never have been part of the curriculum. (Freudians mainly examine on the *dates* of Freud's papers for their qualification of psychiatrists!)

The administration of a proper system of examination is quite simple:

1. Tape examinations or examination questions given verbally to the class as a whole must be written down before being asked and must be posted on a bulletin board afterwards and all examination papers must be returned to the students.

2. Verbal questions asked of individual students must be noted down in a book like an invoice book with tear-out sheets and a piece of carbon paper. Such books are easily procured from stationers as they are used in most stores. The student is given the yellow copy of the questions with the flunked question plainly marked. The white copy is placed in the examiner's folder for the bulletin, tape or material.

In this fashion, we will be able to collect good questions to be asked; to notice fundamental areas of misunderstanding individual students have; and to note any areas of misunderstanding which are broadly misunderstood. We can, therefore, see where the individual student needs help and see where it is necessary to elaborate more fully on certain technical data in order to make it more broadly comprehensible.

Supervisors and examiners doing this will then be contributing to the more rapid progress of individual students and to students in general.

The same principles apply to the Department of *Validity* and any other student examinations given.

Mary Sue Hubbard
Revised & Reissued as BPL
by Flag Mission 1234 2nd
Molly Gilliam
Approved by the
Commodore's Staff Aides
and the
Board of Issues
for the
BOARDS OF DIRECTORS
of the
CHURCHES OF SCIENTOLOGY

BDCS:CSA:BI:MSH:MG:mg.rd