There is not going to be any SCEP course evaluation guide next term. Mr. Baron's 'worry; it's not a bad advice. You can get better advice by listening to upperclassmen and better information by talking to the few members of the tech loop. The evaluation staff has found bubbling-in forms to be most effective. The SCEP guide is selected large core courses.

Students have to try to fill out as much of these forms. It can rate about thirty categories of the course, including the instructor's use of the blackboard and the relevance of the tests during the year. Only a seven-scale space is on the back is allowed for original comments.

The SCEP staff and students in all departments spend the next term compiling the results for publication. And when we pick up the guides next term, we learn that Professor X is a 3.5 on blackboard style but only a 5.6 on relevance of tests. And Professor X can't nail the students for it because they're only reporting statistical facts.

But wait a minute. It tells me nothing that Professor X rates a 3.5 on blackboard manner. I'd rather know this writing is illeg- ible. It doesn't help me to know that his index of test relevance is 5.6. On the other hand, it is useful to know that the exams closely mimic the problem sets.

Even the comments are too terse to provide much of use, and they seem to have been chosen for dullness. I have written remarks both acidic and rhapsodic in the comment space, so I know the SCEP is getting more explosive prose than "Possibly more direction to the overall objective of the course is needed" or "The TAs were highly praised." What are they doing with it?

There are other shortcomings, Humanities, sciences, engineering, and labs are rated on similar unimaginative forms. Not all courses are ranked. The mechanical engineering department, for instance, refuses to allow anyone short of the Chronicle of Higher Education to its facility. Professor Robert Ogilvie breakup the SCEP forms from his 3.081 classroom after getting low re- views for years. Yet no minutes are collected, and no data has been submitted to catch the course until his retirement last year, with little guidance from the SCEP.

The present system is really a cop-out. It may result in some ac- cepted being paid to course qual- ity, but it leaves the specific pluses and problems in a void of numerals, vague categories, and wordy prose. The SCEP guide’s we’ve used can’t improve the course. Colleges teaching, isn’t even entertaining reading, and it is now prohibitively time-consuming and expensive to produce. There must be a better way.

The reaction of a class for a professor can be quantified, except perhaps by money donated- ed to the Big Science Research. I’d have to see the guide staff re- assemble next term — or any term — to get them to budget for what they fight for and the long hours they volunteer to once again route term-long intellectual endeavors to statistics for a few scores. What the SCEP Guide needs is worse: vivid, compelling adjec- tives: "livid," "searing," "flat," "room," and the like to show that Professor X is a 3.5 on blackboard style but only a 5.6 on relevance of tests. And Professor X can’t nail the students for it because they’re only reporting statistical facts.

And the SCEP guide will not be missed.