## HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

Remimeo HCO POLICY LETTER OF OCTOBER 4, 1964
All Staff Reissued on May 21, 1967
All Students

Tech Hats THEORY CHECK-OUT DATA

Qual Hats (Modifies HCO Pol Ltr of Sept 24, '64)

In checking out technical materials on students or staff, it has been found that the new system as per HCO Pol Ltr of Sept 24, 164 is too lengthy if the whole bulletin is covered.

Therefore the system given in Sept 24, '64 Pol Ltr is to be used as follows:

- 1. Do not use the old method of covering each bit combined with the new method.
- 2. Use only the new method. .
- 3. Spot check the words and materials, do not try to cover it all. This is done the same way a final examination is given in schools: only a part of the material is covered by examination, assuming that if the student has this right the student knows all of it.
- 4. Flunk on comm lag in attempts to answer. If the student "er...ah...well...," flunk it as it certainly isn't known well enough to use. (Doesn't include stammerers).
- 5. Never keep on examining a bulletin after a student has missed.
- 6. Consider all materials star rated or not rated. Skip 75%'s. In other words, the check-out must have been 100% right answers for a pass. 75% is not a pass. When you consider a bulletin or tape too unimportant for a 100% pass, just require evidence that it has been read and don't examine it at all. In other words, on those you check out, require 100% and on less important material don't examine, merely require evidence of having read.

## THE "BRIGHT" ONES

You will find that often you have very glib students you won't be able to find any fault in who yet won't be able to apply or use the data they are passing. This student is discussed as the "bright student" in the Sept 24, '64 Pol Ltr.

Demonstration is the key here. The moment you ask this type of student to demonstrate a rule or theory with his hands or the paper clips on your desk this glibness will shatter.

The reason for this is that in memorizing words or ideas, the student can still hold the position that it has nothing to do with him or her. It is a total circuit action. Therefore, very glib. The moment you say "Demonstrate" that word or idea or principle, the student has to have something to do with it. And shatters.

One student passed "Itsa" in theory with flying colours every time even on cross-check type questions, yet had never been known to listen. When the theory instructor said, "Demonstrate what a student would have to do to pass Itsa," the whole subject blew up. "There's too many ways to do Itsa auditing!" the student said. Yet on the bulletin it merely said "Listen". That given as a glib answer was all right. But "demonstration" brought to light that this student hadn't a clue about listening to a pc. If he had to demonstrate it, the non-participation of the student in the material he was studying came to light.

Don't get the idea that Demonstration is a Practical Section action. Practical gives the <u>drills</u>. These demonstrations in Theory aren't drills.

Clay Table isn't used to any exten by a Theory Examiner. Hands, a diagram, paper clips, these are usually quite enough!

## COACHING IN THEORY

There is Theory Coaching as well as Practical Coaching.

Coaching Theory means getting a student to define all the words, give all the rules, demonstrate things in the bulletin with his hands or bits of things, and also may include doing Clay Table Definitions of Scientology terms.

in Practical. But it is done on Bulletins, tapes and policy letters which are to be examined in the future. Coaching is not examining. The examiner who coaches instead of examining will stall the progress of the whole class.

The usual Supervisor action would be to have any student who is having any trouble or is slow or glib team up with another student of comparable difficulties and have them turn about with each other with Theory Coaching, similar to Practical coaching in drills.

Then when they have a bulletin, tape or policy letter coached, they have a check-out. The check-out is, a spot check-out as above, a few definitions or rules and some demonstration of them.

## DICTIONARIES

Dictionaries should be available to students in Theory and should be used in Theory Examination as well, preferably the same publication. Dictionaries don't always agree with each other.

No Supervisor should try to define English language words out of his own head when correcting a student as it leads to too many arguments. On English words, open a dictionary.

A Scientology dictionary is available.

Remember that with Courses becoming briefer in duration, the number of bulletins and tapes which the student must know on a Star-Ratod basis is also less.

General written examination for classification, however, remains on an 85% pass basis.

Be sure that students who get low marks constantly are also handled in Review, preferably by definitions of words they haven't understood in some former subject. Scientology is never the cause of consistent duliness or glibness.

Processing of this nature can be on an Itsa basis. It does not have to be Clay Table. Just finding the prior subject by discussion and discussing its words usually blows the condition. I've seen it change the whole attitude of a person in just 5 or 10 minutes of auditing on a "locate the subject and word" basis.

Therefore, definitions exist at Levels O and I, but not with Clay Table or assessment, only by Itsa. You'd be surprised how well it works and how fast. "Subjects you didn't like", "words you haven't grasped" are the discussion questions.

The subject of "wrong definitions' cause stupidity or circuits, followed by overts and motivators", is not easy to get across because it is so general amongst Mankind. There is a possibility that past lives themselves are wiped cut by changing language, whether it is the same language that changes through the years or shifting nationality. But however that may be, don't be discouraged at the difficulties you may have in getting this principle understood and used in Scientology departments - the person you are trying to convince has definitions out somewhere also!

L. RON HUBBARD Founder

LRH: jw: jp. Mgk Copyright (c) 1967 by L. Ron Hubbard ALL RIGHTS RESERVED