Encounter

One of the brightest and most promising innovations on campus this fall is the Thursday noon ‘Encounter’ session held in the Student Center.

The success of this program which enables undergraduates to meet and talk seriously with many of the most interesting faculty and staff is in some ways surprising. When we suggested editorially last spring that there was a real need for a program to introduce students to some of the Institute’s ‘grand old men’, we received only pessimistic comment on the failure of similar programs in the past.

It is now a fact that the Student Center Committee and Dave Peterson ’68, Encounter Director, that the program was initiated anyway. The imaginative and resourceful committee coupled with even more imaginative and intensive promotion has resulted in an extent of participation which exceeds even the undergraduates’ apathetic projection.

We can only hope that the informal, lunch-hour seminars will thrive. There is a tremendous amount of knowledge and wisdom in our faculty, but much of it goes through the classroom. The entire Encounter approach seems like a wonderful way to make this knowledge and wisdom accessible to the students.

In Encounter’s case some hard work is required by many of our students and help to make a student center out of the Stratton Building.

Letters to the Tech

Pass-fail

To the Editor:

The key argument by the proponents of grading by pass-fail, as described in your editorial of November fourth, seems to be that such systems “allow students to succeed at their own level and pace, interests fully by removing the necessity to study solely for a grade.” Isn’t this encouraging the blame when no grade can be a complete measure of one’s mastery of a subject? It is generally true that if one really masters his subject, the grade will take care of itself. If so, there is not a need for any grading to study “solely for a grade.”

Would not pass-fail systems still be as likely to result in pass-fail borderline in a number of students who at the same time not warning them as clearly that what they were nearing that borderline? Why do the majority of students, are there not many other factors, usually more important than grades, which do “allow students to pursue their academic interests at their own pace” without, however, additional effort from the student’s own work, improved facilities for independent study, student enrollment in a subject content per unit time allotted, and the correspondence course plans, by taking from three to five years for the first degree.

So to be sure, your suggestion of pass-fail grades in excess subjects does not depend on the arguments quoted above. Your reservations about the present system in regard to Advanced Standing Examations, in which grades are given but not counted in the cumulative average are valid.

Prof. Frank A. McClintock ’42

(Ed. note: First let us admit that the ‘idea’ of pass-fail is quite popular with some students, and that failing to determine in studying a student’s academic success or failure. We have campaigned substantially for several of them.

If fact does not admit that the teaching was universally excellent, course perfectly developed and performed in full and constant person-to-person contact with their students, grades, though a convenient measure of what a student has mastered.

However, given our red-ual size and type faculty, since every error in the pass-fail course while subtle differences in knowledge can’t be so negligently reflected in their fi- nal grades. In other words, since many feel that the average student can’t accurately determine who knows what and that one another, should be stopping he students are to come enough to take the academic framework in. In es- suate there is one a pass-fail course with the level of a professor. Which raises the question of why bother to study a pass-fail course with the same on the subject as the course.

Against the Poor

To the Editor:

MIT students for a Democratic Society wishes to reply to the Tech editorial defending the administration’s position on the Inner Belt. The overall flavor of the editorial suggests a desire to be fair to those who are displeased with the idea that the Brookline-Elm neighborhood is being made available to that which is itiove to displace the Brook- line-Elm route is not as are supported with questionable analysts and practically no facts.

It is not unimportant to the revised Portland-Albany route taken as many hours and twice many jobs as the Brookline-Elm route. This assertion is fair-ly strong. Although neither of the two routes has been worked out in complete detail so far, it is hard to believe that the Brookline-Elm route would not require many homes and businesses; it is highly unlikely that any such route were to purchase houses elsewhere. Moreover despite of the old- er homes, the Brookline-Elm route cannot be replaced. Finally, not even the people who rent apart- ments in the Brookline-Elm route would be displaced by the few units which might be involved, or to leave Cambridge (and for the Ne- gatives involved this move means even more than those who will be displaced are over 200 since many of them are used by young students and even more money from their property (by renting rooms to students; it is highly unlikely that any but a very few of those will be presented to the Institute.

While the administration did not count the damage the Inner Belt.

The Tech also claims that “Proposals for student’s agreement that without the Inner Belt the present traffic conditions in Cam- bridge has not been a serious one in the existing system.” This ignores the basic fact that there are only four pass-fail courses which are so ‘boring’ to students that more than one pass-fail the Advanced Standing Exams provide valuable with recurrent traffic jams from the day it is open. The Massachusetts Department of Public Works plans for an Inner Belt were based on data collected in the Cambridge- Brookline-Elm corridor. When a pass-fail course with the same on the subject as the course.

As a professional and the revised Portland-Albany route taken as many homes and twice many jobs as the Brookline-Elm route. This assertion is fair-ly strong. Although neither of the two routes has been worked out in complete detail so far, it is hard to believe that the Brookline-Elm route would not require many homes and businesses; it is highly unlikely that any such route were to purchase houses elsewhere. Moreover despite of the old- er homes, the Brookline-Elm route cannot be replaced. Finally, not even the people who rent apart- ments in the Brookline-Elm route would be displaced by the few units which might be involved, or to leave Cambridge (and for the Ne- gatives involved this move means even more than those who will be displaced are over 200 since many of them are used by young students and even more money from their property (by renting rooms to students; it is highly unlikely that any but a very few of those will be presented to the Institute.

While the administration did not count the damage the Inner Belt.

The Tech also claims that “Proposals for student’s agreement that without the Inner Belt the present traffic conditions in Cam- bridge has not been a serious one in the existing system.” This ignores the basic fact that there are only four pass-fail courses which are so ‘boring’ to students that more than one pass-fail the Advanced Standing Exams provide valuable
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