Grading pros: a confidential plan

Our publication last month of a student Institute history house issues of 10/22 and 10/29 pro
olved a topic largely and partly in a
pose. While readers generally considered
student-organized "feedback" valuable, there
same how bad or how well it was orga
ed and what its value might be.

In particular, people would probably like to
reform a few schemes, some of which include:
(1) the concentration on a few papers of study; or (2) results were distributed only to the faculty involved.

As a result of this survey, we have seen an evaluation of the 3.5-3.3 lab sequence prepared by five of the Phi Lambda Upsilon, the chemistry honor
society; notably it is not based on question-
ers, but rather is more indicative of recommenda-
tions. We hope to reprint it in the near future.

Members of the mechanical engi-
neering department have brought to our attention an alternative of (2), conducted by its honorary, Pi Tau Sigma. Below are printed two letters describing their pro-
gress and a sample of their question-
naire.

To the editor:

I am the article by Alex Makowski
appearing on Page 1 of this Friday, October 15th issue, which reports the student evaluation of instructors; he stated in part "None of the other depart-
ment faculty compares with a recent mechanical engineering labora-
tory's comments on teaching from under-
graduates."

In the Department of Mechanical En-
ineering we have a long tradition of evaluation by undergraduate and graduate students. These evaluations are wholly managed by the undergraduate honorary fraternity, Pi Tau Sigma. They have a very active students group and, at least the past 10 to 15 years, and the system in its present form is now a highly developed one. It includes evaluations and summaries of performances for instructors in all courses, both graduate and undergraduate. The results of this end-of-term questionnaire will be presented and discussed at the most recent department laboratory meeting and evaluation by students. The main purpose of this evaluation is to have a regular mechanism to solicit and receive comments on teaching from under-
graduates.

By vote of the department faculty we are recently approved a new departmental questionnaire survey go to the department head to be used in considerations of salary, promo-
tion, and tenure. They are used consist-
tently for that purpose.

Other departments have an interest in what we are doing, and are moving along similar lines. The point is to me that your readership might be interested in knowing these facts. As it stands, the article has cer-
tainly done an injustice to Pi Tau Sigma, which has done so much for this depart-
ment. We think too that it fails to reflect the long and deep student interest that this department has had with the quality of its teaching and with the input of our students to improve our teaching. I hope that you can do something to straighten out the situation. We, of course, stand ready to supply detailed information if you wish to write another article.

Sincerely,

Aske M. Herold
Head of the department

The wizard of 1D

I Hate This Swill!

The Wizard of D appears daily and Sunday in the Boston Herald Traveler.