

HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE  
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex

Remimeo HCO POLICY LETTER OF 20 MARCH 1977R  
REVISED 15 JUNE 1977

(Taken from LRH OODs item  
of 15 October 1973)  
(Revisions in Italics)

Data Series 44R

SUPER EVALUATION

I have examined four evaluations recently and have found in each case that the evaluator had not gone to the trouble of looking in obvious places for data.

In each of these cases, personnel whose personnel folders had not been looked into and whose ethics files had not been examined were concerned. In the last one, a person was being proposed for promotion to a high executive position in an org while the stats for the past week demonstrated that his area was seriously downstat, *the matter even being mentioned on the current Battle Plans.*

It is not how much you read, it is where you look. In the Data Files, if one is examining the statistics of a division, one does not read all manner of reports from other divisions and other personnel. One has to be selective and right target to get his data.

Statistics (as fully outlined in Statistical Management PLs) are the dominant factors in an evaluation, and most evaluations begin on the basis of statistics which are either sufficiently high to merit examination so as to be reinforced, or are too low to be viable. These read in conjunction with other statistics usually give you an org situation.

When one discovers a series of outpoints, there is generally a situation underlying them.

From the statistical trail, or the gross outpoint trail, one can locate a situation. The situation is then evaluated by looking for and finding the exact data which applies to that situation. From this one can find his Why, and once this is found he can get a bright idea.

A program can then ensue which terminatedly handles that situation.

Evaluations cannot be done in any other way. The moment that you apply humanoid think to the subject of evaluation, you lose.

In the last evaluation I looked over, the evaluator obviously had not gone to personnel files, Data Files or any other files but had simply read some PR dispatches written by the guy himself and had taken single-source data and decided to promote the person to the control of an area. Statistics demonstrated at once that the person's stats were down, that practice evaluations done on that very org existed, and that the ethics and personnel files of that person would never have suggested any promotion and on the contrary would

have suggested demotion. This would have made a very dangerous situation in the area, would have victimized a great many good people, and would have played hell with Flag statistics.

*Persons "evaluating" without having looked at the vital data concerned with their evaluation, are subject to a Court of Ethics on the charge of FALSE EVALUATION.*

*While this might be looked on some as a deterrent to evaluating at all when evaluations are vital, remember that it is better to handle one person, the evaluator, than to tie up and maul a thousand people with a program based on a false Why.*

Evaluations not only can be done but are quite magical in handling things when the evaluator knows what he is doing and when he looks for the information he needs to evaluate in the places where that information exists.

It is out of correct and brilliant evaluation that high stats are made.

We have superlative tools, we must use them right.

Compiled from  
LRH OODs item,  
15 October 1973  
"Super Evaluation"

L. RON HUBBARD  
FOUNDER

Assisted by  
AVU Aide  
Evals Officer  
and  
AVU Veris Off, Flag