

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

Remimeo

HCO POLICY LETTER OF 3 JULY 1974R  
REVISED 17 SEPTEMBER 1974  
(Revisions in Italics)

Data Series No. 33R

EVALUATION, CRITICISM OF

There are six duties of a person who is responsible for passing evaluations:

1. To see that the evaluation is correct and that it can accomplish or approach the Ideal Scene,
2. That those doing evaluations, by the process of the criticism itself, become trained and better evaluators,
3. That persons doing evaluations become correctly and well trained by the process of training, cramming and, as needed, ethics,
4. To see that evaluations do occur on existing situations,
5. To see that unevaluated situations do not exist and,
6. To make sure that the Data Series is used to its full potential.

When an evaluation is rejected, care must be taken that the criticism is correct and not capricious.

If one gives out-tech criticisms of evaluations, no evaluator will really ever learn evaluation. He will just become confused and desperate. The quality of evaluations will deteriorate and the Data Series potential will be defeated.

Therefore the only criteria that may be used in calling attention to outnesses in an eval, a requested rewrite or correction are:

- A. Purity of form. (All parts of an eval included.)
- B. Verification of stats.
- C. Date Coincidence correct and proven on graphs, using all graphs that have to do with the situation.
- D. GDS Analysis supporting the eval (Stat Management P/Ls apply).
- E. Exactly offered data not borne out by an inspection of files.
- F. No situation.
- G. Insufficiently broad situation.

- H. Inconsistent - Policy - Situation - Stats - Data - Why - Ideal Scene - Handling - Tgts, not on same subject. The inconsistency must be precisely pointed out.
  - I. Outpoints in the eval itself - such as in bright idea or handling etc. The outpoint must be precisely noted and named. This does not include outpoints in the data section which are the outpoints on which the eval is based.
  - J. Not all pertinent or available data applicable or needed was examined by the Evaluator. The excluded data must be exactly stated as to what it is and where found. Not looking at all applicable or important data makes it a partial eval.
  - K. Wrong Why.
  - L. Weak Handling.
  - M. Handling does not include targets to handle directly or indirectly the more serious outnesses found in the data mentioned.
  - N. Absence of ethics handling on serious ethics matters found *in the data mentioned or of the ethics why.*
  - O. No method of implementing the evaluation or maintaining the scene and getting its targets done. Such as a broken line between evaluator and scene or omitted terminals or *Ethics Who(s) depended upon to do the targets.*
  - P. Sequence of handling incorrect or omitted. A production target must come first. Errors of solid organize for many early consecutive targets without production in them, no organizing at all are flunks.
  - Q. Vague generalities in postings which do not name the new person or the person to replace the person being moved up.
  - R. Musical chairs.
  - S. No resources or ways to get them or non-utilization of known resources or excessive use of resources for no real gain.
  - T. Off-policy orders or orders that set policy.
  - U. No target or targets to get in the policies mentioned under "Policy".
  - V. Unreadable or illegible presentation of the eval for criticism or review.
  - W. Failure to return eval promptly with corrections.
-

HCO PL 3.7.74R  
Rev. 17.9.74

- 3 -

If the reviewer, corrector or critic of evaluations does the above AND NOTHING ELSE he will be rewarded with better and better evaluations, less and less time spent correcting, more and more gain by use of the Data Series and a happier and more productive scene entirely.

L. RON HUBBARD  
FOUNDER

LRH:nt  
Copyright © 1974  
by L. Ron Hubbard  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

This is Reproduced and issued to you by  
The Publications Organization, U. S.