



THE TOWER LIST

1964

PRESENTED BY TAU DELTA PHI,
MEN'S HONORARY SCHOLASTIC FRATERNITY

50 cents

The purpose of the Tower List

Serious students have long attempted to secure the best possible education by careful selection of their instructors. In making their selection, however, they have had to rely primarily on the campus grapevine. This grapevine has its disadvantages: it is not available to the many students who have few contacts on campus, it is of uncertain accuracy, its coverage is very spotty, and it is generally unavailable to the faculty members who wish to see themselves as students see them as a means of improving their teaching.

The Tower List is an attempt to compile in a systematic and responsible manner the responses of San Jose State students to their faculty, and to make this information available to all who can profit from it. Student response is, of course, only one of many factors in determining the merit of an instructor, and the Tower List does not pretend to measure the merit of instructors. It does claim to be a summary of student opinion regarding instructors, which is as accurate as it was practical to make it.

In the fall of 1963, an initial experiment in compiling such a list was undertaken. This first Tower List made no effort to secure an adequate number of student ratings, nor an adequate coverage of the faculty; it was intended to provide experience in how ratings could be collected and reported. For this reason, the first Tower List was never made available to the general San Jose community. It provided the basis, however, for the present project.

Professional assistance was obtained in designing and revising the rating sheet and in planning the process of tabulation. The most careful thought was given to the problem of sampling. It was found impractical to secure a truly random sample of sufficient size so that ratings from several students would be available for each of hundreds of instructors. Every effort was made, however, to obtain broad coverage and to avoid obvious sources of bias. In all some 20,000 rating sheets were distributed through classes and through booths on campus. Publicity for the project was begun well in advance through the Spartan Daily, and it is reasonable to assume that almost any student willing to participate in the undertaking had an opportunity to do so. Each student participating was given ten rating forms and a sheet of instructions. He was asked to rate only those professors with whom he had had classes in the last year. He was not asked to give his name, but was asked to give his major, grade-point average, academic year, the courses he had taken from the instructor, and the grade received in each. This information was used by those tabulating the forms to interpret cases where ratings of instructors were highly inconsistent. Such inconsistency is noted by an asterisk in the summaries which follow.

Continued inside back cover.

Over 4,000 forms were returned. Instructors who were rated by 2 or less students were not included in the final publication. Future editions of the Tower List are anticipated, and every effort will be made to expand the coverage in each edition. All students who find the list useful, as well as those who feel it should be improved, are strongly urged to cooperate in future editions by giving us their serious and thoughtful evaluations of the instructors they know. Students, and especially faculty members, are invited to make any suggestions for improvements in the methodology within the limitations of our resources.

The ratings were tabulated carefully and in accord with a standard set of instructions. The results of these tabulations are presented in the following pages. The instructors are listed alphabetically within departments. Each instructor was rated on eight criteria, and his average rating on each of them is presented. The number of students who rated him is given along with a general interpretative comment and recommendation.

Any rating system such as this has an obvious utility to both students and faculty, but certain inherent limitations must be recognized. Inevitably, some of the faculty members listed will have left San Jose by next fall, and obviously many new faculty members will be joining the staff then. As previously mentioned, the sample of students, although large, is not random, and may well over-represent students with strong pro or con feelings regarding the instructor. Moreover, careful attention should be given to the number of ratings available for each instructor; in general, the larger the number the more useful the rating is likely to be.

The ratings represent an average of student opinion; but it must always be borne in mind that an average is derived from differing opinions, all of which may have been equally valid responses on the part of particular individuals. The most unpopular instructor in terms of average ratings may nevertheless be excellent for particular students, and the most popular instructors may not be effective for some. We have attempted to cope with this problem by using the recommendation "some" in cases where some students think highly of an instructor who is lowly regarded by others. Nevertheless, no rating system can replace individual judgment, and the opinion of a close friend of similar interests and temperament may be more useful to the student than our ratings. They will, however, provide some basis for selection of instructors when more direct and personal means are unavailable.

The members of TAU DELTA PHI

Tau Delta Phi's Professor of the Year



DR. LEROY R. POSEY
PROFESSOR OF PHYSICS

From the moment he arrived at San Jose State, this dynamic professor has distinguished himself among students and faculty as a teacher of exceptional skill and devotion. He has continually captivated students with lucid, stimulating, and thoroughly absorbing lectures. He instills insight into abstract mathematical concepts through the use of familiar physical analogies. His lectures are delivered with such vitality and showmanship that admission could be charged. The showmanship, however, forms an integral part of his presentation, but only as a means of holding class interest—not as a substitute for instruction. Dr. Posey feels that the purpose of the classroom is to excite the student to search out the subject himself. The instructor's job is not to bore a hole in the student's head and pour material into it, but to ignite the "spark" of interest.

Outside the classroom Dr. Posey is a warm person who is a valuable source of advice and counsel. His office is always open to those interested in discussing a problem or simply chatting. Good students are a source of pride to Dr. Posey and he makes every effort to insure that they continue in their endeavors. He maintains an active interest in them long after they have left the classroom and the college.

Dr. Posey thrives on teaching and enjoys being a part of campus life. His goal is to enable students to form broader concepts and interests which will help them in building a mature philosophy of life. We of Tau Delta Phi believe that Dr. Posey has been extremely successful in this aim and is truly the "PROFESSOR OF THE YEAR."

EXPLANATION OF THE NUMBERS

The numbers in the columns represent averages. The higher the average, the better the professor, except for question three. A one half point difference is extremely important in the overall evaluation of a professor in a given area.

1. Are the lectures in the course interesting?
1—no; 2—below average; 3—average; 4—above average;
5—exceptionally interesting.
2. Are the lectures relevant to the course and well organized?
1—no; 2—below average; 3—average; 4—above average;
5—exceptionally relevant.
3. Is the total amount of required work high, low or about average?
1—very low; 2—below average; 3—average; 4—above average;
5—very high.
4. Is the required work interesting, relevant and useful?
1—no; 2—below average; 3—average; 4—above average;
5—exceptionally useful.
5. Is the grading easy, hard, or average in the course?
1—very hard; 2—hard; 3—average; 4—easy; 5—very easy.
Be careful on this question. The lower the number, the harder the grading.
6. Are the tests fair, clear, and relevant to the course?
1—no; 2—below average; 3—average; 4—above average;
5—exceptionally clear and fair.
7. Is the assignment of final grades fair and based on valid criteria?
1—no; 2—below average; 3—average; 4—above average;
5—exceptionally fair.
8. Is the professor interested in the student and willing to respect and help him?
1—no; 2—below average; 3—average; 4—above average;
5—exceptionally interested in the student.
9. The number of evaluation forms tabulated for each professor.

* Irregular ratings, a more specific explanation of that question will be found in the comments.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

ALL—Recommended for all students on campus.

SOME—The professor will appeal to only a certain segment of the student body.

MAJOR—Majors in that department will most probably derive the greatest benefit from the professor.

AVOID—The professor may have some commendable aspects, but they are heavily outweighed by other factors. These professors are to be avoided.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Intelligent Professor's Guide to Students	1
Aeronautics	4
Art	4
Biological Science	6
Business	9
Chemistry	16
Economics and Geography	18
Education	21
Engineering	23
English	26
Foreign Languages	34
Geology	37
Health and Hygiene	38
History	39
Home Economics	44
Humanities Program	45
Journalism and Advertising	46
Librarianship	46
Mathematics	46
Meteorology and Physical Science	50
Music	52
Philosophy	53
Physical Education	56
Physics	56
Police	58
Political Science and Public Administration	58
Psychology	62
Science Education	67
Sociology and Anthropology	68
Speech and Drama	70

INTELLIGENT PROFESSOR'S GUIDE TO STUDENTS

by Dr. Robert C. Gordon,
associate professor, English

The only trouble with confidential student guides to professors, is that the professors have no such information about prospective students. Here is an attempt to fill the gap.

URIAH SIGGIFANT

No need to carry matches when he's around. As soon as you flourish a cigarette his obsequious Ronson is on the job. These and other little courtesies, of course, merely prepare the way for the inevitable midterm conference, when he comes in to discuss the exam and to find out "where he went wrong." Then he expects payment for his past deference. These conferences are always interminable and excruciating. Recommendation: Contrive to be interrupted by an urgent telephone call from "the Dean."

THESPROTIA GUMM

Softhearted but purposeful, Thesprotia slips into your office when no one is looking, clutching a sheaf of her poems. She has shown them to no one, but she is shyly expectant and glowing with creative energy. What she wants is your honest criticism. What she writes falls somewhere between Ferlinghetti and the Ladies' Home Journal. At the first hint of a negative comment she will launch into a long explanation of what she "really meant." She is still there two hours later. Recommendation: give her unstinting praise and tell her to send her poems to the Sewanee Review. It is always slow to answer and you'll have at least three months' peace.

JODHPUR S. FENWAY

This neo-conservative has read Buckley, Ayn Rand, and Goldwater. Though a student at a state college he loudly deplores the withering of rugged individualism and the coddling of the citizenry by government. He cannot conceal his contempt for professors; if they weren't incompetent they'd be out meeting payrolls and earning \$35,000 a year. The only way to deal with him is to look him straight in the eye before the whole class and tell him that you're very, very rich. His attitude will change on the spot, and you must be prepared henceforth for some nauseous flattery, but at least the classroom will be quieter.

REGINALD BUNTHORNE

This is a warning for feminine professors. Reginald will sit in the front row and gaze at you with a look of calf-like eroticism. He will breathe sighs and pretend to be distracted by a hopeless passion. The office visit will follow. He will lean at you over his paper and there will be an occasional "accidental" caress with his knee. Remain unconvinced and, above all, don't be alarmed. You're always perfectly safe with Reginald.

MILES P. GLORIOSUS

This lad is a strategic gadfly. He differs with you in class, sometimes rudely, and he always looks at you as though he were fearful of your getting away with some slipshod reasoning. This will always annoy you, but it won't last forever. Near the end of the term he will "confess" to you that you gave him some

"fresh insights" and helped to "reorient his thinking." He has done this in every course so far. Current G.P.A.--3.50.

PERDITA DABCHICK

Poor Perdita! Her one anxiety--can he make the Civil War interesting? Can he make Courtship and Marriage interesting? Can he make the Fall of Rome interesting? Tell some jokes about Beauregard, Planned Parenthood, or Caligula? Above all, try to see that she gets her C. She will lobby for freedom of thought and higher academic salaries for the rest of her life.

SIEGFRIED WUNDT

Professors of literature beware of this ferocious psychology major. He sits in the back row and sneers. Although he acknowledges Shakespeare's "verbal facility," he considers his psychology "primitive." Recommendation: suggest that Falstaff is a libido symbol. He will consider you out of date but still far in advance of your more hide-bound colleagues.

S. QUENTIN BAEZ

He enters the class in sandals, his shoulders bent from the constant pressure of a guitar strap. He courageously opposes the bomb. Unfortunately, he also opposes civilization, the fine arts, voice culture and the Renaissance. Quell him at once by proclaiming yourself a Wolfganger. (Wear a Bach sweatshirt for the occasion, and greet your class with "Viva Verdi!") When he offers to bring his guitar and entertain the class with Songs of the Labor Movement, utter the word No, very firmly.

HAROLD PROUDFOOT

A brilliant student. Learns the material, then develops and presents his own views with clarity and dignity. Turns in papers on time, takes criticisms well, but can defend himself when you've been too hasty or harsh. His main problem is philosophical and psychological; he is haunted by fears that he doesn't really exist. Perhaps he doesn't, but at least we can encourage him in his delusion.

HAMLET MC DANE

Sometimes called "The Question Man." No one can accuse Hamlet of a lack of respect for professors. He regards them as ultimate authorities on everything. Our man in Math, who teaches Hamlet the calculus, reports that in one recent week Hamlet asked the following questions after class: a) Is Kruschew's de-Stalinization policy genuine or a mere propaganda stunt? b) Has recent investigation of the 48 hours before the Battle of Antietam enhanced McClellan's reputation as a strategist? c) Are pitted black olives required or optional in the preparation of Saute de Boeuf a la Provencale? d) Did Moses really write the Pentateuch? Recommendation: Have a catalogue with you at all times and refer Hamlet to the proper academic department. When your colleagues elsewhere become angry with you, tell them it was all a joke.

F. SCOTT FITCH-ABERCROMBIE

Ski-buff, sometimes called The Abominable Snowman. He misses Fridays and Mondays during the season. Soon he will appear with a proud expression on his face and a leg cast, garnished with obscene inscriptions by his girl friends. Observe his ruddy complexion and note that the color deepens toward the nose. This confirms reports that F. Scott merely does one turn down the beginner's slope and then goes into the bar, wheezing and slapping his thighs, to spend the rest of the weekend.

MRS. PERUNA FISHBEIN

I wish Mrs. Fishbein would develop a sense of proportion in her domestic life. Maternity--Incipient, Chronic, and Convalescent--is her constant theme. Sooner or later she will ask to be excused from classes for one of the following reasons: a) morning sickness; b) onset of labor; c) post-parturitive exhaustion; d) 2 a.m. feedings. In fairness to Mrs. Fishbein, she never tries to take advantage of her condition and will attend classes as long as possible. For this reason, each professor should check carefully at registration. If her name is on his class list he should enroll at once in Nursing 103A (Fundamentals of Midwifery).

ADVERTISING (see Journalism and Advertising)

AERONAUTICS DEPARTMENT

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

SHREVE, G. L.

3.3	3.3	2.7	2.7	2.7	3.0	3.0	3.7	3
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Young - nice guy - willing to help. Knows material well, Exams are fairly easy with emphasis on a good general understanding of the concepts. (Rec: ALL)

AIR SCIENCE DEPARTMENT

An insufficient number of evaluation sheets were returned to cover the professors in this department.

ANTHROPOLOGY (see Sociology and Anthropology)

ART DEPARTMENT

BALLARIAN, A. N.

1.4	2.0	4.2	2.4	2.8	3.0	1.8	3.2	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A good artist. Female, unmarried - with a bias toward male students. Talks at long length about nothing, with the result that one cannot obtain any peace during classtime in which to work. (Rec: SOME)

BROSE, R. C.

3.5	3.8	3.3	3.3	3.1	3.7	3.8	3.8	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Tries to inspire students and make the course interesting for both majors and general education students. Has a good sense of humor and tells funny jokes. Be careful in lettering - he demands the best for an "A." (Rec: ALL)

COLEMAN, R. R.

3.2	2.5	3.5	3.7	2.7	3.0	3.3	4.2	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A very nice professor and an excellent artist; students like and respect him. He has something to say, so he is good if you love art. However, he seems to expect too much work for a 3 unit course. (Rec: SOME)

DE LA CROIX, H. M. H.

2.3	3.5	3.5	3.5	2.7	2.7	3.3	2.3	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Very good but very hard. Stands aloof from the students. (Rec: SOME, those willing to work.)

DE VINCENZI, J. V.

3.3	3.3	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.7	3.7	3
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A very warm person, he recognizes sincere effort and is willing to help the student. Interesting lectures and good projects. (Rec: MAJOR)

DONOHU, D. C.

4.2	4.4	4.2	3.8	2.6	3.2	1.6	3.4	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Grading is subjective. Expects much from student. Semester project counts very heavily in final grade. Some believe there is cheating in the classroom. (Rec: SOME)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

HATCH, D. P.

3.8	4.1	2.1	3.5	3.0	3.2	3.3	3.4	2.4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

Very interesting, spontaneous lectures. Take good notes since he gives somewhat ambiguous, multiple choice tests from lecture material, slides, and textbooks. (Rec: ALL)

LOVERA, J.

4.0	4.0	3.7	4.3	2.7	4.0	3.0	4.3	3
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He knows the subject well and is able to transmit it to others. Also very interested in the student and willing to give individual attention. (Rec: ALL)

OBACK, N. E.

4.2	4.5	3.7	4.5	2.2	3.7	3.7	4.5	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Considered one of the best in the art department for majors. General education students should be prepared to work hard, emphasizing quality in their work. (Rec: SOME)

POWERS, H. E.

4.0	4.0	2.3	4.0	3.0	3.7	3.7	4.0	3
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Fine teacher. Knows his field and is interested in his work, as well as that of the student. (Rec: ALL)

SORBY, J. R.

2.0	1.6	3.6	3.0	2.6	2.4	2.8	3.4	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures irrelevant! He talks about his family. He is so disorganized that he changes assignments in midstream. Lectures are redundant. He has his own concepts. If yours differ, be able to defend them well. Spend extra time on assignments and talk with him, if you want a good grade. Tends to push favorites. (Rec: MAJORS, if you agree with him.)

STEWART, M. D.

3.4	4.0	2.4	3.0	3.4	3.7	3.9	3.1	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Grades on class average. Fairly boring lecturer; gets mixed up and rattled easily. Has a realistic technique and knows the subjects basic and necessary for an art major. Partial to some students; dictatorial. (Rec: SOME)

TANSEY, R. G.

4.9	4.8	3.9	4.6	2.6	3.9	3.7	3.4	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Dr. Tansey is an institution in himself, not only as a fine and brilliant lecturer, but also for the position he has on campus and the views he holds. His lectures should be attended, if only to broaden the student's views of the world around him. He brings art to life through the use of slides - the combination of slides and lectures is almost an aesthetic experience in itself. Tests are identification of slides (who, when, where and how). (Rec: ALL, a must for every student.)

VOGEL, D.

3.0	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	2
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Mr. Vogel is among the "avant garde" in art. Good if you like highly abstract art. Rather than really teach you, he lets you "find yourself." He is interested in the student who shows a degree of feeling. (Rec: SOME)

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT

DUNCAN, C. D.

3.3 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 6

Intelligent man, knows his field well - also related fields. Has a genuine interest in student. Wonderful sense of humor and enjoys teaching. Requires great deal of outside work. (Rec: SOME)

EDWARDS, J. G.

4.5 | 4.8 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 2.4 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 7

Dynamic, interesting lectures. Very Personable prof.; really extends himself to help student. (Rec: ALL)

FIGG-HOBLYN, J.

* | 3.9 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 14

His lectures are rated poorer by upper division students than lower division, speaks in a monotone. Presents a good general biology course and does put a little humor in his lectures. Grades on a curve and tests based primarily on lectures. (Rec: SOME)

HARRIS, H. A.

3.5 | 4.7 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 3.2 | 9

Good instructor; excellent organization. Makes otherwise dull subject interesting. Personable attitude towards student. Tests are difficult but well constructed and relevant; grades fairly. If you miss three classes in Bot. 100, you have to take an extra exam. Memorization is emphasized a great deal. (Rec: ALL)

HARTESVELDT, R.

3.9 | 4.3 | 2.9 | 3.7 | 3.1 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 8

Very much interested in the subject. Obviously knows his material and presents it in an interesting way. One of the few instructors who speaks in a monotone - yet keeps student's attention. (Rec: ALL)

HARVEY, H. T.

3.8 | 3.8 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.4 | 13

Some students may not like him at first, but the observant gain respect for his command of many areas of biology. His main aim is to make you question the basics of the course and prove them for yourself. He "expands" in the out-of-doors, ie. field trips. (Rec: SOME)

HENDRICKS, L. J.

2.8 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 5

Demonstrates great interest in material; floods you with classification. Gives useful research projects to acquaint you with literature. Pop-quizzes. If you're not a major, don't take him. (Rec: MAJOR)

HUTTON, K. E.

3.6 | 4.3 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 2.9 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 8

Good lecturer; outlines his lectures on the board at the start of class. Knows his field and gets the material across to

students. Has some distracting personal habits eg. never looks at students during lecture. (Rec: SOME)

JACOBS, A. W.

2.0	2.2	4.2	1.8	2.2	1.4	2.4	2.4	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Poor instructor; lays on the classwork as a substitute for personal instruction. Lectures are not organized; types student's grade and makes it virtually impossible to change it. Considered by some a "Very fauning old satyr." (Rec: AVOID)

LEVINE, E. P.

*	2.6	3.4	2.9	3.0	2.4	3.7	2.9	7
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Many students run into personality conflicts with this instructor; she tends to be very egocentric. Quite willing to help students. When she lectures, she tends to be so dramatic that you are more interested in watching her performance than listening. (Rec: SOME)

MC MASTER, P.

2.5	2.3	2.7	3.5	2.7	4.3	3.7	3.0	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

She has a novel approach to teaching; tends to prepare lectures a few minutes before class and in consequence you never know what she will lecture about. Student must be independent and able to study on his own. Stresses concepts and gives excellent tests; does not teach a "regurgitation course". Very willing to assist student. (Rec: MAJOR)

MOREJOHN, G. V.

4.0	3.8	3.7	4.0	1.2	3.0	2.8	3.3	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He is a very intelligent instructor and excellent lecturer. Context, organization, personal experience and wit are unified nicely. Only majors should take him as he has an admitted bias towards non-science majors. Demands utmost effort; only students who are willing to work should take his courses. Very stringent grader; high percent of students receive D's and F's (some of them are repeaters in Genetics, particularly). Tests are clear and gives ample problems and sample questions beforehand. (Rec: MAJOR)

PATTERSON, H. R.

2.8	3.2	2.6	2.8	3.2	2.4	2.8	3.0	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Knows limitation of non Bio. Sci. majors in a Bio Sci. course and does not pile on unreasonable amounts of work. Tests purposefully worded to mislead students. Lectures reasonably interesting. (Rec: SOME)

PORTER, C. W.

*	3.4	3.4	2.6	3.0	*	3.3	*	8
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	-----	---	---

Lower division students have difficulty with lectures but those in upper division with greater background find him excellent. Expects background in biochemistry, which is rough in a lower-division course. Spends a great deal of time in private lab and hence hard to get in touch with. Great interest in placentas (his hobby). (Rec: SOME)

RICHTER, R.

3.0	3.0	2.2	2.5	3.3	2.8	2.8	3.5	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Very likeable; says the only reason he is teaching is because it's such easy work. Very lethrgic when it comes to tests (all multiple choice, IBM). As a result, the curve is very tight. Good knowledge of subject. (Rec: MAJOR)

ROBINSON, H. W.

4.4	4.6	3.6	4.4	3.6	3.6	3.4	4.0	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Exceptional lecturer, well organized and experienced in the field of parisitology. Excellent instructor, but will not "lead the student by the hand", expects considerable amount of outside effort. Impatient with those who do not put forth. (Rec: SOME)

SHARSMITH, C. W.

2.3	3.7	3.7	3.0	3.0	3.6	3.6	3.0	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A real authority in his field, probably the best at State. Highly misunderstood instructor. He is unpopular with some students, especially those who are lax. Has some very distracting mannerisms - speaks in a monotone, and paces. However, his command of the subject makes him worthwhile for Bio. Sci. majors. Lectures very clear and well organized. (Rec: MAJORS)

SHELLHAMMER, H. S.

4.0	4.0	3.7	3.7	2.3	3.9	3.7	3.6	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

One of the few profs who inspires you to learn. Expects a great deal in return. Good sense of humor. Really a dynamic, well-informed instructor; however, hard to get to know and often misunderstood. One student likened him to a "Farmer throwing slop to the pigs (students)". (Rec: SOME)

SMITH, CHARLES E.

4.9	4.7	4.0	4.5	2.3	4.7	4.6	4.7	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A prof who will do anything for an interested student and is extremely interested in students. A hard taskmaster but makes even the most complex, completely understandable. Even if a student flunked, the knowledge obtained by osmosis would be great. (Rec: ALL)

THOMAS, F. C.

2.8	3.4	3.9	3.4	3.4	2.8	3.1	3.6	14
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Much busy work (book reports, etc.) - not really college level. Otherwise good instructor; related course material to other areas. Take good lecture notes, as tests are primarily from lectures. (Rec: SOME)

WESTON, H. G.

3.2	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.0	3.4	3.3	3.6	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures are pertinent and interesting; constructs good valid tests. Excellent organization, but tends to put students to sleep. In courses other than Ecology (Bio. 160) he expands and is easy going. Very anxious to help any student. (Rec: MAJOR)

YOUNG, H. H.

3.9	4.0	3.3	3.5	2.8	3.7	3.8	4.3	17
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Injects the right amount of humor into an occasionally dull course; welcomes questions and is willing to answer them.

Admits it when he doesn't know something; won't "beat around the bush". Final exam covers general concepts, not picyune details. (Rec: ALL)

BUSINESS DIVISION

ABERLE, J. W.

3.3	3.6	3.5	3.3	2.8	2.9	3.5	3.3	12
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

He puts tremendous effort into his lectures, which include outside lecture material. The case method is used extensively, which demands participation from the class. He is very helpful to marketing majors. (Rec: SOME)

ANDERSON, Y.

3.7	3.5	3.6	3.7	2.9	3.6	4.2	4.0	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

She has a pleasing personality and is astute at developing enthusiasm among the students. She gives constructive and helpful advice to the students. The homework is tedious but necessary for mastery of the subject. (Rec: ALL)

APPLETON, L. A.

1.9	2.6	2.3	2.5	2.4	3.4	3.5	2.7	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

He does a good job of presenting subject matter, but falls behind his class lecture schedule, thus keeping the class overtime. The work assigned is very long and can be classified as "busy work." Tests tend to result in most students receiving a grade of "C." (Rec: MAJORS)

BEAN, M.

4.8	4.4	3.2	3.6	2.5	3.4	3.3	3.3	22
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

His lectures are humorous, interesting and related to experiences in his law practice, thus providing an incentive to the student. His tests are multiple choice and require a thorough knowledge of the subject. (Rec: ALL)

BECKETT, A. C.

4.3	4.3	2.8	3.6	3.4	3.8	4.1	4.3	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He is an interesting lecturer with a good sense of humor. He has a wide range of knowledge of the business world. A fair grader and is willing to help the students at any time. (Rec: ALL)

BEEGLE, D. E.

2.7	4.0	3.8	3.3	2.8	2.8	2.3	2.7	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Her tests are complex but fair to the student. However, the final grades are distributed on a questionable basis. Students have an excess of work to do in the time allotted. (Rec: SOME)

BEESON, A. C.

3.2	3.4	2.8	3.0	2.8	3.0	3.2	3.4	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He has a thorough background in business and a thorough knowledge of the subject. He is active in outside business ventures and periodically misses classes, but is able to provide the student with many of the current ideas and problems in that field. Students are displeased with the course readers who apparently have no idea of what material is covered in lecture. (Rec: SOME)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

BURGER, J. A.

2.0	2.2	2.7	2.6	2.8	2.6	3.0	2.5	3.0
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

He has a complete knowledge of business law but cannot present the material to the class in a clear and concise manner. His references include law cases dating from the 1920's, which appear somewhat dated to the class. Tests are from the reading material, which appears to be in excess proportions. (Rec: MAJORS)

BUTLER, C. L.

2.5	2.9	2.8	3.1	3.2	3.6	3.7	3.3	13
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

His transportation courses are outstanding in terms of inspiring and stimulating student interest. He knows the subject matter quite well and gives a humorous and interesting lecture. The tests are fair and require a thorough knowledge of the subject. His management courses are repetitious of the text, with the majority of grades falling in the "C" bracket. (Rec: SOME)

CHAVEZ, M.

2.3	3.2	3.0	2.8	3.0	3.2	3.0	3.5	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

His presentation of the subject is good, but overstresses certain aspects of insurance. Strict adherence to the text show signs of disorganization. A lot of memory work required. (Rec: SOME)

COFFIN, K. B.

2.1	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.9	3.9	3.4	3.7	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He knows subject thoroughly and stresses competition in the classroom, which provides an incentive to the students. Willing to help the student. His lectures digress into irrelevant material at times. (Rec: MAJOR)

COOPER, W. E.

2.8	3.8	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.5	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

His lectures are well prepared and interesting. He is very enthusiastic about the subject and goes to any extreme to help the student understand the material. Tests cover material similar to the workbook and are graded very fairly. (Rec: ALL)

CURTIS, M.

1.4	2.6	3.9	1.6	2.9	2.4	2.6	2.3	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Her lectures are uninspiring to the student. Detailed, irrelevant material is stressed which tends to make the course one of pure memorization. Students feel that her two-unit courses carry the same work load as a three unit course. (Rec: MAJOR)

DALE, R. S.

2.3	2.3	3.5	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.2	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures are unorganized and cover a wide range of material. Appears to be a lack of correlation between lectures and tests. Definition of final grades is unclear. (Rec: SOME)

DAVIS

3.1	3.7	3.5	3.0	3.4	4.2	4.1	4.2	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Good techniques for teaching. Extremely fair grader. Interested in student and willing to help when possible. (Rec: ALL)

DESHON, G.

2.0 | 2.7 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 16

He must be sub-author of the text because it serves as his lecture notes. Case problems are interesting, but he fails to follow them up with candid remarks, Avoids answering questions - no class participation. Avoids the complicated aspects of industrial management, for which a professor is useful. Tests are relatively easy in comparison to the required cases, but the grading system is in chaos. (Rec: MOST STUDENTS AVOID)

FETZER, J.

3.8 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 2.4 | 3.9 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 10

His courses are mathematically oriented. Knowledge of the "slipstick" is advised to speed computations during exams. Most of his tests are designed so that no one will finish them, not even the A students. Definitely an instructor for independently orientated students. (Rec: SOME)

FISCHL, L. J.

3.7 | 4.2 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 2.7 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 3.8 | 25

His course is extremely well organized; lectures cover an abundance of interesting and relevant material supported by current legal cases. His enthusiasm for law at times leaves little room for humor in his lectures. His tests are demanding but graded very fairly. (Rec: ALL)

FOSTER, T. L.

3.1 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 8

His lectures and tests follow the book closely. He is interested in the student and is eager to help him. His grading is fair. (Rec: ALL)

GARNEL, D.

4.6 | 4.1 | 4.2 | 3.7 | 1.9 | 3.7 | 3.2 | 3.2 | 9

Students are advised to carry their teamster cards at all times. His number of books on reserve total $1/3$ the number of all books for the business division in the Reserve Book Room. His course is demanding and will keep the student extremely busy. Grading is fair and course is centered around essay exams. (Rec: SOME)

GRAPE, E. F.

2.4 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 3.2 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 21

His lectures come straight from the text; the class thus is handled on an open seminar basis. He is an easy instructor for the student to talk to. Salesmanship appears to be based on memorization rather than concept. Frequent quizzes test the students' ability to memorize specific details. All of his tests appear to be in Fraternity files. (Rec: MAJOR)

HALVERSON, G.

3.8 | 4.2 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 2.7 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 2.9 | 10

Knows his subject material and enlightens his courses by inclusion of current and significant historical events. Large term paper is required along with rigorous essay exams. (Rec: ALL)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

HAY, L

1.4	2.2	3.6	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.7	2.8	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Has a problem in presenting information to his class in an interesting manner. Lectures are read, not spoken. With a little effort, a grade can be achieved. (Rec: MAJOR)

HERLIHY, J.

4.0	4.0	2.6	3.3	3.0	3.6	4.0	5.0	3
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

An instructor with an intense interest in the student. He will help the student at any time, in class - or out, and also has advice and tips about job opportunities for graduating seniors. Lectures are humorous but tend to stick to his outline. It is also beneficial to become one of his "twenty heroes."

HOLLAND, J. H.

4.5	4.7	2.8	3.7	2.7	3.5	2.9	4.2	24
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

An outstanding lecturer who uses current and relevant material in his courses. Applies his business experience to his lectures. 58.4% of returns complained of favoritism in grades toward S.A.M. members and fraternities, specifically A.T.O. Investigation revealed that A.T.O. members are working as his course readers. (Rec: SOME)

JORGENSON, J. G.

2.4	3.0	3.5	3.7	3.0	3.4	3.7	4.1	12
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Lecture is a waste of time; fortunately tests are on the text. His grading is fair. Notify the professor if you're dead, otherwise attend class. (Rec: SOME)

JANES, C. W.

4.5	4.8	4.1	4.1	2.3	4.5	4.6	4.4	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures are extraordinarily interesting and well-organized. He is a very competent instructor who is interested in the student. Grading is hard, but fair. He is an absolute must for anyone seeking to be an accountant rather than a bookkeeper. (Rec: ALL)

KIMBELL, T. F.

2.6	3.8	3.4	3.6	2.8	3.4	3.2	3.2	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A part-time instructor who shows little interest in the student. Seems to be bored in class. A medium grader. (Rec: SOME)

LANSER, R.

3.7	3.9	2.8	3.5	2.9	3.2	3.1	3.9	15
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

He is an interesting and dynamic lecturer. The presentation of complex course material is done in a clear and concise manner - with students being able to ask questions at any time. Willing to help students and give them the benefit of the doubt. Assigned work is relevant and cannot be considered as "busy work". Tests are fair to the student and there is no question as to the assignment of final grades. (Rec: ALL)

LAURIE, E.

4.3	3.0	2.8	3.6	3.0	3.7	3.7	3.5	16
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Lectures are excellent, humorous and infrequent. He has a firm understanding of the subject and is aware of all new developments in his field. Tests are rather detailed and ambiguous at

times. Any remarks about his test questions are considered as remarks about his personal abilities as an instructor. This man is considerably overworked by the administration and his outside activities. The class should improve next year. (Rec: SOME)

LAZZARINI, E. J.

4.3	4.6	4.1	4.4	3.9	4.6	4.6	4.1	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures straight from book. If you know the book, a good grade is insured. Grading is fair. (Rec: ALL)

LEE, L.

3.5	2.7	2.4	3.2	3.2	3.5	3.0	2.7	14
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

His lectures are interesting because of the inclusion of current events. The class is handled in an informal fashion. The mid-terms are essay and the final is take-home. The student is on his own to cover the subject material since there are no written assignments. (Rec: SOME)

LOWER, R.

2.7	2.8	3.0	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.4	3.6	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

His lectures are presented in a happy-go-lucky frame of mind, thus making the course interesting to marketing students. He is willing to spend time to help the student understand the subject material. Appears to be well organized most of the time. Includes outside cases to show current course applications. (Rec: ALL)

MA, J. C.

1.9	2.3	3.0	2.9	3.0	2.7	2.1	2.7	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

His lectures follow the text very closely, showing lack of experience in his field. On questionable points raised in class, he tends to become dogmatic. Recommended that the student have a business background before entering his course. (Rec: AVOID)

MINER, D. A.

2.0	2.0	3.3	2.7	2.5	1.8	2.3	1.8	27
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Seems to have a good knowledge of subject matter but presents it in an uninteresting fashion. In sickness or in health go to class. Doesn't make himself available for office hours. Is very dogmatic and self-centered. Very hard but a fair grader. (Rec: AVOID)

NORWOOD, B. J.

3.9	3.9	3.5	3.3	2.5	3.2	2.9	2.1	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Attempts to weed out undesirables during first few weeks by scaring them. Intelligent man with excellent background. Cliquish. Stays up to date. Dogmatic, egotistical. (Rec: SOME)

OVERSON, W.

3.7	3.7	2.3	3.2	2.9	2.3	2.9	2.0	15
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

A humorous and interesting lecturer who will usually lecture without notes. The class is conducted on an informal basis, which is not conducive to student motivation. He has a tendency to show up on the day of a scheduled exam without the exam. Tests last semester were in fraternity files. No punctuality. Final grade is based entirely upon points; thus the student

does not know where he stands in the class until he gets his final grade. He has too many outside activities to be a teacher and spends no time with the students. (Rec: SOME)

PINTO, E.

2.3	3.5	3.9	3.0	2.1	2.3	3.0	2.3	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He is a raw, somewhat revolutionary professor. His lectures are difficult to understand, and he grades severely. He is not overly interested in helping the struggling student. Enter this professor's course with caution. (Rec: MAJORS ONLY!!!)

PORTER, A.

3.8	2.5	2.7	3.4	3.8	3.5	3.4	3.6	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

A new approach to education! No classes are conducted per se; the course is handled on a graduate basis with the students. The student has the opportunity to explore his own areas of interest instead of the opinions of an author. Reports are required periodically as part of the course requirement. (Rec: ALL)

REYNOLDS, J. D.

1.8	2.7	4.0	3.2	2.8	3.4	3.4	3.3	18
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Lectures are sleep inducing - spends majority of time going over homework or tests. He is very poor in answering questions from the floor. Test tends toward problem solving - no theory. He is very interested in the student and is eager to help. Rain or shine come to class. (Rec: SOME)

ROARK, D. E.

3.6	4.2	4.3	3.8	2.1	4.3	4.5	4.2	13
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

His courses are difficult, but very rewarding. His strongest area is taxes; unfortunately his course in this area is straight memory. He is very interested in the student and is eager to help. An attempt to coast through a course given by this professor will prove to be disastrous. (Rec: MAJOR)

ROMEY, K.

2.8	2.8	3.9	3.1	3.9	2.9	2.9	3.5	12
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

He is knowledgeable on the subject material. Lectures as well as the entire course show lack of organization. Most of the work is detailed, "busy work," which is poorly graded and quite often misplaced by the instructor. The student does not know where he stands until the final week of the course. He is always available to help the students outside of class and is an easy instructor to talk to. (Rec: SOME)

SAUNDERS, W.

2.7	3.6	2.5	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.7	3.6	12
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

An interesting lecturer who is aware of problems and practices in his field. He tends to follow the text at times. Tests are graded on a liberal curve which shows lack of correlation between grade achieved and material learned. (Rec: SOME)

SIELAFF, T. J.

3.6	3.7	3.9	3.6	3.1	3.9	3.6	3.9	18
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

A patient, helpful instructor who has the ability to make the students understand a difficult subject. Presents outside,

interesting material in a practical manner that aids the student in applying statistics to business problems. (Rec: ALL)

STEPHENSON, H.

3.5	3.7	3.1	3.4	2.7	3.5	3.1	4.0	16
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

He relies on discussion-type lectures in which class participation is invited. Lack of practical business experience reflects in the reliance upon charts, graphs and other visual aids. Grading appears to be on a basis of effort and retention of detailed facts rather than a firm understanding of the course. (Rec: SOME)

STRAUB, D.

4.0	4.4	2.6	4.2	3.4	4.4	4.2	4.8	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

His lectures are interesting, since he attempts to make a rough course easier for the student to understand. He does not assign irrelevant "busy work" to the class. Provides the students with many ideas and attitudes of what the business community is looking for in a college graduate. (Rec: ALL)

STRICKLIN, W. D.

4.3	4.0	3.0	4.2	2.8	3.2	4.4	4.5	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

She has a sincere interest in both the subject and the student. Willing to give extra help if needed. Tests are hard and the term paper takes much time. (Rec: ALL)

SWANSON, E.

4.0	3.6	3.6	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.3	5.0	3
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A sincere instructor who makes an attempt to understand the student and his problems. Courses are centered around individual participation and independent research. (Rec: ALL)

TENGE, J. J.

3.3	3.7	3.9	3.9	2.8	3.5	3.6	4.8	15
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

He knows his subject matter and is extremely interested in student progress in his classes. Lectures are interesting and easy to understand. However, in his marketing class, he gives only one midterm, which is severely graded. (Rec: ALL)

TOOTLE, J. C.

2.8	3.7	4.2	3.6	2.1	2.9	3.6	3.7	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He is interested in the student and is willing to give help. A fair but very strict grader- with grades being dependent upon reports handed in. Allows very little class discussion and appears to have favorites. The student should have a business background before taking him. (Rec: SOME)

TRAVIS, R. W.

3.5	4.0	3.0	3.3	2.7	3.7	3.9	3.6	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He presents humorous and interesting lectures. The course is hard but the student is graded fairly. He has a very thorough knowledge of the subject. (Rec: ALL)

TRIANDAFLLIDES, A.

3.5	3.6	3.4	3.7	2.5	3.4	3.3	3.2	13
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

He presents a challenging and demanding course. He is well versed in his field and stresses philosophy as well as fact.

The student will have to work for a grade. (Rec: SOME)

WALKER, R. D.

3.5	2.5	2.9	3.3	3.1	3.7	3.2	3.1	16
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

The "cost Man" of the accounting dept. has an extremely good practical grasp of the subject. His lectures are frequently irrelevant to the material, and his 'sage' personal advice is geared to the junior high school student. Study on your own in his course. Grades with the student in mind. (Rec: SOME)

WANG, P. S.

3.5	4.1	2.9	3.1	3.5	4	3.5	3.5	12
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	-----	-----	----

He knows the subject well and relates the matter to current business problems. He is helpful to the student with a weak math background. Does not assign unrelated or busy work. However, he is arbitrary on test questions. (Rec: ALL)

WEDDEL, B. L.

2.0	2.1	3.6	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.8	2.6	19
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

A brilliant man; unfortunately he is unable to communicate with his students. His tests are demanding and too long to complete in one hour. Lectures are disorganized and often irrelevant. (Rec: AVOID)

WORRELLS, C. E.

2.8	2.6	3.3	3.4	2.9	3.5	3.5	3.5	15
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

He is a poor lecturer - has a tendency to ramble. Lecture stresses theory, not practice. Grading is fair. He is interested in and is willing to help students. (Rec: SOME/MAJORS)

ZIDNAK, P.

3.0	3.0	4.0	2.2	3.0	3.0	3.8	4.0	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

His lectures are interesting but he assigns an abundance of written work which is not covered in any way on an examination. (Rec: MAJOR)

CHEMISTRY DEPARTMENT

CASTRO, A. J.

4.3	4.0	*	4.0	1.7	3.7	3.3	3.0	3
-----	-----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

*Opinions differ here, but the consensus is that a great deal of work is necessary, whether required or not, to get a fair grade in his classes. Lectures are very important for exams and a tremendous amount of material is covered. (Rec: MAJOR)

CLARK, M. H.

1.6	2.2	3.0	3.0	3.4	2.8	3.0	3.6	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Dr. Clark's poor ratings in lecture are due in part to a physical handicap and also poor advance preparation. He is interested in the individual and deficiencies in lecture may be offset by after-class discussions. (Rec: SOME/MAJOR)

FESSENDEN, R. J.

4.0	4.5	3.1	3.4	2.4	4.0	3.4	3.2	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He knows the subject extremely well and takes an active interest in the individual. He sometimes lectures too fast and tends to

gear his lectures a little too high for the non-major, but the lectures are fairly interesting. (Rec: ALL)

LIEN, O. G.

2.4	2.6	2.8	3.0	2.9	2.7	3.0	3.0	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

His tests tend to cover specifics rather than general topics. The lectures are poorly organized. Jokes correspond to lectures - i.e., poor. Laugh loud and live. He is a fair grader. He is very friendly and helpful to the individual. (Rec: SOME)

NEPTUNE, J. A.

3.2	3.6	4.0	4.0	3.2	4.2	3.8	4.0	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Dr. Neptune takes an interest in the individual. He assigns homework to be turned in, but this is a good study aid. A congenial person. He makes the subject matter clear and easy to understand. Lab work totals about 50% of the grade. (Rec: SOME)

REPOGLE, L. L.

3.5	4.0	3.0	3.2	1.2	3.5	2.8	3.0	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Well organized lectures. May be boring to a major, but non-majors seem to like him. (Rec: ALL)

SCHMOLDT, A.

3.4	3.6	3.1	3.1	2.9	3.7	3.4	4.6	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He has been around a long time but he is still interested in students and teaching. Very helpful. Tends to be a bit wordy in lectures and sometimes wanders into unrelated topics. (Rec: ALL)

SPITZE, L. A.

3.0	4.3	3.2	3.3	2.5	3.8	3.9	3.5	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Dr. Spitze has an excellent knowledge of chemistry and can teach it to interested students by means of clear explanations and good lectures. Multiple choice tests with more than one correct answer per question. He is best in lab courses. (Rec: ALL)

WEST, D. M.

3.2	2.7	3.7	3.7	3.0	3.5	2.5	3.7	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Good background and command of chemistry. Lectures are valuable and interesting, but delivered in a low monotonous voice. Thorough knowledge of the material is necessary to succeed. Dr. West is considered a "nice guy" and is willing to help his students. (Rec: MAJOR)

WILKERSON, R. E.

3.7	4.5	3.2	3.9	2.5	3.9	3.9	3.7	15
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Extremely organized approach. Take notes to the most minute detail and don't miss any classes. The exam answers must be identical to class notes, so put study emphasis on notes rather than text. Follow rules of etiquette and don't try to disrupt the organization of his lectures with any questions. He doesn't care for skirts. (Rec: SOME)

WILLIAMS, AL. L.

3.4	3.6	3.0	3.6	3.1	3.4	3.6	4.7	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He takes an extreme interest in the individual. Very congenial

and a fair person. Tends to stray off the subject at times. Described by a home economics major as "a very sweet old man." (Rec: ALL)

YAFFE, R. I.

3.9	4.7	4.3	3.9	1.9	4.1	4.0	4.0	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A demanding teacher who expects students to perform at a high level. Most frequent comment: "She works your tail off, but you will never regret if if you really want to know chemistry." She is an extremely brilliant and knowledgeable person. (Rec: SOME/MAJOR)

DRAMA (see Speech and Drama)

ECONOMICS AND GEOGRAPHY DEPARTMENT

ECONOMICS

BATE, R.

2.0	2.4	2.5	2.4	3.2	2.6	3.3	2.8	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

His lectures are rambling, inconsistent and reflect little preparation. Very personable and interesting personally but it doesn't carry over into his lectures. He requires papers in upper division courses and gives good, fairly graded essay tests. Serious about learning Econ? Avoid him. (Rec:SOME)

BROYLES, O. M.

1.2	1.4	2.6	1.8	3.1	1.7	1.8	2.0	15
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Lectures are incomprehensible, boring, and generally out in left field. The tests are even less comprehensible. He is a very sincere person who is willing to help the student, but it is recommended that you talk to him in his office - do not take a class from him. (Rec: EVERYONE AVOID)

EDMONDS, R. H.

2.0	2.4	3.3	3.0	2.7	2.9	3.3	3.4	18
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Lectures are wandering, inconsistent, and often about his personal experiences. They are quite boring. He allows the class to get "out of hand" on occasion. Tests are objective, in lower division at least, and the grading is pretty tough. He's very interested in the student and in economics, and apparently knows his stuff, but he doesn't relate it very well. (Rec: SOME)

GLAZE, B. T.

3.5	3.8	3.1	3.9	3.7	4.1	4.0	4.0	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Dr. Glaze is an all-around nice guy who likes students and teaching. He makes no pretense of making things unnecessarily hard and even his tests are a teaching tool. He is organized and relatively interesting in lecture and allows good class discussion. He's very interested in the individual student. His tests are all essay, fairly graded, and not hard. (Rec: ALL)

HUEGY, C. W.

2.5 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 2.7 | 3.0 | 10

His lectures are unprepared and usually random until the class picks a topic - then it is discussed. He has a great sense of humor and wit, and appears totally relaxed. Tests are essay (upper division) and good teaching tools. Grading tends to be arbitrary. He knows his material and is a fun prof for majors. A nice guy. (Rec: MAJORS)

JOHNSON, W. B.

3.6 | 4.1 | 2.8 | 3.4 | 2.8 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 10

Lectures are organized, pertinent, concise, and interesting. He's excellent for both upper and lower division classes; especially tough in upper division. His tests are fair, as is his grading. Register early and try to get his class if you must take econ. (Rec: ALL)

KEISER, N. F.

3.2 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 2.6 | 18

He is a good man who is handicapped by the mental capacity of the students. He relates to current events extremely well. Lectures wander into liberal (well grounded) political opinions at times, but are otherwise well planned. Opinions about him are mixed - generally however, if you're sincere about learning econ he's good. Tests are objective, fair and his courses are tough. (Rec: SOME - serious students)

KRESS, S.

4.0 | 4.4 | 2.9 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.5 | 13

Her lectures are well prepared, easily understood and interspersed with good jokes. She's young and good looking but unfortunately, boys, she's married. A student herself recently enough to be able to make econ understandable. Tests are objective, related to lecture and text. (Rec: ALL)

LEE, M.

4.6 | 3.8 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 3.5 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 17

Dr. Lee is described in superlatives. His lectures are outstanding - to both majors and non-majors. His tests are a teaching tool (upper division); a unique method of essay - then oral defense. Relates econ to whole of social science in an interesting, refreshing manner. If you're only taking one theory course in econ, avoid him for a more conventional prof. (Rec: ALL)

MINGS, T. R.

1.7 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 3.2 | 2.5 | 13

He speaks in a monotone so his lectures are hard to take. He lectures fast and doesn't pull any punches. He really knows his stuff and takes no nonsense but he simply doesn't communicate well. For upper division majors who want a challenge and who can break up lectures - he's ok. (Discussion in class is good if you can stop him) (Rec: MAJORS)

WIGGINS, S. E.

3.1 | 3.1 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 14

She requires a lot of outside reading in some classes and has

trouble communicating with some students. However, she is good looking enough to make economics somewhat bearable. Tests every week and requires thorough knowledge of the material.
(Rec: ALL)

WILLIS, J.

2.7	2.8	3.3	2.8	2.9	2.9	3.5	3.3	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Lectures aand tests are on the theoretical level. He's a nice guy, very sharp with a dry sense of humor and is an excellent theoretician. However, he is a difficult teacher recommended only for serious econ majors. (Rec: MAJORS)

GEOGRAPHY

ELLEFSEN, R. A.

4.3	4.4	3.0	3.7	2.9	3.7	3.8	4.2	36
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

He is dynamic, organized, stimulating and popular. Majors, non-majors, both upper and lower division like his classes. He has humor - is famous for his puns. Tests are very hard (factual), include maps, and are based mainly on lecture. Grading is objective and very fair. Good teacher you will learn from.
(Rec: ALL)

MC INTYRE, M. P.

4.4	4.2	2.4	4.0	3.1	3.8	3.9	4.4	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures are given without notes of any kind. They are relaxed - like an informal chat - and injected with humor. He uses visual aids well and reflects complete command of his subject. Tests are fair, easy enough and mostly on notes. He loves teaching and has mastered his art. Relates to students very well. (Rec: ALL)

STANLEY, R. W.

2.3	2.0	3.7	3.1	2.8	2.8	3.2	4.1	13
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

He is controversial. Lectures are boring to most students. But, he is a very rigorous prof and some bright upper division students like him very much. For a career in geography or planning he's a good man to know. His courses are tough and require much work. "He can't be snowed." (Rec: MAJORS & OTHER UPPER DIV.)

STEELE, W. C.

2.7	1.8	3.0	2.6	2.1	2.2	2.9	2.4	25
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Lectures are opinionated and irrelevant to the course except just before the exam. They are, however, very current and interesting to some students. He is controversial and recommended for a bright diligent senior or grad student. He grades much too hard at the top and his tests are very tough.
(Rec: MAJOR, Social Science too, if willing to work)

WHITE, C.L.

4.3	4.3	3.4	3.8	3.3	4.0	3.8	3.0	15
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

His lectures are excellent since he is experienced and knows his subject. Upper division students may tire of his rambling but most find him extremely stimulating. Tests are part essay, part objective, pertinent to the course, and not too hard. He grades

pretty easy. (Rec: ALL)

EDUCATION DIVISION

COCHERN, G.

4.5	4.5	2.0	2.8	2.7	3.2	3.2	3.5	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Dr. Cochern is well liked by his students, who consider him to be a dynamic individual. As a professor, he is friendly and willing to help. One of the few A.V. instructors who transforms this typical "Mickey Mouse" course into a useful and meaningful teaching aid. Dr. Cochern doesn't allow one to become bored in this potentially boring course. This professor is highly recommended for all prospective teachers. (Rec: ALL)

KALLENBACH, W. W.

1.8	2.3	4.3	3.5	3.3	3.0	3.4	3.0	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Occasionally, useful information is presented. As organized as a mess of scrambled eggs. There is enough outside busy work to put Spartan Book Store's paper sales up 20% if everyone would take him. (Rec: AVOID)

KERR, G.

2.5	2.6	3.1	2.6	3.4	3.1	3.4	4.2	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Dr. Kerr shows a definite concern for her students. The class atmosphere is a friendly one. This is one of the relatively few classes where one has the opportunity to learn the other students' names. She expects the best that one can produce on outside assignments and tests. Some think she reads to her class too much, resulting in poor communication. Her tests are controversial. Some consider them extremely easy, while others feel that they are tricky and ambiguous. Much of the test material comes from the outside readings. (Rec: SOME MAJORS)

KOLTE, M.

2.3	4	3.3	3.3	3.6	*	3.6	3.6	3
-----	---	-----	-----	-----	---	-----	-----	---

Most students think Mrs. Kolte is the best instructor for Ed. 110. Homework is plentiful--two pages minimum each night. However, this seems to be standard for the course. As your handwriting improves, you'll see the homework's worth. Mrs. Kolte's personality is pleasing to everyone. Outside requirements can tie in nicely with other subjects. There are no tests. Grading is + or - . If you don't have some originality, you will be writing, "The lazy brown fox jumped over the little grey poodle until you go nuts. Think up some new alphabetical sentences . (Rec: ALL)

MORLAN, J.

2.3	3.3	3.0	3.6	3.0	3.3	4.3	4.0	3
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Some students consider him to be hard, but he knows his material well. He practices what he preaches about testing. You get a chance to teach the class and make up your own test for Ed. 102. He is a fair grader and most of his test material is taken from the lecture. He is one of the best teachers instructing this required course for elementary teachers. Since he is connected with the A.V. Dept., he uses many A.V. aids. For extra Brownie points, use A.V. aids in your presentations. (Rec: ALL majors)

PELUSO, F.

3.4 | 2.4 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 2.6 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 5

Dr. Peluso is considered one of the better teachers in education. His lectures are full of illustrative tales; many - too many, about himself. After awhile you will notice that he tends to repeat himself. Opinions range from 1-5 for question four. He has many good ideas about teaching children, and he enables you to recognize their needs. Many students think he does a better job of teaching Ed. 170 than Ed. 150. (Rec: ALL majors)

PUGNO, L.

2.8 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 4

A theory man; get someone else for methods. Encourages student participation. Many of his beliefs in education are based on his background in Biological Science. (Rec: SOME)

SHAFER, D.

3.1 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 4.3 | 6

Dr. Shafer is controversial in that he is rated at both ends of the scale on items 2 and 3. His tests represent a good sampling of the material and tend to lean toward the hard side. Do the outside readings, and be sure to take good notes. One can tell his lectures aren't well organized, for he sometimes rambles and repeats. Lazy people take note -- there isn't much outside work compared to the other Ed. 150 courses. (Rec: SOME majors)

SPRING, W.

2.9 | 3.9 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 4.1 | 7

Dr. Spring is thought highly of, except by those who are down on education courses. Many would recommend waiting to be sure you get this instructor. He is enthusiastic and extremely willing to help you. Be sure to make an appointment to see him--this will go over big. He is rich in ideas and willing to try new techniques. He gives different kinds of tests, many of which are harder than expected. Try giving him a bright necktie for a present to make up for all of his plain and dull ones. (Rec: ALL majors)

SUTHERLAND, J.

3.4 | 3.8 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 3.4 | 5

How is your G.P.A.? Many consider this professor to be an easy grader. Care to try your luck? Even though his lectures aren't exceptionally well organized, they are interesting. He provides good motivation. Many students think Ed. 149 is a course on common sense, so don't bother to read the text. Be sure you pin him down on assignments as to exactly what he wants, for his ambiguity confuses many. (Rec: MOST MAJORS)

TIEDT, S.

4.8 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 4.5 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 4.0 | 4.8 | 4

Conservative education majors, "Beware! This professor is not for you. Go back to your little red school-house." Dr. Tiedt discusses controversial education issues openly. Students are encouraged to voice their opinions. Disagreements are welcomed. In fact, this professor will take an opposite stand to get you to voice your opinion. All opinions are respected. Many interesting, unusual and generally worthwhile discussions evolve

out of his classroom. The great majority of students thoroughly enjoy Dr. Tiedt as a professor and as a personal friend. The class atmosphere is light, friendly and an informal one, for names are learned early in the game. Ideas flow in his courses. The essay tests usually require creative thinking and your own ideas. Taking a course from this professor is a must for all future elementary teachers.

ENGINEERING DIVISION

ABOU - TALEB, N.

2.9	2.7	2.9	3.0	3.7	3.2	3.0	3.8	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He lectures very little and has the students explain the problems. Students will find him a sharp contrast to other instructors; he is very easy going. (Rec: SOME)

AGARDY, F. J.

4.5	4.2	2.8	3.2	3.0	3.7	4.0	4.7	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He is a young, well-informed instructor who gives interesting lectures which put across the point. He is very willing to help the student. Uses "pop quizzes" in lieu of collecting homework in statics. (Rec: ALL)

BARRIGA, J.

1.5	1.8	4.7	3.2	2.8	2.2	3.0	3.8	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

The lectures are exceptionally dull and uninformative. The labs seem to last three days, not three hours. The required amount of work is high. (Rec: AVOID)

BLAIR, P. M.

3.2	3.8	3.0	3.4	3.0	3.8	3.4	3.2	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Mr. Blair is an interesting lecturer who makes a course as enjoyable as possible. He has a broad knowledge of many subjects other than engineering. M.E. 108 is his weakest course. (Rec: ALL)

DIONNE, E. A.

3.7	4.0	3.5	3.8	3.0	4.2	4.2	3.2	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Mr. Dionne is an interesting lecturer. He is best for upper division courses and probably should be avoided for Engineering preview since he makes it into a three-unit course. Freshmen and sophomores sometimes find him difficult to get along with. (Rec: SOME)

HASKELL, B. P.

3.8	3.5	2.8	3.3	3.3	4.0	3.7	3.0	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Mr. Haskell is interested in things other than engineering and often expounds on these subjects in class. He is cynical and arrogant and should be avoided by anyone with strong conflicting views, as it could be a miserable semester. Perhaps his being a bachelor has something to do with it. (Rec: SOME)

HUANG, J.

2.3	3.8	3.5	3.0	2.8	3.0	2.5	2.5	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Knows material well and will help student after class. This is good since student will probably need some help; Dr. Huang has

a very pronounced accent. (Rec: MAJOR)

KRAFVE, A. H.

3.5	3.8	3.0	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.8	4.0	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Mr. Krafve has a good sense of humor and is easy to get along with. However, he lectures too fast occasionally. Requires reasonable lab reports. If you want brownie points, ask him about his boat racing experiences. (Rec: ALL)

LIMA, J. A.

3.5	3.9	3.3	3.5	3.0	3.9	3.6	3.8	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He gives good lectures and will answer questions and discusses the material with the student. He tries to make the information understandable. The exams are of reasonable length and difficulty. (Rec: ALL)

MC ALLISTER, A. S.

3.3	4.0	3.3	3.3	2.8	3.8	3.5	3.8	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

His lectures are well organized and he will help the student. (Rec: MAJOR)

MOUSTAKAS, E.

3.9	4.6	4.3	3.4	2.3	3.4	3.4	4.5	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Tests are very hard, but he is willing to explain things to the student until the latter sees the light. He requires a lot of work, but you leave his courses knowing the subject. (Rec: MAJOR)

MOYNAHAN, G. F., JR.

1.2	2.2	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.3	1.2	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He does assigned homework problems in class each day. However, if you have a question - forget it. He does not tolerate questions from the ranks. (Rec: AVOID)

MUNIR, J. A.

4.3	4.5	2.9	3.8	2.5	3.1	3.8	4.4	12
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Dr. Munir is young, enthusiastic, and knows the material thoroughly. His lectures are interesting and well organized. He is always willing to help a student who has a question. His exams, however, are difficult and tend to cover only the lecture notes. Tests tend to emphasize details. He expects his students to be mature enough to study without being prodded by homework assignments. (Rec: ALL)

NIELSEN, H. J.

3.0	3.4	3.0	3.4	2.9	3.4	3.4	3.5	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Prof. Nielson tends to emphasize theory in his lectures and does few problems. The problems he works are too often the same ones worked out in the text. The lectures tend to be dry and uninteresting, but are quite well organized. His exams tend to oscillate between problems and theory. He occasionally feels guilty about emphasizing problems on his exams and then emphasizes theory on the next one. He is very interested in the student and willing to help. (Rec: ALL)

PARKMAN, R.

3.0	3.7	3.3	4.0	2.7	3.0	3.0	4.0	3
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Dr. Parkman is an average lecturer but is very willing to help the students understand the material. His exams are difficult, especially in Mat. Sci. 25. He is especially good for the smaller upper division courses where the students make more personal contact with the instructor. Dr. Parkman is also the best laboratory instructor in the Mat. Sci. department. (Rec: ALL)

PETERSON, R. E.

1.3	2.3	2.5	2.8	2.8	2.3	2.5	2.0	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Mr. Peterson's lectures are uninteresting and sleep inducing. Exams tend to emphasize trivial items. The student must rely almost completely on the text. (Rec: AVOID)

PRATHER, R. E.

2.0	3.5	3.0	2.2	2.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

All evaluations were from students who took EE-100, a new and different course in which the E.E. department tries to combine 3 math courses into one. Mr. Prather knew the material well but lectured way above the heads of the students. (Rec: AVOID)

ROBERTS, J. E.

4.4	4.4	3.8	3.8	2.8	3.6	3.4	3.8	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He is a good lecturer who knows the material inside out and tries to make it interesting. (Rec: MAJORS)

RODRIGUES, A. F.

3.3	4.0	3.3	4.0	3.7	4.2	4.2	4.8	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Prof. Rodrigues is a practical instructor who emphasizes problem solving, and relates principles to practice. His lectures are good, though occasionally sterile and often from the book. He is very interested in the student and will go out of his way to help. (Rec: ALL)

SETO, W. W.

4.0	4.2	3.7	3.7	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Prof. Seto is a very interesting and fun-loving man who takes a very practical approach to engineering. He occasionally stumbles on the English language but is relatively easy to understand after you get used to him. He is definitely not the man if you desire a theoretical approach. He is a good professor for the run-of-the-mill problem-answer engineer. Prof. Seto knows the material very well, grades fairly, and is quite interested in helping the student. (Rec: ALL)

SNYDER, W.

1.6	1.8	3.0	3.0	3.2	2.7	3.0	3.2	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures are from the book. He mumbles into the blackboard and his writing is hard to read. (Rec: AVOID)

VAN DYKE, J. R.

2.1	2.6	3.3	3.0	2.9	3.1	3.5	3.6	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Prof. Van Dyke is a very interesting, friendly, and talkative elder citizen. It is too bad that he is such a poor lecturer and instructor. His lectures are vague and incomplete--the

students must pin him down to get anything worthwhile out of him. If you want a senile point of view about the good old days, Van Dyke is the man. (Rec: AVOID)

VENUTI, W. J.

3.8	5.0	3.3	4.0	3.3	4.3	4.0	3.5	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He knows the course material forward and backward. Tests require an interpretation of the lecture material rather than being of the straight plug-in variety. (Rec: ALL)

WILLIAMS, D. F.

4.5	4.5	3.1	4.0	3.3	4.5	4.3	4.5	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Dr. Williams is one of the best profs at SJS. He has an excellent grasp of fundamentals, and lectures and solves example problems without notes. His exams are extremely reasonable and can always be done if you understand the subject. Other engineering profs should sit in on one of his classes to see the right way to teach a class. (Rec: ALL)

WOOD, W. W.

2.7	2.8	3.3	2.8	2.7	3.2	3.0	2.7	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Prof. Wood is a former English professor and is the only instructor who teaches E 103 "Eng. Report Writing." His writing requirements are based on his English background and his years as an employee at Convair. The lectures tend to ramble and are often uninteresting. His grading system is unusual, vague, and unpredictable. The course does provide the engineer with an idea of what life in industry is like. (Rec: AVOID when possible--it's not)

ZSUTTY, T. C.

2.7	2.5	2.3	3.2	2.8	3.5	3.7	3.2	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Dr. Zsutty teaches fairly easy Statics and Strength of materials classes. His grammar, however, makes one wonder about Ph.D.'s from Stanford. He should be avoided by students who want a theoretically rigorous course. For some strange reason he is at his best in more advanced courses. (Rec: SOME)

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT

BEZANKER, A.

3.5	3.1	3.1	3.4	2.6	3.0	3.4	3.5	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

This instructor expects a lot of discussion from students in basic English courses, and stresses individual thought; he is a bit difficult but worthwhile. (Rec: SOME)

BLOESSER, R. L.

4.0	4.3	3.0	3.0	3.7	3.5	4.0	4.5	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Mr. Bloesser is highly recommended for sub-freshman English. He is extremely interested in his students and is very helpful in preparing the student for English IA. His lectures are interesting (he has a good sense of humor) and his grading is fair. (Rec: ALL)

BOGOSIAN, E.

4.0	3.5	3.5	3.5	2.5	3.5	4.0	4.0	3
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A very capable scholar, eager to convey a message to his

students. Leads discussion with a strong hand and a definite direction, but somewhat evasive in leading up to the point which he tries to make. An authority in the field of literary criticism, a rather dogmatic field; the student can learn a great deal, if he treats the material critically. (Rec: SOME)

BRANDT, W. J.

4.3	4.0	3.3	4.3	3.3	3.5	4.3	4.6	12
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

An eccentric genius; a truly original and creative thinker, undoubtedly one of the most distinguished scholars on campus. Able to relate diverse areas of knowledge. Ideas come to him so fast that he often leaves a sentence unfinished and goes off on a new tangent. He is nervous and restless, unable to stand still. He combines dry humor and a deft criticism; encourages class discussion and leads the student to new insights. Likes topic sentences and orderly development on essays. (Rec: SOME)

BRITZ, J. P.

3.5	3.5	3.7	3.9	3.3	3.5	3.7	3.0	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Distinguished by a fine, dry sense of humor. Likes a humorous, smooth style of writing on essays. He may not teach you to write well if you don't know how already, but you can get by if you are grammatical and say something interesting. Gives heavy reading assignments, but provides a lively commentary. (Rec: SOME)

BURBANK, R. J.

2.5	3.1	3.1	3.1	2.7	2.6	2.9	3.4	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Sharp, well prepared, and knows his subject. Unfortunately, he does not know how to draw the class out for discussion. His lectures are outlines and abstracts, well-digested, from which he wants you to give back specifics. Interesting and inspiring to talk to in person, but not so in his lectures. (Rec: SOME)

CANARIO, J. W.

2.9	3.8	3.2	3.4	3.9	3.5	3.5	3.6	13
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Well prepared, sticks to text. Often plods along but likes material and can be stimulating. Likeable and friendly. Tests are ridiculous. (20 question final. Answer in one sentence) He is a hard grader. Often his reader grades tests. (Rec: ALL except majors)

CASEY, R. H.

2.8	3.2	3.3	2.5	2.3	3	2.7	2.8	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	-----	-----	---

Dr. Casey's biggest fault is his inability to make contact with his students and to help them personally - he simply seems to lack interest. He does not always make clear what he expects of his students. Otherwise he is an acceptable, if not outstanding professor. (Rec: SOME)

CHANDLER, J.

2.9	3.9	4.0	3.1	1.3	2.8	2.2	3.0	15
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

A shy woman who may be very fond of her students, but who would rather flunk them than see them progress further in our educational system without first attaining a high degree of perfection. The educational system is plainly at fault for not preparing students for Dr. Chandler; one wishes she could be more

lenient and vent her frustrations on the system, rather than the students. If a student is willing to risk a D or an F, he will learn a great deal from her, including how to express himself clearly and concisely in a term paper - after rewriting it 2 or 3 times. (Rec: AVOID)

CLARK, J. J.

3.6	4.0	3.4	3.8	3.6	4.0	3.8	3.0	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Knows his subject well, makes it interesting, and gives a clear and reasonable presentation of worthwhile material. Makes light assignments, and emphasizes important points which should appear on essay exams. Extremely helpful and friendly to interested students. (Rec: ALL, especially non-majors)

COLLINS, J.

3.3	3.0	4.3	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.0	3.0	3
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Requires more work than average. Grades hard, but tests are fair and relevant. Insists upon class participation. (Rec: SOME/MAJORS)

COLLINS, R.

2.6	2.4	2.4	3.9	2.8	3.1	3.6	3.4	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Relaxed classroom atmosphere, but he should strive to make his lectures more pointed. (Rec: SOME MAJORS)

COX, M. H.

3.1	3.6	3.8	3.6	2.8	3.1	2.8	2.7	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Not too inspiring a lecturer. Students' opinions vary widely on this instructor. Although the language may vary, most are at least agreed on the following: a) For: well-prepared, knows material, emphasis on hard work. She is usually fair in grading. b) Against: Opinionated. Grades hard & to some extent on how students mold their opinions to hers. Stresses detail too much, and the best way to get good grades is to have good notes and a good memory. (Rec: SOME)

FERGUSON, J. H.

3.0	3.3	3.3	2.9	2.6	3.6	2.7	2.9	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures average but can be sarcastic and often is. Tests fair and relevant. (Rec: SOME)

FINK, J. E.

3.9	3.9	3.5	4.1	2.8	3.8	3.7	3.1	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Dr. Fink is excellent at stimulating student discussion and thought. While somewhat conservative in his own ideas, he demands originality from his students. He is very precise and demanding about the mechanics of English. He is intelligent and has a broad background. (Rec: SOME)

FOOTE, D. N.

2.6	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.5	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Dr. Foote is an expert on the Age of Elizabeth and obviously loves the people and literature of the times. Unfortunately, little of either her knowledge or enthusiasm is communicated to the students because her lectures are most often superficial

explications of the text. She also wanders, and is repetitious and difficult to understand. Long pop quizzes are frequent, her grading is not hard, but it is sometimes difficult to see the rationale behind it. (Rec: SOME)

GALM, J. A.

3.4	2.9	3.4	3.1	2.8	3.3	3.3	3.3	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Mr. Galm is a good, sound teacher. His lectures are interesting, his grading fair. (Rec: SOME)

GIRDLER, L.

3.2	3.5	3.3	3.7	2.9	3.5	3.6	3.4	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

A real character and a true individualist, with a droll sense of humor; his classroom manner is casual and relaxed; he is outgoing and helpful to students. An expert on folklore. A student will have to digest a lot of material and be able to organize an essay in class, with details and examples. (Rec: ALL)

GORDON, R. C.

4.1	3.9	3.5	4.0	2.5	3.7	3.3	3.2	14
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

An unexcelled lecturer, with a magnificent command of language and a thorough understanding of his subject. Extremely interesting and enlightening. He has a sharp, penetrating intellect, and is inclined to be impatient with imperceptive students. He has a sardonic, dry incisive wit which grows on one, once one gets to know him. A thoroughly distinguished man. (Rec: ALL)

GUTH, H. P.

3.0	4.0	4.2	3.5	3.2	4.5	4.2	4.2	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

An extremely accomplished lecturer. Dr. Guth has the gift of breathing life into the most obscure or dry material. His pointed, humorous comments are strangely enhanced by his precise, scholarly presentation. He has an ability to lead class discussion around to the point he is trying to make, to elicit insights from students and elaborate on them. He is open-minded and knowledgeable; his essay questions are on broad, general topics, but he demands a balanced, structured argument. (Rec: MAJORS)

HEAD, W. D.

4.8	4.0	4.4	4.5	1.7	4.0	4.0	4.1	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Dr. Head is a man with a strong and distinctive personality, which he exploits for all it's worth. He has a fine sense of humor which inclines toward sarcasm; he is rather moody, and will not tolerate laziness or apparent lack of enthusiasm among students. Gives two-minute quizzes at the beginning of each class period. He demands quality work, and his classes are always interesting--never a dull moment; however, he tends to favor cliques of student admirers. He is skillful in relating the faults of modern society to human nature as expressed in the various periods of English literature, but he is sometimes lacking in his comprehension of poetry. (Rec: ALL)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

HENDERSON, R.

2.3	2.3	3.3	2.3	2.0	2.2	2.1	1.2	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Mrs. Henderson is an interesting case. Her students are almost universally critical of her as being opinionated, dogmatic, overly critical of the student in class, and unhelpful. Yet her students produce some of the best writing of the English IA and IB classes. Grading is quite fair and improvement is high among her students. (Rec: AVOID unless you want to improve your writing)

HOLLOWAY, R.

3.4	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.1	3.9	3.7	4.1	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Dr. Holloway is a charming, kind, and broadminded woman, fantastically well-read. Her lectures are geared to do the most for the student; she reads them after having organized a mass of relevant data. Her tests and essays are stimulating. English majors should by-pass her Eng. 111 poetry course for Eng. 190, but will find her novel courses extremely informative. (Rec: SOME)

JACOBS, J. F.

3.6	4.3	3.0	3.6	3.0	3.3	3.3	4.3	3
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Teaches remedial, English A. Good teacher, well-prepared, dynamic. Work is helpful and relevant. (Rec: All English A students)

JENSEN, L.

2.6	3.4	2.8	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.8	4.0	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Mr. Jensen's lectures are clear and interesting, but he doesn't tend to encourage class discussions. He is not an easy grader, but gives helpful criticism and one learns from his basic writing courses. (Rec: SOME)

LAUTNER, E.

3.5	3.3	3.2	3.2	2.0	3.7	3.3	3.0	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

There is considerable disagreement as to whether or not Dr. Lautner is an interesting teacher. Most agree, however, that he is a tough grader and rather unhelpful. (Rec: SOME)

LAVARE, R.

3.3	3.3	3.8	3.5	2.9	3.4	3.6	4.0	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Enthusiastic, conducts an interesting course for non-majors. Carries on good discussions and commentary on readings. (Rec: SOME)

LAWSON, J. B.

3.5	3.9	3.2	3.8	3.2	3.2	3.5	3.6	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Knows her subject, universally liked and respected - (with the possible exception of some in children's lit.). Definitely recommended for everything else. Friendly, interesting, most helpful to students. (Rec: ALL)

LEACH, E.

3.7	4.2	3.5	3.4	3.6	4	3.9	3.9	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	-----	-----	---

She is a very good instructor, lively and interesting and interested in her subject. She encourages class discussion and is

thoughtful of the opinions of others. (Rec: ALL)

LEE, R. F.

3.6	3.9	3.1	4.3	3.1	4.0	3.9	4.1	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Dr. Lee is almost universally recommended. He is acknowledged to be extremely well-read, though some find that he makes this too obvious. Lectures, though slow, are good in content and are usually interesting. He has a fine humor, grades very fairly, is helpful, and is one of the department's best professors. (Rec: ALL) (Humanities: SOME)

LU DLUM, C. P.

3.1	3.1	3.5	3.4	2.7	3.1	2.9	3.4	14
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

One of the nicest men in the department, gentle, considerate, and modest - although he is too dry and unassuming for some people's taste. His sense of humor is very subtle and his approach to the subject is one of an intensive examination of minute details; he avoids pedantry by his obvious enjoyment and love of the material and the language. A good memory is an asset in his classes. He is very willing to help; the inquisitive student will find him a gold mine of ideas. (Rec: SOME)

MACARE, H. H.

2.6	2.8	3.7	3.2	2.4	2.7	3.4	3.0	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Dr. Macare's lectures are considered useless; she often talks of her family and her Phd. She stresses minor details; one of her English 40 finals included 200 fill-in and multiple-choice questions. None of her students were favorably impressed with her classes. (Rec: AVOID)

MAC DONALD, F.

3.0	3.6	3.7	3.7	2.0	2.9	3.3	2.2	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Seems to lack interest in student and feels very few students really try. Likes to throw "snap" questions at students. Lectures loaded with detail, tests cover same--are essay type and very comprehensive. Work load above average. (Rec: to a few--MAJORS)

MARTIN, J.

2.8	3.8	2.9	3.5	3	3.8	3.4	4.3	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	---	-----	-----	-----	---

A little timid and easy going; her standards of grading may be easier than other instructors for English IA and B. Conscientious, pleasant; she loves children's literature. Tests fair and easy. (Rec: SOME)

MILLER, H. P.

3.4	3.8	3.0	3.4	2.6	3.6	3.7	3.0	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

The students in Dr. Miller's more advanced courses like him extremely well. He has a highly contagious enthusiasm about the literature and likes all human beings - those in fiction and those in classes. He tends to require some memorization of details, but his tests are fair. Keep up with the reading. (Rec: ALL)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

OREM, R. V.

3.7	4.4	3.7	4.1	2.5	3.7	4.1	3.3	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

An authority on Milton and Shakespeare, he assigns a great deal of reading in primary and secondary sources and often over-estimates the interest of the material. He is courteous and gentlemanly, but inclined to pick favorites in his classes and to disregard the opinions of some students. (Rec: MAJORS)

OWEN, L.

3.4	3.5	3.1	3.5	2.9	3.2	3.2	4.3	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Conscientious teacher and clear lecturer. She emphasizes writing in her composition course. All consider her most helpful to students, taking a real interest in their problems. Relatively easy grader. (Rec: ALL)

PEPPER, R.

3.0	2.3	3.2	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.5	3.0	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Dr. Pepper is an interesting lecturer and knows his field but often wanders off the topic and into irrelevancies. Those in his basic writing course feel that he should spend more time actually teaching how to write. (Rec: SOME)

PETERSON, N.

3.4	3.0	3.9	3.4	3.0	3.1	3.4	3.3	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

This teacher is difficult, but usually quite fair. His lectures are interesting and often witty. (Rec: SOME)

PROSSER, E.

4.8	4.6	3.7	4.2	2.9	3.9	4.1	3.9	12
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Dr. Prosser is witty, dynamic and excellent in every respect. She is an outgoing woman possessing the rare ability to draw the most out of her students and involve them in the subject matter. She does not stress the memorization of details, but on the contrary is more concerned that the student learn and understand the concepts covered. She is very eager to listen to and discuss individual ideas, but expects an honest, intense effort and interest if the student is to learn anything. Some have commented that she is the "finest professor they have ever had." (Rec: ALL)

REED, G. A.

3.5	3.9	3.5	3.5	3.1	3.5	3.8	4.0	14
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

A pleasant man who comes up with some good ideas. Gives frequent pop-quizzes along with occasional essay exams which are quite interesting and worthwhile; ridiculous objective tests. Somewhat methodical and undynamic but usually stimulating. His well-planned lectures indicate a thorough grounding in modern American and British literature and feeling for close textual analysis. Grading relatively easy. (Rec: SOME/ALL)

RICHARDS, M. K.

4.7	4.2	3.3	4.0	2.5	2.8	3.3	3.8	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Well liked and an excellent teacher with a broad background. Always well prepared, enthusiastic, and instills an appreciation of the subject in the student. Interesting class discussions. Gives reams of notes. Likes well-written, well-organized

essays. The objective portion of her tests cover background material and lectures. Grading is tough to average. (Rec: ALL)

ROSENBERG, A.

3.3	3.4	3.7	3.4	2.7	3.8	3.0	3.3	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Dr. Rosenberg is distinguished by his badger-like appearance, quick wit and deep regard for female students and intellectuals. His lower-division classes reflect a patient disgust for persistent ignorance. His sense of humor, which runs to short quips and puns, is the essence of his feeling regarding education and academia. His biting, sarcastic character is appealing to certain students. Rosenberg's paradise is the seminar, and his usual habitat, the cafeteria. His exams are designed to eliminate lazy thinking and lack of preparation. Although he may listen and consider your questions and discussion, he is difficult to convince. Grades are very easy to acquire for some and highly difficult for others. (Rec: MAJOR)

SIMPSON, F.

1.8	2.5	3.5	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.2	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Disorganized, but unquestionably knows his subject. Usually quiet and uninspiring, but can at times be very stimulating. Takes an interest in his students and is willing to help them, but count on doing most of the work yourself. Easy grader. (Rec: SOME/humanities: AVOID)

SCHUTZ, F. C.

2.8	3.6	3.8	2.8	2.6	3.4	2.6	3.4	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

His composition sections are very good; students work hard and learn a great deal. Watch out for surprise quizzes. His Romantic Period classes are bad. Discussion is discouraged, and material is rapidly covered. (Rec: SOME)

TRAGER, E. C.

3.7	3.0	2.8	4.0	3.5	3.5	4.0	4.5	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

This professor is an expert in the field of linguistics. She is considered to be a delightful woman with a wild sense of humor and a great interest in her students. She often digresses off the main path, but these digressions are very interesting. (Rec: ALL)

VAN BECKER, D. M.

3.5	3.8	3.7	3.7	2.4	3.4	3.7	3.6	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

He is interested in students and very helpful, but grades harder and requires more work than average. He is a good teacher with a broad background. Comments range from "a gentleman" to "most interesting." Some complain he loses or forgets to return papers. The suspicion thus arises that he grades rather subjectively. (Rec: SOME/ ALL)

WATERS, L. A.

3.1	3.8	3.3	3.5	2.8	3.2	3.5	3.7	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

An expert in his field, but lectures emphasize too much detail. Tests fair, expects good work but the work load is not too heavy. Humanities - uses a great deal of Greek and Latin terminology which may snow students. (Rec: SOME)

WILLIAMS, O. C.

3.0 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4

A gentle, soft-spoken man, with a warm heart. His insight into poetry is quite exceptional; his Eng. 190 course is a must for English majors who want to understand poetry. He analyzes poems with great thoroughness, and demands perceptive, detailed essays from students. Non-English majors would do better to take Dr. Holloway's Eng. 111. (Rec: MAJORS) Humanities - talks to the class as if they were children. Tests are picayunish. (Rec: AVOID)

WILSON, G. C.

4.2 | 3.7 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 4.2 | 6

Always well prepared; makes modern grammar interesting - unquestionably knows his subject. Tests are sometimes picyune and not to the point. Seminars are sometimes lacking in pertinency and depth. Interested in students and most helpful. (Rec: SOME/MAJOR)

WOOD, J. O.

3.5 | 3.8 | 4.3 | 3.7 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 3.5 | 3.1 | 11

Universally liked and admired for his warmth and wit, and respected for his scholarship. All students agree he places the responsibility of preparing on the individual, that his lectures are well-prepared, and that his tests are extremely difficult and emphasize background material. Yet all recommend him for those who want a firm basis in English and don't mind working like fiends for a "C". A trifle hard-of-hearing; not very much in class discussion. (Rec: all serious majors and some others)

WOODWARD, R. H.

3.8 | 3.8 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 6

Pedantic, humorous and witty; he is always well-prepared and thoroughly a master of his material. Unfortunately, he tends to be both opinionated and moody, and he can sometimes be cutting to students. Those students who share his tastes consider Woodward a very superior instructor; those who do not, claim grades are not always based upon ability. (Rec: ALL)

ZOLLER, W. O.

1.0 | 2.5 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 2.6 | 2.0 | 14

Dr. Zoller is nervous and unsure of himself, and therefore apt to discourage student interest. If you enjoy the reading assignments, and are able to get something out of them on your own, you may enjoy the class. Some like him; most don't. (Rec: AVOID)

FOREIGN LANGUAGES DEPARTMENT

BOROVSKI, C.

3.5 | 3.8 | 3.6 | * | 2.6 | 3.6 | 3.7 | * | 10

He is an intelligent and extremely well versed professor in his field. Capable of being an excellent instructor, but affects students in different ways. He is very demanding. His dry humor

is often misunderstood by students. He is very helpful and interested in the students but his seemingly cold and distant Continental manner may prove a barrier to Joe College's appreciation of his qualities. For the dedicated student the lectures may prove very interesting. (Rec: MAJOR)

BRADMAN, H.

3.7	3.7	3.6	3.0	2.7	4.0	4.1	4.3	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Very good class presentation. The atmosphere is very relaxed. Stimulating to the beginning and advanced student. (Rec: ALL)

CASSARINO, S.

3.8	3.7	3.2	3.3	2.8	3.7	3.5	4.2	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Recommended highly for those interested in Italian literature. Expects much work from his students, but is very helpful and fair. He is pleasant, with a good sense of humor, and establishes immediate rapport with the students. (Rec: ALL)

COHADE, M.

4.2	4.6	4.3	4.5	2.3	4.3	3.6	3.8	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A very exacting, yet thoroughly excellent instructor. Any earnest student will find encouragement and assistance from her as well as a challenge; but this challenge is often hard for some students to accept. Her tests are not easily finished in 50 minutes, sometimes leaving no time for rereading. (Rec: ALL)

COLLINS, P.

2.8	2.6	3.2	3.2	2.5	3.7	3.5	4.2	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Interesting and entertaining, although the latter may sometimes lead the student far afield of the subject. He is organized in his preparation and fair in grading, demands that the student keep up with the subject and emphasizes grammar. He has interesting manners and habits which may prove exasperating to some, aggravating to others, and gratifying to still others. He is always willing to help the student. (Rec: SOME)

COOK, C.

4.0	3.5	3.7	4.0	3.7	3.7	3.7	4.0	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

She is interested in and understanding toward her students. Although she is not easy and assigns much homework, her testing and grading are fair. The tests do not try to trick the students, but she often inserts items which only the better students will know. Lower division students may find her less valuable than those in upper division, due to a slight mutual language barrier, although she is a fine instructor on both levels. (Rec: SOME, esp. MAJORS)

DAVID, E.

3.7	4.2	3.5	3.5	2.5	3.5	3.7	3.5	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

She emphasizes conversation, not grammar; little written work. It would help if the student had some Spanish background due to this emphasis. She has difficulty in understanding students' questions and is sometimes impatient in answering them. (Rec: SOME)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

GUEDENET, S.

3.3	3.0	2.8	3.6	3.3	3.4	3.7	4.3	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A personable instructor with an excellent command of his subject, but his lectures vary greatly in content. For the more advanced student, his lectures may prove more interesting but the beginning student cannot correlate the material contained within them. His teaching methods may prove difficult for the class as a whole. (Rec: SOME)

GUSTAFSON, D.

4.3	4.6	4.2	4.2	2.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

The atmosphere of the class is relaxed and enjoyable. She has a good sense of humor and is interested in what she is teaching. Integrates study of the language with supplementary information on Spanish culture. (Rec: ALL)

HERMANN, W.

3.5	1.6	2.5	3.0	4.0	3.1	2.0	3.6	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A German scholar, but not a German instructor. He should be avoided by those with either no previous foreign language training or no firm grammatical background. The student should be prepared to do extensive study on his own. (Rec: SOME, German Majors avoid)

HULANICKI, L.

3.8	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.2	3.6	4.0	4.4	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Very interesting lectures, relevant to the problems of the language. Those who put no effort into the course, will find him difficult. (Rec: ALL)

LUKACH, B.

2.7	3.5	3.2	3.0	3.0	2.2	3.0	3.2	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He is well versed in his subject and is friendly and helpful outside of class. Unfortunately, he often mistakes student dissatisfaction for personal criticism and his method of teaching becomes rigid. Frequently, when differences of opinion exist, student viewpoints are not adequately examined. (Rec: SOME)

MAIQUES, G.

4.4	4.3	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.7	4.0	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A stimulating and interesting lecturer, he motivates his class and gives them a greater feeling for the subject at hand through cultural explanations. His consideration of language within the totality of the culture is pleasurable for major and non-major alike. (Rec: ALL)

MUSHIAKI, K.

4.5	4.8	3.8	4.0	3.5	4.3	3.8	4.5	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A well-prepared and stimulating foreign language instructor. She develops good student-teacher relations immediately and imparts enthusiasm for the language. (Rec: ALL)

PANN, F.

2.8	3.2	3.6	4.0	3.0	3.6	3.8	4.2	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

An amiable and easy-going prof. He is enthusiastic about the subject and uses recitation of relevant material to impart the

greatest amount of knowledge. Covers subject rather rapidly.
(Rec: SOME)

PINKSTON, M.

3.6 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 3.9 | 2.6 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 9

Helpful and understanding but hard to get to know for some. She grades hard and requires much, though it is all to the advantage of the student. She is fair, patient and pleasant and the student does not feel that he is being rushed nor does he fear making a mistake. Class discussions cover a wide variety of topics for which the student should prepare on his own.
(Rec: ALL)

RADKE, W.

4.2 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.1 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 9

Keeps the students enthusiastic about the language. He mixes humor with thoroughness. Conscientious, patient and stimulating professor. Grades determined by a point system. The student leaves the course with a good foundation in German. (Rec: ALL)

SCHULZ, W.

3.6 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 2.6 | 3.6 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 11

He has an excellent command of German, and gives the student a firm foundation in the language. Good for beginning students and has a good sense of humor. His tests separate the men from the boys, but grading is fair. Tends to make the material too mechanical at times - a dilemma of a grammar course. (Rec: ALL)

STENZEL, J.

3.2 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.3 | 6

An able and understanding scholar who knows his subject and is able to communicate it to the students. He is patient and understanding in a difficult subject. (Rec: ALL)

GEOGRAPHY (see Economics and Geography)

GEOLOGY DEPARTMENT

ARNAL, R. E.

3.0 | 4.7 | 2.7 | 3.3 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3

The tests are taken exclusively from lecture material. Some people have difficulty understanding his English. Grading is on a straight percentage basis. He takes an active interest in the individual. (Rec: SOME)

BROOKE, J. P.

3.5 | 1.7 | 3.2 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 1.5 | 4

He is a man with a six foot, 380 pound chip on his shoulder. The lectures sometimes are not relevant to the course. He teaches his courses at a high level and then gives easy exams. He should not be taken for general education courses. (Rec: MAJOR)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

COTTON, W. R.

2.9	3.8	2.9	3.1	2.9	3.2	3.6	3.1	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

New prof, lectures may improve. They are read from notes, sometimes hard to follow. Movies are better than ever. Tries to make course interesting for average general education student. (Rec: ALL)

DOLLOFF, N. H.

3.0	3.0	3.0	3.8	3.0	3.2	3.5	4.0	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He goes strictly by the book. Labs (if taught) are separate from the lecture, and are important in the final grade. He is sometimes vague in answering questions. He is enthusiastic and willing to help the individual. The tests are hard, but grading is fair. (Rec: ALL)

KARTCHNER, E.

3.1	4.3	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.3	3.6	4.0	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Lectures are good, if one has an interest in the subject. Dr. Kartchner philosophizes too much and worries about upsetting the religious beliefs of the students. Tests are multiple choice, I.B.M. and fairly hard. He leads excellent field trips. (Rec: SOME)

MADDOCK, M. E.

3.8	3.8	2.8	3.8	3.2	3.7	4.2	4.4	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He is congenial and fair. He is willing to help the individual. His lectures are geared to a leisurely pace, and are relevant to the course. (Rec: ALL)

ROSE, R. L.

2.4	3.1	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.7	3.1	3.0	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

The tests are difficult for the average student. The tests tend to be ambiguous. He is a nice person but does not lecture well. (Rec: SOME)

SKAPINSKY, S. A.

2.6	3.6	4.4	3.4	2.6	3.2	3.6	3.8	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He takes an active interest in the individual and is always willing to assist a student. He knows his subjects well. Tests are hard and grading is fairly hard. Essay tests. Too much work is required. (Rec: MAJORS)

STEVENS, C. H.

4.2	4.6	3.4	3.8	2.8	4.2	4.0	3.8	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

His lectures are extremely interesting and clear and are outlined on the board. Tests are fairly hard. A nice person. (Rec: ALL)

HEALTH AND HYGIENE DEPARTMENT

JEPSON, W. H.

4.0	3.8	2.5	3.6	3.1	3.8	4.0	4.1	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

One of the outstanding professors in the department. His lectures are very interesting, his tests are made up new each

semester and the old ones are available in his office. He is very fair in his grading procedures and adjusts his test schedule around the normal midterm load. Very willing to help the student in or out of class. Spends a great deal of time in preparation and it shows in his classes. (Rec: ALL)

PETERSON, L. J.

3.3	3.6	2.7	3.3	3.0	3.6	3.1	4.0	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A competent instructor but not flashy. Grades on a curve, but tends to be a soft touch, especially for the campus actives and athletes. If you need a grade tell him a long story and he will "take care of you". (Rec: ALL)

RIGTER, A. H.

2.4	2.7	2.7	2.8	3.3	2.8	3.1	4.4	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures are about average with a tendency towards humor and heavy use of movies. The courses tend toward the easy side of the ledger. Generally considered somewhat Mickey Mouse, but you do learn something. The grading is reasonable and fair and she is always willing to talk to the student. (Rec: ALL)

SMOLENSKY, J.

2.4	2.6	2.2	2.4	4.8	2.8	2.0	3.6	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

The lectures are not quite up to par for he relies too much on class participation. Dr. Smolensky tries to be friends with all his students. He is especially friendly toward certain sororities and fraternities even to the extent of holding private seminars on his tests prior to the test date. If you want to go out for a few drinks with him or belong to the proper group, you have a snap A. (Rec: SOME--those who are capable social animals.)

WHITLOCK, R. E.

4.1	4.3	3.5	3.6	2.3	3.5	4.1	3.6	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures are well above average in interest and content. They are so well organized that it is often difficult for a student to break in with discussion, but he does welcome relevant questions and discussion. Dr. Whitlock has a tendency to be a stern taskmaster who expects students to be mature enough to work for their grades. Tests are made up new each semester, and are fair, although not easy. He goes out of his way to help the interested student. (Rec: SOME--those who are willing to work for knowledge.)

HISTORY DEPARTMENT

ADDINGTON, L. H.

4.0	4.1	3.2	3.3	2.7	3.6	3.4	3.5	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Specializes in military history and knows this subject well. He grades on the absolute scale and an A is difficult to attain. Essay exams are based on the lecture material and are easy for the student who takes good notes. A term paper and book reports are usually required. (Rec: ALL)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

ANDERSON, E.

2.8	3.6	3.6	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.5	3.0	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Has a tendency to talk too fast. This, combined with his accent, makes him very difficult to understand. He has an excellent command of Russian History and could have much to offer, with the help of proper speech technique. His finals are too short to be a fair estimation of a student's ability. (Rec: MAJOR)

BRUSNIN

3.8	3.2	2.8	3.0	2.8	3.8	3.6	4.0	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures are difficult to follow if one does not keep up with required reading. Covers much material in each lecture but doesn't follow course outline and gets easily sidetracked. He can get into some interesting discussions. He has a sense of humor and can answer one's questions. Gives questions that will be on tests, but tests are hard. Will give the student opportunity to improve grade. (Rec: SOME)

BURDICK, C. B.

5.0	4.8	3.4	4.4	2.2	4.6	4.6	4.8	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Dr. Burdick is outstanding in every respect - a scholar and a fine teacher. He is very popular with his students and takes a personal interest in them. Essay exams and a term paper are required in most courses. (Rec: ALL)

BUZANSKI, P. M.

4.1	4.2	4.1	3.5	1.9	3.3	3.1	2.9	14
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Dr. Buzanski conceives of the student body as a vast quantity of threatening top soil which tends to blur his vision if not watered down. Consequently, he finds it necessary to continually remind his students of their stupidity and incompetence. Like many historians, he finds it no longer necessary to convey facts and thus, gives clear lectures with excellent organization and no content. He is also much opposed to facts presented on his exams. With Buzanski, B.S. is king both in lectures and on exams. Grades are difficult to acquire; one must learn to B.S. in a well organized, verbose manner. One who is cowed by his big words will be highly impressed by Buzanski but will be saddened by his grade if he does not study. (Rec: SOME)

CLARFIELD

3.7	3.7	2.9	3.4	2.3	3.4	3.5	3.6	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Rather uninspiring lecturer, although material is well covered. Comprehensive essay exams are given and are general in nature. Should strive to be more specific in given areas. (Rec: SOME)

CRAMER, R. S.

2.8	3.3	3.9	3.4	2.7	2.8	3.5	3.1	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures tend to be uninspiring and read from notes. Classes conducted in discussion form, but lack emphasis and direction. Students are left to learn vital material on their own, although some good material is used. (Rec: SOME)

EDWARDS, G. T.

3.9	4.2	3.7	3.6	2.6	3.6	3.9	4.1	19
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Dr. Edwards is an extremely interesting and well-versed lecturer,

His command of American History is exceptional. He demands that students work for him and rewards them accordingly. Takes a sincere interest in his students and desires to help them in any way possible. He tends to dwell on subjects of particular interest and passes over others, but his lectures are well organized and precisely given. (Rec: ALL)

EICHHORN, I.

4.5	5.0	4.5	4.0	1.5	4.0	4.5	4.5	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

An extremely well informed instructor in her field, who not only covers the dates, but also imparts insights into the who and why of history. Lectures and outside reading are planned to help the student identify with the mood and spirit of the period. She is very demanding of time and energy, but for those willing to put out, the course will be a truly enlightening experience. All tests are essay and grading is hard - however, the final grade is partially determined on improvement throughout the semester. (Rec: SOME)

GAILEY, H. A.

4.6	4.5	3.5	4.2	2.0	4.0	3.6	3.7	13
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Excellent lectures which are well organized and well presented. Upper division tests are essay which require much thought. Lower division tests usually are of the one-word completion type. Requires much from the student but gives much in return. Term papers required in upper division courses. Good prof for serious student who wants to learn and is willing to put in much work. (Rec: SOME)

GILBERT, B. F.

2.4	3.0	3.3	2.7	3.4	3.2	3.3	4.0	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

In lower division classes lectures are well done with a fine sense of humor. Tests are objective with high grades few and far between. Attendance is a must. In upper division classes he takes an interest in the student but his lectures are very boring. Tests are essay type with general questions requiring absolute regurgitation. Footnote papers extensively and forget about "A's". (Rec: Lower division - ALL Upper Division - AVOID)

GILMORE, G.

4.5	4.3	4.1	4.4	2.5	3.7	3.9	3.9	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Outside readings are many and diversified. Essay exams call for well written ideas from the content of the lectures. She occasionally goes off on tangents; but otherwise lectures are well organized. (Rec: SOME)

GRAHAM, F. E.

4.5	4.7	2.5	3.5	2.0	3.0	3.4	3.9	15
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Lectures are the all-important thing, and are humorous, interesting and well done. Recommend taking complete and exhaustive notes, then memorizing them. A textbook is needed only for a doorstep or to impress a girlfriend; it rarely supplements a lecture. Tests are T-F and recall. Little outside work needed but class attendance is all important for a good grade. (Rec: SOME)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

HAZARD

2.1 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 7

Generally confused. Lectures wander and stress unimportant topics. Often he digresses into Japanese history, his main interest. Tests are essay in European History. (Rec: MAJORS)

HENDRICKSON, E. J.

3.6 | 4.4 | 3.7 | 3.4 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 3.1 | 2.6 | 7

Lectures have a tendency to be overly detailed and delivered in an assembly line technique. Outside reading is required and tests are designed to bring out a thorough knowledge of the subject, in essay form. Facts are all important to him - not ideas or concepts. (Rec: SOME)

HORNIG, E. A.

4.5 | 4.5 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 3.8 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 8

A liberal Democrat who considers F.D.R. practically a god. He vehemently dislikes conservatives, businessmen, newspapermen, etc. and readily admits this. Grades are very fair. Tests are often essay and always difficult, requiring students to know the significance of events or a person's contributions to history. He tries to make his subject interesting. Good students will get more than average attention. (Rec: ALL)

HUGINS, W. E.

3.8 | 4.3 | 3.1 | 3.7 | 2.6 | 4.0 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 14

The material covered is good but his speaking ability leaves something to be desired; however, he is willing to help his students and possesses an excellent knowledge of history. Upper division courses require a complete background in lower division work. (Rec: ALL) Humanities - lectures dry and class discussion not very stimulating. (Rec: SOME)

JENSEN, B. B.

3.8 | 4.3 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 12

Quizzes are announced and of the objective type. Midterms and finals are thorough, difficult, and essay type. Interested in the work of each student and willing to help him out of class. Outside work is related to current lecture material. Grades are given on a percentage scale. Lectures tend to be a bit fast, but interesting. (Rec: ALL)

KIBBY, R. W.

2.8 | 3.3 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 4

Very well versed in Civil War History and has excellent command of his subject. Much reading is required, as are term papers. Lectures are usually quite good, but tend to wander. Willing to spend time with the student if help is needed. Exams are difficult. (Rec: MAJOR)

KLOSE, N.

1.6 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.1 | 14

Very poor lecturer who resembles the original hulking statue while he is speaking. He never takes his eyes off his notes, which are a summary of the day's reading assignment. Quite disorganized most of the time. Communicates on a high school

level. Tests are T-F, multiple choice and easy. Very disappointing as a college professor. He should try research.
(Rec: AVOID)

KULSTEIN, D. I.

3.6	4.4	3.4	3.6	2.8	3.8	3.6	3.3	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures show that this prof. knows his material but sometimes has difficulty getting it across. Can get off on tangents, and has difficulty getting back on subject. Tests tend to be difficult. (Rec: ALL)

LEE, L. B.

3.0	4.5	4.0	2.6	2.3	3.5	4.0	4.5	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A very helpful, personable man who is willing to take time to help his students in any way possible; an extremely friendly professor. Weekly quizzes are given to insure that assignments are being met. Mid-terms are very exacting and quite difficult. Lectures tend to be dry but well prepared. (Rec: MAJOR)

MAIN, J. T.

4.6	4.7	3.0	4.1	3.3	4.3	4.0	4.3	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A real scholar of colonial history, he possesses a good background. Lectures are interesting, well done and easy to follow. Mid-terms are essay type, being quite exacting and very difficult. (Rec: ALL)

MARTIN, H. I.

2.5	3.0	3.0	2.9	3.1	3.4	3.1	2.4	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

The lectures are very well organized and cover the material in good order but speaking ability seems to be lacking; however, good command of subject matter is evident. Exams are of the essay type and stress facts. They are relevant to the course and fair. (Rec: Wide range between SOME and AVOID)

PANAGOPOULOS, E. P.

4.1	3.8	3.3	3.8	2.6	3.7	3.1	4.3	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He is very much interested in the student and willing to help him. Good instructor for U.S. History but student must be prepared to work and keep up with the assignments. Often difficult to get an answer from him and he tends to wander in his lectures. (Rec: U.S. History - ALL)

PATT, J. M.

2.3	2.9	2.6	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.9	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures are somewhat slow and he seems to be searching for the next point. Gives a combination essay-objective exam. One can do extra credit work. Class discussion is limited to the specific subject. (Rec: SOME)

ROGERS, R. C.

3.8	4.0	4.5	3.5	2.5	3.2	3.8	3.5	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

An excellent instructor who makes the student think for himself. Heavy outside reading is required and map quizzes can be expected. A term paper is required in upper division courses. Class discussions are made enjoyable and interesting; while class

learns from them. Willing to take time with students. Exams are quite difficult and require much individual thinking on the part of each student. (Rec: ALL)

WALTERS, D. E.

2.5	3.0	3.0	3.1	2.5	3.1	3.5	2.8	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Excellent command of history, but has difficulty conveying it to the student. Lectures are somewhat lacking in force, although the material is well covered. Objective tests stress detail and are accompanied by essay questions. Willing to help the student, although class discussion is limited. (Rec: SOME)

WINTERS, M. G.

2.9	3.6	3.2	2.9	3.4	3.4	3.0	3.2	22
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Lectures amplify the book but can be difficult for students to organize. Mostly essay tests. Capably acquaints student with little-known subjects, but student must be willing to work. She is willing to talk to students when she has the time. (Rec: SOME)

HOME ECONOMICS DEPARTMENT

ASHE, M. L.

2.4	3.6	3.0	3.2	3.2	3.6	3.6	3.0	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

She has a tendency to be rather bitter and sarcastic to the students. She makes it quite clear in class she is not just a babysitter. Her lectures are boring at times although quite well organized. If one has any background in nutrition, her lower division courses should be avoided, as they are quite basic. (Rec: SELECTED FEW)

BURGER, L.

2.4	3.2	4.0	3.0	2.2	2.8	3.0	3.0	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

The general feeling towards Miss Burger is that she should be either avoided completely or taken only by majors. She is a dull lecturer, hard grader and not at all interested in her students. An excessive amount of work is required. (Rec: AVOID)

DARBY, C. R.

1.5	2.0	3.0	3.2	3.2	2.2	2.5	2.8	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

75% of the lecture is read from the text and rest is spent on her personal experiences in the Philippines. She emphasizes the scientific details a great deal in some courses. Her tests, however, are not comprehensive in their coverage of the course material. (Rec: AVOID)

DURRETT, M. E.

3.4	4.0	3.2	4.0	2.6	2.8	3.2	4.4	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

She works hard to make the subject matter interesting. Appears to be interested in people as individuals. The lectures are full of important information, though they may be delivered somewhat fast and cover a great deal of case material. It is necessary to "toe the line" with her. (Rec: ALL)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

NELSON, V.

3.2	3.5	3.8	3.6	3.0	3.8	3.8	3.5	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Her lectures are well prepared, but may be dull at times. Outside reading and written work is heavy and sometimes tends to be busy work. Tests demand a good deal of memorization. (Rec: SOME)

PIROFSKI, F.

4.5	4.0	2.6	4.1	3.5	3.6	3.7	4.7	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

An invigorating person to be around. She is highly recommended to all who plan to work with children since she has a very extensive knowledge of their actions and development. (Rec: ALL)

SAALE, V. G.

3.9	3.6	3.0	4.0	3.5	3.6	3.1	4.3	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Mrs. Saale is very interested in her students, in her work and in art of all forms. She grades fairly except that she shows a slight prejudice to people who are more artistically endowed. (Rec: ALL)

SMARDAN, L. E.

4.0	4.2	3.2	3.5	3.3	2.4	3.8	3.8	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Dr. Smarden likes his work very well and demonstrates enthusiasm toward his subject matter. In one of his lower division courses he devotes one class period to listening to records of a romantic nature in order to make a point out of romantic love. He is well thought of by many because he knows how to say what people like to hear. He appeals to girls since he is quite gossipy and uses his relatives as examples in his lectures. (Rec: ALL)

HUMANITIES PROGRAM

SPERLING, J. G.

4.5	3.8	3.8	4.2	2.5	4.0	4.2	4.5	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Dr. Sperling gives his students a nearly free reign in class encouraging the engagement of conflicting ideas. He is a challenging instructor and expects students to give their best effort. In return he is the type of dynamic directing force that is so necessary to a good discussion oriented class. (Rec: ALL)

For other HUMANITIES instructors see: Art, English, History, Philosophy, Political Science, and Speech and Drama.

INDUSTRIAL ARTS DEPARTMENT

(Insufficient ratings were returned to evaluate the professors in this department)

JOURNALISM AND ADVERTISING DEPARTMENT

BENTEL, D.

3.6 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 3.2 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 14

Knows material well. Lectures are vividly and lucidly presented. Likes to express his own opinions on different subjects but will listen to others. Requires a term paper for "Press & Public," which determines the final grade. (Rec: SOME)

EPSTEIN, I. M.

3.4 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 2.4 | 2.8 | 2.2 | 3.8 | 6

Knows subject very well. Hard grader who tends to favor intelligent females. Teaching methods leave something to be desired, but a person can learn a lot from her. Is very picayunish and can easily get on your nerves. (Rec: MAJOR)

MARSHALL, C. E.

3.6 | 3.7 | 2.9 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 10

The value of Ad. 91 depends on the students interest in the course. Class atmosphere is relaxed. He knows his subject and is a fair grader. Busy work: clip ads each week. He watches a lot of T.V. - it's obvious - it comes out in his lectures. (Rec: ALL)

SPURGEON, D.

2.3 | 3.0 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 3.6 | 7

Teaches as though she were in high school. Class is interesting, although lectures are dull. The assignments and teaching methods seem to be outdated. (Rec: MAJOR)

LIBRARIANSHIP DEPARTMENT

NORELL, I.

* | * | 2.2 | * | 3.0 | 2.4 | * | 2.8 | 5

There are great differences of opinion regarding lectures, work, and grading for this instructor. The differences seem to be related to the courses concerned. For Lib 139 and Lib. 1 she is rated from 3 to 5 and is recommended for all. For Lib 119 and 116, however, ratings are very poor. (Rec: According to classes indicated above)

MATHEMATICS DEPARTMENT

ANDERSON, R. E.

3.0 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 2.7 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3

He is an average professor. His lectures are strictly from the text book - that is, he reproduces theories, theorems, and examples of the text book. He is a better teacher for upper division courses. (Rec: SOME)

BIRD, M. T.

3.0 | 3.4 | 2.9 | 3.6 | 2.8 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 4.2 | 9

Lectures aren't very interesting. Extremely slow speaker. If he had two periods a week rather than one he would be a very

admirable prof. He is an excellent slide rule teacher. (Rec: SOME)

BRADSHAW, C. K.

3.8	4.0	3.2	3.4	3.6	4.2	3.2	4.4	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He is a very good lecturer. Has a good sense of humor and is intelligent. However, he is better for lower division math courses. He gives tips on enrichment ideas. Homework is light, but daily. (Rec: ALL)

BRIAN, R. B.

3.0	4.0	2.6	2.8	3.2	3.8	3.6	3.8	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A sweet understanding man; a nice fellow. (Rec: SOME)

BRISTOW, L.

1.7	1.9	2.9	2.9	3.4	3.0	2.9	2.8	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

The lectures are very disorganized and in general not very clear. He has trouble communicating relevant and useful information to his students. His blackboard work is very confused. His writing is atrocious and very hard to take notes from. (Rec: AVOID)

BRUNINGS, J. H. M.

1.8	2.5	3.2	2.5	3.0	3.2	3.1	2.0	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures are not well organized. It seems that she can't run across the ideas that are in her mind. Tests are very easy and grades are fair. (Rec: AVOID)

CAMPBELL, D. R.

3.4	3.2	3.4	3.4	2.5	3.3	3.0	4.0	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Interested in the student. His lectures tend to wander off of the track and he keeps the class overtime to finish lectures. Fairly good remedial math instructor. (Rec: SOME)

DIECKMANN, R. H.

3.4	4.4	3.6	3.6	2.2	3.6	3.6	3.8	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures are well ordered; they are clear and easy to follow. Because he covers material in such detail his lectures are slow. He gives about 12 tests during the semester. (Rec: MAJOR)

EDGAR, H. M.

2.8	3.0	4.0	3.4	2.2	3.0	3.4	3.8	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He has a fantastically well organized mind which shows in his lectures. However, he can be boring for someone who doesn't like to concentrate for 45 minutes. Recommended only for math majors or for those who like to play with theories. (Rec: MAJOR)

FOWLER, K. A.

2.1	3.8	3.1	3.3	2.6	3.3	3.5	2.8	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

All reports except one were from lower division calculus students. His field is algebra. His lectures tend to be extremely slow and deliberate. Reports varied from extreme like to extreme dislike. (Rec: Only upper-division Math Majors)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

GREER, E.

3.2 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 2.9 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4.1 | 10

Lectures are rapid and well organized, but he does occasionally wander off the subject. He is always willing to help the student. (Rec: SOME)

HOGGATT, V. E.

3.2 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.4 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.9 | 8

Dynamic lecturer; covers required material well and expands on it. Often digressed into other fields of math in order to provide background. Although he sometimes wanders far afield from the subject at hand, he is always interesting and informative. Seems to be able to spot "A" students during the first week of class. (Rec: ALL)

JAMISON, H. E.

2.8 | 3.0 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 2.6 | 5

He is not what one would call a stimulating teacher. His lectures are very straight forward and presented on a fairly high level. His tests cover precisely the information that is presented in class. No material outside of the text is presented. (Rec: MAJOR)

KRAMER, M.

4.4 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 4.4 | 5

A man who is truly interested in mathematics and the teaching of mathematics. He requires a lot of homework but you are highly motivated by his lectures to complete all of the assignments. His tests and grading are especially fair. He really stimulates and motivates thinking on the part of the student. (Rec: ALL)

LANGE, L. H.

4.0 | 4.3 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 3.0 | 4.3 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 3

He works very hard to make sure that all the students understand the material. He spends so much time in explanations that he does not have time to lecture on all the material that is in the book. His lectures are very clear. (Rec: MAJOR)

LARSEN, C. M.

4.0 | 4.1 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 2.9 | 4.1 | 3.6 | 4.1 | 7

He is very well informed in his subject area and he can teach students at various levels. He is very good at instilling attitudes and concepts. His lectures are never dull and boring. He lets you know what his prejudices are, and he respects disagreement. (Rec: ALL)

LOVAGLIA, A. R.

4.5 | 4.6 | 4.1 | 3.8 | 1.8 | 3.8 | 3.1 | 3.8 | 7

He is a brilliant mathematician who lives math. His lectures are exceptionally well organized and come mostly from his brain. He puts great emphasis on theory and tends to slight practical application. He is not recommended for students afraid of honest, hard work. All math majors should take at least one course from him. (Rec: MAJOR)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

MARKS, J. L.

4.0	4.2	2.5	4.0	2.8	3.5	2.8	2.8	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He is very outstanding in methods courses. He is up-to-date on the new trends in mathematics and especially in the teaching of mathematics. He really makes you feel that you want to teach mathematics.

MYERS, W. H.

4.2	4.6	4.0	4.4	2.4	4.8	4.8	4.4	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

All students agreed that his classes are excellent. Homework (in lower division) counts about 20% of grade. Explanations are so clear that he never has to repeat. One of best in math. department. (Rec: ALL)

O'DONNELL, P. F.

3.5	4.6	4.0	4.0	2.6	4.5	4.9	4.4	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

She requires a lot of work but it is all relevant to the course. The tests are well coordinated with the material covered in class. Her explanations are clear and concise and she is more than willing to help her students who have difficulties in her courses. (Rec: ALL)

OLDS, C. D.

4.5	4.4	3.4	3.8	3.0	3.9	3.8	3.1	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

He presents the subject as a challenge to the students. Through his clear and concise lectures he covers a large amount of material, all of which is useful to the student. (Rec: ALL)

POST, R.

4.1	3.9	3.3	3.2	2.6	4.0	4.0	3.9	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He is a very sincere professor. He expects the student to work hard, but he pays them fairly. He is always willing to help the students. A person can get a good idea about what an approaching test will be like by reviewing past homework and lecture notes. (Rec: ALL)

PRESTON, G. C.

3.7	3.7	3.3	3.7	2.5	3.5	3.5	3.8	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

His lectures are well structured. Exams will be on lecture material and text. Exams tend to be a little too long for the time allotted. Has excellent command of his subject. (Rec: ALL)

SCHWEITZER, B. J.

2.3	3.0	3.0	3.0	2.7	3.3	3.1	2.9	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He doesn't seem to have any detailed knowledge of the subject matter in upper division courses. His lectures are fairly dry and he has trouble making clear certain relevant points in his lectures. Lets you know in advance the extent of the material to be covered on an exam and he sticks to this on his exams. Exams are fair and reasonable, as are his grades. (Rec: SOME, but major should avoid)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

SIMS, B. T.

2.2	3.1	2.8	2.9	3.2	3.4	3.6	3.2	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Opinions on this prof. vary greatly. At his best when teaching topology. Lectures are somewhat dull. (Rec: SOME)

SMART, J. J.

2.7	4.0	3.3	2.3	2.5	3.0	3.1	4.5	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Recommendations were about evenly split between "all" and "avoid". Comments ranged from extremely critical to extremely complimentary. No valid conclusions can be drawn. (Rec: see above)

SUDBOROUGH, D. R.

3.0	3.4	3.4	3.4	2.4	3.0	3.4	4.0	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A very exact and precise lecturer. He makes every effort to have every student understand the material but in doing this during class time, he sometimes over-lectures on points that are too elementary for his classes. His tests are very fair but tend to be a little too easy at times. His grading is hard but fair. (Rec: SOME)

THORO, D. E.

2.5	2.8	4.3	2.7	2.5	2.7	2.8	2.7	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures are presented in a very simple manner - that is, he uses same approach most of the time. It seems that he would be a better teacher for upper division courses rather than lower division. (Rec: AVOID)

WREDE, R. C.

3.3	3.6	2.9	3.7	2.8	3.9	3.6	4.2	19
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

His lower division courses are taught with ill-directed lectures; they are few and far between. Class time is spent discussing homework which no one has done. His courses in vectors and tensors are very good. He is quite rigorous and demands class participation. Grad students recommend him highly. (Rec: MAJOR)

METEOROLOGY AND PHYSICAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT

BALCOM, D. M.

3.3	3.3	3.3	3.6	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.3	3
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures well and works to explain concepts thoroughly, with many examples. Mr. Balcom is willing to help the student and is considered a good man. (Rec: ALL)

BOSS, M. A.

2.9	3.5	2.6	3.2	2.6	3.1	2.6	2.5	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Seems to know his subject well, but does not know how to teach it. Is a fair instructor who gives well written, but difficult exams. Requires notebook - it must be very neat to get a good grade. Sometimes irritates students with his manner of teaching. (Rec: SOME)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

COCKRELL, L. T.

4.0	4.0	3.8	4.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	4.2	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Knows subject well and keeps up on it. Lectures are to the point. Helpful to the individual student. Offers encouragement, but desires perfection. (Rec: ALL)

FOSTER, R. J.

3.4	3.9	2.7	3.7	3.6	3.8	3.0	3.9	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

A good instructor, intelligent and enjoyable. He knows the subject and encourages discussion. (Rec: ALL)

GONG, W. A.

4.0	4.0	4.3	3.7	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.7	3
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A good instructor who gives the students a break. (Rec: ALL)

MILLER, A.

3.3	3.7	2.3	2.3	3.0	4.0	3.3	3.3	3
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Well organized with a sense of humor. Large classes cut down personal interest. Tests are rigorous, but reported to be on file with some social organizations. (Rec: ALL)

PFUNDSTEIN, D. W.

2.3	2.8	3.2	3.0	2.4	2.8	2.6	2.7	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Knows what he is doing but tends to assume that everyone else does also. Inclined to waste time and is a dull lecturer although some rate him as excellent. Sometimes forgets what he assigned, then marking students off if they don't hand everything in. (Rec: SOME)

ROBERTS, B. J.

2.4	3.0	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.8	3.0	2.8	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Tries hard to make an unpopular subject interesting to non-science students required to take the courses he teaches. Has a sense of humor that some find dull and corny. Lectures sometimes boring, reading assignments unclear. Lecture exams fair; covers text as well as lecture. Lab quizzes weekly covering previous week's lab work. No lab final exam. (Rec: SOME)

SPRAIN, W.

4.7	4.5	2.5	4.0	3.7	4.3	4.2	3.5	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures well organized, knows subject, has a good sense of humor. Will take time to answer questions if approached with sincerity. Time probably limited as he is department head. (Rec: ALL)

TRUE, A. E.

2.6	3.0	2.8	2.6	3.1	3.0	2.7	2.8	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures are sleep-inducing, but interspersed with movies fit for all ages and sexes. Tests are objective, based on fact. (Rec: SOME, lectures are geared for those who have had no science background.)

MILITARY SCIENCE DEPARTMENT

(Army R.O.T.C.) Insufficient ratings were received to evaluate the instructors in this department.

MUSIC DEPARTMENT

DOWNEY, L. W.

1.8	1.8	2.6	1.8	2.2	1.8	2.2	1.4	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

The ratings tell the whole story. He seems to have a "chewing gum complex" and harangues on the subject for an entire class period. (Rec: AVOID)

EAGAN, T. E.

4.0	3.8	2.2	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.7	3.8	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Has the ability to interest the average student in classical music. Classes are relaxed, casual and have good student instructor rapport. An easy grader. He avoids dealing with the details of music structure, and concentrates on the more general aspects of the subject in 10A. (Rec: ALL)

HARRISON, R. M.

4.2	4.6	2.7	4.0	3.3	4.0	4.2	4.5	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Very friendly casual atmosphere in class. He teaches the practical aspects of music teaching in Elem. School music courses. General chorus and other vocal courses don't require much ability. (Rec: ALL)

LEASE, G.

2.9	2.9	2.8	3.6	2.9	3.0	3.4	3.3	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

The lectures are filled with humor, but conducted on an elementary level. If the student enjoys the same, he should find the lectures interesting. Fond of the girls. (Rec: SOME)

ROBINSON, F.

2.9	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.5	2.7	3.0	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

She is up on all musical events and students honestly seeking to appreciate music may enjoy her lectures. Sometimes gets carried away with her travel stories. Gives the same tests every year which are in fraternity files. Two required concerts. (Rec: SOME)

NURSING DEPARTMENT

(Insufficient ratings were received to evaluate the instructors in this department.)

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY DEPARTMENT

(Insufficient ratings were received to evaluate the instructors in this department)

OCEANOGRAPHY (see Geology)

PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENT

ALBRIGHT, G.

4.0	4.0	3.6	3.4	2.8	3.8	3.8	4.0	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A very intelligent, unconventional and politically liberal philosopher. He knows his subject but occasionally goes over the heads of the novices. He grades hard on theses and has only a mid-term and final. Allows a paper for those who want to bring up their grade. He will broaden anyone's outlook on life.
(Rec: ALL)

BURTON, J.

2.4	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.0	3.3	3.3	2.6	12
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

In logic, Miss Burton moves hurriedly over the material and will appeal only to quick, bright students. She uses only Plato's Republic in 50 and is spotty in her presentation. Has a tendency to forget tests and arrive late to class. Has difficulty in getting any response from the students. (Rec: Quick, bright students)

CURLEY, E.

3.5	3.3	3.3	3.4	2.2	3.0	3.6	4.1	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Dr. Curley is a new professor and reflects this fact by the difficulty he has in preparing clear and relevant tests and covering the material in the lectures. He is open to all questions and allows much discussion. He has the ability to clarify issues, but sometimes dwells too long on certain problems.
(Rec: SOME)

DAVIS, P.

*	3.7	3.0	3.4	3.1	3.8	3.7	3.3	23
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Lectures are dry, dull but very informative. Highly formalized and well-organized. Permits limited discussion but only if relevant to lectures. Classes lack intellectual excitement. A little too fast and vague for non-majors. A master of organized argumentation. (Rec: MAJOR)

DEININGER, W. T.

4.4	3.7	3.3	4.2	2.6	4.3	4.0	4.2	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Deininger involves himself so deeply in the field of philosophy that he has great difficulty in extracting himself. The twists and turns which his mind takes to work out a difficult problem are clearly revealed in the class. This results in a detailed and highly interesting presentation which lacks only clarity and invitation to discussion. In seminar, his desire to single-handedly solve the problems of the world practically precludes worthwhile discussion. If he doesn't know the answer, he will find it. Exams are excellent and very fair. (Rec: SOME - those with an excellent vocabulary.)

DOMMEYER, F. C.

2.8	3.0	2.6	2.3	2.4	2.1	2.4	2.1	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Dommeier has practically no ability to teach a philosophy class properly. He has no inclination to be a decent teacher and even less to investigate philosophy. Lectures are fairly interesting

if you accept everything as the gospel truth. His concern is with para-psychology, his important friends and second-rate semantics, in that order. His tests in logic are in every fraternity test file, and he never changes them. (The honest student doesn't have a chance). Just memorize the order of T and F. He rambles on about trivia and makes no attempt to listen to his students. (Rec: AVOID)

DUTTON, J.

2.7	3.2	3.3	2.5	1.9	3.1	2.5	2.4	19
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Dutton believes that logic is simple, philosophy is simple and students are simple. Consequently, he tends to berate them and down grade them as if they only existed to soak up knowledge, rather than to think. No discussion - deep concern for semantics - excellent knowledge regarding the philosophical system. Tests are impossible. (Rec: AVOID)

FALLICO, A.

4.1	3.8	3.0	3.8	3.3	3.7	3.8	3.7	20
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Professor Fallico is a man who is universally praised and admired by his students. A rare wine among a flock of Thunderbirds. His lectures have the tone of a personal conversation; unstructured, but creative, vital, and evocative. He has a real message to deliver, and original ideas which no other professor on campus can offer. A Renaissance man, a humanist, a lover of life, and a profound existentialist, he truly lives his philosophy of life, setting an example by which his students may do the same. He has a many-faceted and magnetic personality, and a probing, questioning intellect which dominates the course - so sit back and enjoy it, if it suits your temperament. (Rec: ALL)

GOLDWORTH, A.

3.8	3.6	2.8	3.7	2.8	3.4	3.5	3.5	12
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Goldworth is a fine philosopher--dynamic and open to a wide variety of discussion topics. Occasionally he wanders off on trivial side issues and has a tendency to go over the head of some students. He requires a student to keep up with the work. (Rec: SOME - those who like to debate in class.)

JACKLIN, P.

3.3	3.4	3.3	2.9	2.0	2.8	3.1	3.1	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures tend to dissolve into class discussion, in which Jacklin excels. Those not participating generally feel lost and learn little. He is friendly and will answer questions. He is very slow at returning examinations. Philosophy 60 tests are hard. (Rec: for the thinking man)

JONES, G.

3.8	3.4	2.9	4.0	3.3	3.8	3.6	4.5	12
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Witty, sharp, critical and interesting. Extremely competent instructor and serious individual. A must for anyone - whether he is a major of just fulfilling a requirement. He is sometimes slow at making a point. Brings the students into the subject, although lectures are sometimes over their heads. (Rec: ALL)

KOESTENBAUM, P.

3.7	3.8	3.2	3.6	2.6	3.3	3.0	3.7	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Follows the tenets of existentialism, resulting in an unstructured class, openness to discussion and fair grading. His lectures are sometimes not explicit enough regarding the readings and he tends to ramble on occasion. (Rec: ALL but majors)

LEVI, D.

*	2.3	2.7	3.0	3.4	3.4	3.0	3.9	16
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Dr. Levi, who prefers to called Don, does not teach it; he does it (philosophy that is). Levi's lectures may be confused and disorganized but only, as he will admit, because that is the present state of philosophy. His presentations in 157 are highly mathematical while those in philosophy are highly linguistic in content. Conducts a good logic class. He gives very few tests and cares little about grades. He will help any student who desires it, and, in fact, spends more time with his students than any other instructor in the dept. (Rec: SOME MAJORS)

MADDEN, E.

4.1	4.1	2.4	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.4	13
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

The histrionic and volatile Dr. Madden, who teaches philosophy as if he were sweating out a fever, is in fact an incredible scholar regarding the philosophy of science. He knows the issues and presents them well. Unfortunately, in all other fields he forces the issues into three areas: causality, principles and hypotheses. In seminars, he allows only those remarks of which he approves. Discussion is limited to the amount needed to re-express his beliefs. Very frustrating to a student of philosophy. (Rec: SOME)

MC CULLOUGH, J.

4.2	4.4	3.2	4.1	2.8	3.0	3.9	4.4	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Great man of interest and vitality. A sage. Has excellent rapport with the students. Class members will be excited into action by the exuberance with which he presents his lecture material. Excellent sense of humor. Tests are multiple choice and IBM, which stress terminology. Very difficult to study for. Requires a book report. (Rec: ALL)

O'NEILL, J.

*	3.4	2.2	2.6	4.0	3.0	*	3.0	5
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---	-----	---

O'Neill is quite witty and interesting; however, this often obscures the content and organization of his lectures. He requires minimum amount of work. He weighs the final very heavily and his final grading is somewhat controversial. (Rec: SOME)

SHAPIRO, H. S.

4.4	4.4	2.6	3.9	2.8	3.9	3.9	4.0	23
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

An excellent historian of ancient and medieval philosophy, but as a philosopher he leaves much to be desired - incapable of philosophizing. An extremely dynamic and colorful scholar who gives interesting and thought-provoking lectures. Very good at explaining a difficult subject and is willing to spend a lot of

time with the student. His logic tests are the best in the department. (Rec: ALL)

SHARMA, V.

1.9	2.2	3.3	3.3	3.1	2.7	3.4	2.6	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

He has a language problem, which is embarrassing in philosophy. In spite of this, he manages to wander. Test questions are vague and have to be interpreted before they can be answered. A genial man - interesting outside the classroom. (Rec: AVOID, unless you think you can follow the accent.)

PHYSICAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

(Men's and Women's departments combined)

NEAL, M. M.

*	*	3.3	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.0	4.0	4
---	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

She is completely a sportswoman. To be outside the realm of sports is to be out of her favor. (Rec: MAJOR)

SPREEN, H. L.

3.0	3.7	3.8	3.0	2.6	3.7	3.6	3.4	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Good teacher for P.E. majors, or those who enjoy sports. Demands top performance from students. (Rec: SOME)

TROTTER, B. J.

2.5	3.5	3.3	3.5	3.0	2.5	3.0	2.3	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

For upper division courses, she is extremely organized. Is reluctant to help students outside of class. Recommended for methods, rather than activities courses. Shows little interest in her volleyball class and grades on the number of cuts, using every petty point towards or against a decent grade. (Rec: MAJOR)

WINTER, L. C.

4.0	3.7	2.8	4.3	4.2	4.0	3.6	3.4	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Conducts an interesting activities class. Track: good for those who have athletic ability, but may not give second stringers adequate attention. (Rec: SOME)

PHYSICAL SCIENCE (see Meteorology and Physical Science Department)

PHYSICS DEPARTMENT

ANDERSON, M. F.

2.6	2.7	3.8	2.5	3.1	2.2	2.2	2.7	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Opinions vary considerably on this instructor. Some are weighed by the fact that he is inexperienced and seems to be trying hard. Upper division students cite the fact that his lectures are a repetition of text with little originality and are presented in a monotonous manner. Explanation of physical principles involved in a problem is rarely offered. Take-home exams and

homework constitute 60% of the grade, thus giving the student with plenty of time and "contacts" a better chance than he deserves. His knowledge of the subject is lacking which results in fumbling with details and sometimes an inability to do problems which he has assigned for homework. Lower division students have a more benevolent attitude toward him resulting in average ratings.
(Rec: Upper-Div. AVOID; Lower-Div. SOME) (Not majors)

CARTER, D.

3.2	3.9	3.5	3.4	2.8	3.4	3.0	3.2	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Exceptionally knowledgeable in the field of physics. He emphasizes the general nature of physical principles whenever possible. Seems to think students shouldn't be interested in grades - he doesn't seem to be, either. Tries to cover up errors. He is brusque and never seems to have time; usually late for class.
(Rec: MAJOR)

EASTER, R. R.

2.3	2.5	2.8	1.7	3.0	2.8	3.3	3.0	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Delivers a below average lecture and relies too heavily on an overhead projector to deliver lectures. The book is a better reference than class notes in studying for an examination.
(Rec: SOME)

EINARSSON, A. W.

2.3	3.3	2.0	3.0	3.1	3.0	3.0	3.4	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

As a lecturer, Prof. Einarsson lacks any dynamic qualities, but he does present the material clearly and logically. He emphasizes the organization and logic of the subject rather than memorization of a great mass of data. Quite willing to help students individually. Exams are True/False and multiple guess.
(Rec: SOME)

FITZGERALD, D.

2.1	2.9	2.1	2.4	3.9	2.9	3.1	2.9	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Always dismisses class 15-45 minutes early. Doesn't seem to give a damn about teaching. Tests too easy and good students are never challenged by the material. (Rec: AVOID)

GREENE, E. S.

1.9	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.5	3.7	4.1	4.4	15
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Dr. Greene wrote the text for his courses and lectures from it. The text is a good one, but his lectures are somewhat boring. However, this is made up by his willingness to help students, especially girls. His jokes are corny, but he is considered a nice guy. (Rec: ALL)

MORELAND, W. H.

4.0	4.9	4.2	4.2	2.0	4.4	4.2	4.5	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Prof. Moreland is one of the most respected teachers of physics. He is noted for the frequency (every two weeks) and difficulty of his exams. Their difficulty, however, becomes transparent to a good student who stops to think before plunging into the problems. The exams provide a very valid criteria for judging ones aptitude in the sciences. He is very willing to help students individually, is exceptionally knowledgeable, and

lectures are magnificently clear and well organized. A great deal of work is required, but the effort is very rewarding to a true student of the sciences. (Rec: ALL SCIENCE MAJORS)

NOWBRAY, A. G.

1.7	2.8	2.7	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.0	19
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Monotony 1A -- A ridiculously poor lecturer. He reads lectures from ancient, prepared notes which are of very low quality. Material presented is simple and far below the level of the course. Exam grades are heavily weighted on arithmetic, about 30%; also overemphasizing his own peculiar definitions. He is quite sardonic and of no help to a student who has a problem. As a sarcastic gesture, he provides cookies, kleenex, and aspirin during the final. A physics major can only hope that having a course from him won't be too detrimental. He doesn't violate the integrity of physics during the summer session so take the course then. (Rec: AVOID)

POSEY, L. R.

4.5	4.3	3.0	4.3	2.5	4.3	3.7	4.4	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

"Professor of the year" Professor Posey stresses physical analysis and insight into the mathematics of a problem. He inspires students to a good deal of effort. Required work is low but procrastinators will be losers since the exams are designed to disclose any weakness on fundamental concepts. (Rec: ALL)

WILLIAMS

3.5	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.5	3.5	4.5	2
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Very good lectures emphasizing theory and physics rather than engineering. Very well liked since he is fair and has a very good personality. (Rec: ALL)

POLICE DEPARTMENT

MISNER, G.

3.5	3.8	4.0	4.0	2.8	2.5	3.3	4.0	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Demands perfection. Enjoys the same in females, in fact expresses enjoyment thru custom known as flirting. Life is easier if he likes you. (Rec: MAJORS, all for report writing)

POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT

BALLARD, J. T.

2.8	2.3	2.8	3.1	2.9	3.5	3.7	4.1	14
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

He is unorganized and tends to wander from the subject; seems to be disinterested in the subject. A good guy. Encourages discussion. Absolute scale for grades, but nobody finishes tests. (Rec: SOME)

BTRNBACH, M.

4.1	4.1	3.0	3.4	2.7	3.7	4.1	4.1	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He is inspiring and integrates discussion and analysis of the material into the class period. A very perceptive, challenging

and highly stimulating man. Outside preparation is essential, as Dr. Birnbach does not consider it adequate that the student merely give an opinion, but he must also defend it with logical reasons. Tests are essay. (Rec: ALL)

BRAZIL, B.

4.1	4.6	3.5	3.6	2.9	3.9	3.7	4.2	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures are extremely compact, meaty, and thought-provoking. His ability to clarify and illustrate complex political theories is superior. Student should have a firm European history background. Tests are long and hard. Student must be willing to put out an intensive effort. (Rec: ALL)

BRUNTZ, G.

2.5	2.5	3.1	3.6	3.0	2.5	2.7	3.0	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Lectures almost non-existent in Ed. 378. He is abrupt, opinionated, and stern. Like an iceberg to people who don't take the time to get to know him - cold and hard. Those who take the time - and don't polish the apple - find him a warm, kind old gentleman, though still abrupt. He is capable of stimulating lively class discussion. Teaches lower division pol. sci. like a high school class - a little despot. (Rec: SOME, lower division pol. sci. AVOID.)

CRESAP, D.

3.7	4.1	2.4	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.6	2.9	17
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

A man with a lot of practical experience in politics - mayor of Palo Alto. Students learn a lot in his lectures. Relates course to local politics. Tests are very fair and related closely to material discussed in class. Seems disinterested in the job of teaching. Often looks out the window during his own lectures - toward Palo Alto. No papers required. His time schedule allows for little student-prof contact. (Rec: ALL)

GILBERT, J.

3.7	3.4	2.9	3.8	3.4	3.5	3.8	4.0	12
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Although not profound, Mr. Gilbert presents and covers the material in an interesting, complete manner. He encourages class participation by leading question and answer periods. It is said he manages to make a dry course (Pol. Sci. IA) into an interesting enjoyable experience. Tests are of the objective type. Grading is fair. (Rec: ALL)

HAAS, M.

2.5	3.2	3.3	2.8	3.0	2.2	3.2	2.6	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Well educated in Pol. Sci. but has trouble communicating his ideas to students. Reads his lectures from notes. A nut on statistics; has his students write two abstracts and a paper. Unannounced quizzes. (Rec: for those who love statistics.)

JARVIS, J.

1.4	1.6	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.1	2.7	2.1	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

An apparently well-meaning and knowledgeable person completely unable to get a point across in a coherent lecture. They are unimaginative, boring, and a complete waste of time. Tests are

similar. If you take this instructor, prepare to do extensive study outside of class. (Rec: AVOID)

KUNSMAN, C. H.

3.4	3.8	2.8	3.4	3.1	3.8	3.8	4.1	13
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Bubbling over with Santa Claus like good humor, lectures give insights into the daily life and institutions of the countries studied. Well versed in his subject. Impossible to fake it on exams. Grade will improve if you show constant improvement throughout the semester. (Rec: ALL)

MORGAN, G. G.

3.2	3.9	3.5	3.4	2.6	3.6	4.0	3.2	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Lectures are well prepared and stress a great amount of detail. For the student interested in national administration, this man is a veritable wealth of information, having spent a number of years working in the federal government. His statements and opinions are supported by carefully researched facts. Lectures sometimes wander onto the subject of Goldwater and the John Birchers, about whom he becomes adamant. Tests are very long and detailed multiple choice questions. Very interesting to discuss political problems after class with. (Rec: SOME)

NORTON, T.

2.9	3.3	3.3	3.2	2.3	3.6	3.4	3.8	14
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

His lectures are delivered in a monotone. He has an excellent command of his subject and speaks knowledgably on any topic. A must for the pre-legal student! His grading is very stiff and hard, but fair. A very conscientious instructor. Above freshmen in use of language. He is here for the benefit of the student. (Rec: SOME - soph. and above)

PERCY, N. W.

2.1	3.3	3.0	2.6	2.5	3.0	2.6	3.3	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

She teaches as though she were conducting a high school class. Overly concerned with discipline. She is relatively inexperienced and has trouble making the class interesting. Multiple choice and essay questions on tests. Not much homework assigned. (Rec: SOME)

PERLMUTTER, A.

3.8	3.5	3.3	3.3	2.3	3.4	3.3	3.5	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

This professor seems to effect students in different ways, principally because of his accent. Some find him very hard to understand. He is, however, very knowledgable and well versed in his subject. He prefers to instruct those students in the class who are exceptionally bright. The lectures are interesting and he makes the student think. Pol. sci. 124 deals with a great amount of theory, which may be confusing. Recommended for Pol Sci. 123. (Rec: lower division: ALL, upper division: SOME)

PRATT, J.

3.9	3.6	3.3	3.9	3.1	3.7	3.7	3.7	12
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

A very good teacher, especially for non-majors. Lectures are

very interesting, contain a lot of useful information. Very good on fundamentals which provide a background for further study. Seems to enjoy his subject very much. Tests are not easy, but fair and related to material covered in class. (Rec: ALL)

RINN, F.

3.5	4.0	3.5	3.6	3.1	3.9	4.1	4.2	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Concerned more with ideas than with facts; elicits good deal of class discussion. Requires a great deal of reading. Very helpful and knowledgeable. Exams are essay. Pleasant to look at! (Rec: ALL)

ROGERS, E.

2.9	3.1	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.9	3.2	2.7	16
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Pol. Sci. 129 - doesn't teach foreign policy, but rather a basic history course based on his own opinions. Gives the student the impression of being an inferior creature. Test questions cover insignificant points tucked away somewhere in his lectures. Doesn't go for class discussion - even though very relevant to the course material. His interests lie in Latin America. Once the course is finished there is no lasting knowledge or insight into foreign policy. (Rec: Selected few)

STAVELEY, R. W.

4.3	4.3	3.0	4.3	2.6	3.6	3.0	4.3	3
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Dr. Staveley delivers his lectures with eloquence. He doesn't use second-hand opinions, only original source material. He likes to teach and knows the subject forwards and backwards. Very patient and concerned that the student understands the material. (Rec: ALL)

VATCHER, H.

2.1	2.9	3.1	2.7	2.6	2.6	3.0	2.8	12
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Pol. Sci. 1A-- dull lectures but is able to convey material to students. Pol. Sci. 124--Professor Vatcher does his best to make a potentially interesting course into one of the most sleep-inducing experiences possible. Lectures are poorly presented and unorganized. He repeats himself. Test questions dwell on the insignificant and irrelevant; very difficult to study for. Interesting outside of classroom. (Rec: lower division--selected few; upper division--AVOID)

VOTH, A.

2.8	2.8	4.2	2.8	3.0	2.5	3.3	3.2	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Dr. Voth is very intelligent and extremely willing to help students outside of class. However, his lectures are disorganized because he stops to answer every question. Many lectures degenerate into discussions between two or three members of the class. (Rec: SOME)

WATSON, J.

3.9	3.5	2.8	3.7	3.0	4.0	3.5	4.1	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

An effective teacher who is successful in making dull courses interesting. Class discussion used. Tests are essay - hard,

fair, and relevant to course material. Watson is quite friendly and willing to converse with students. Talks with students as an interested equal. (Rec: ALL)

WEED, F. A.

3.5	4.0	3.3	3.4	2.8	3.8	3.8	3.4	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Most agree that Dr. Weed is the man for Pol. Sci. 1A. The lectures are interesting, informative and relevant to the study of American Govt. Upper division - he loves detail and knows the material forwards and backwards. Class discussion is emphasized. He is ruthless on students if they haven't read the material. (Rec: lower division: ALL; upper division: SOME)

PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT

ASHER, J.

3.9	3.6	3.5	4.0	2.6	3.6	3.9	3.0	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

For Psych. 170 the key word for the course is "heuristic" meaning if you don't understand the principles you won't recognize the test material. He wants to know the applicability of lecture material. The thinking scholar's professor. He will tell you where to find what you need, but will not B.S. with you. (Rec: Lower-division: AVOID)

BENDER, H.

2.3	2.8	3.1	3.6	2.5	3.0	3.2	3.1	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Sticks closely to the book. If you learn the glossary backwards and forwards an "A" might be in the cards. He gives multiple-guess tests. Appears to be best for Psych. 5 (but omits all non-clinical areas from course.). (Rec: Lower-division: SOME)

CLARKE, R.

3.8	4.0	3.1	4.1	2.9	3.8	4.1	4.7	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

An instructor that makes Stat. 115A and 115B palatable. In fact, probably the best: considering his patience with students. He is willing to give as much outside time and help as necessary for understanding of the material. He includes a theoretical justification for the use of formulas. He's fair: your understanding of the course, and your grades will be commensurate with your work. (Rec: ALL (even with poor math background))

COOPER, J.

2.5	3.3	2.8	3.1	3.2	3.7	3.6	2.9	17
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

The very dull lectures are read from the text, and outside readings; but does mention exam questions. The tests are the multiple-guess variety covering the text which should be memorized word for word. He won't go out of his way for the student, and isn't often in his office. (Rec: Upper division: AVOID (Just read the book if you're interested in his courses) Lower division: ALL. (Teaches a more interesting course))

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

DEMENT, A.

2.0	2.8	3.2	4.0	3.6	3.4	3.6	4.2	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

For Psych 112 a research paper is required. Although a rather dull unorganized lecturer, as a person she seems likeable and interested in the student. (Rec: Upper division: AVOID Lower division: No rec. because of insufficient number of evaluations.)

EGGER, N. L.

4.8	4.4	3.3	3.6	2.2	3.3	3.5	3.0	2.0
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

An outstandingly fascinating lecturer, but an extremely hard grader. His tests epitomize pickyism. A clinical psychologist (Freudian) but is cold. Uses personal experiences. (Rec: Lower Division Majors (He's too difficult and the text book is boring) Rec: Upper Division ALL (If you don't mind to work &/or G.P.A.)

FINNEY, B. C.

3.0	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.4	3.8	3.8	3.8	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A good guy. He is exceptionally fair, by providing extra credit work for the student; and gives out study questions for each chapter. The student can also do field work if interested. He is clinical-research oriented and assigns relevant reading material. Shows good movies. (Rec: Upper division ALL (especially Abnormal Psych.) No Rec: Lower division because of insufficient ratings.

HEATH, H. F.

2.3	3.2	4.0	2.8	3.0	3.5	3.8	2.5	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Old Crank and Grind in the flesh. Presents no theoretical justification for all the garbage (formulas) he gives out. The lectures are rambling, gives a lot of busy arithmetic work. Note - Homework counts a lot. On tests in order to get any credit you must have the correct arithmetic answer, so if you make any simple mistakes like $2+2=5$ or 3 then AVOID like the black plague. (Rec: Non-Majors (and to people who have trouble with mathematical theory; and can add correctly)

JOHNSGARD, K. W.

4.3	5.0	2.9	3.3	2.9	3.7	3.8	3.6	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A good instructor. Not for the timid student, he is a very candid individual. Interested in clinical psychology but gives the impression of not being interested in the student. Exams are from the book. (Rec: LD ALL (but impersonal) UD ALL (more personal)

KEELY, H. W.

2.4	2.8	4.4	2.8	3.0	3.2	3.4	3.2	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Although he gives quite dull lectures, the student can learn a lot. There is a lot of interesting outside reading. He will bend over backward to help the student. If you have a problem go in and see him! He requires a term paper for Psych 5 and gives numerous midterms. (Rec: LD ALL UD (insufficient evaluations)

KILBY, R. W.

1.8	2.2	3.0	3.2	3.2	2.9	3.1	3.5	13
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

He doesn't give lectures; he reads from the book. The tests are on the text. He doesn't inspire anything but calouses on one's derriere. Fair. He has a lot to offer if the class initiates questions and participates even if evasive answers are sometimes the result. (Rec: UD Major only (But you could just buy the book instead) LD AVOID.

MC BAIN, W. N.

2.2	2.5	2.9	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.3	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

A boring lecturer. His hard tests are out of the text book. A lot of reading required. (Rec: LD AVOID)

MC CULLERS, J. C.

2.8	3.0	2.8	2.8	3.7	3.3	4.2	3.5	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Some lectures from the book. The objective exams are written by the publisher of the text book. He has a fairly good sense of humor. (Rec: LD ALL: UD Non-clinically oriented majors.)

MEDINNUS, G. E.

2.0	2.1	2.9	2.7	2.6	3.0	3.3	3.1	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A HAM. Tests are multiple-guess. (Rec: LD AVOID UD MAJORS who like ham)

MERYMAN, J. J.

2.5	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.9	3.1	2.6	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

The tests are on the book; hard. He's systematically late to class. Poor lectures and worries the subject to death. He's good for outside help: he knows the material. A speed reader with eidetic imagery, tests examine for this quality in others. (Rec: LD:SOME; UD: In general, try to avoid if possible.)

MINIUM, E. W.

3.4	4.2	3.2	3.4	2.4	3.6	3.2	2.3	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

The head of the Psych. Dept. His interesting lectures are too fast but keep up with him; take careful notes. Tests are hard. Although very busy, he will always see a student when he needs help. Extremely fair! (Rec: MAJORS - especially if good in math)

MUENCH, G. A.

3.0	3.2	4.0	3.2	2.5	3.0	3.2	4.0	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Good but not outstanding. Tests are based on common sense. Lectures tend to be boring but thorough. Clinical approach. (Rec: SOME)

NEWMAN, D. K.

3.7	2.3	2.7	3.4	3.3	3.5	4.2	4.4	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

An informal instructor interested in the student. Gives detailed objective tests on the text material only. (Rec: LD:ALL; UD: MAJORS)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

OGILVIE, B. C.

4.3	3.5	2.8	4.0	3.1	3.4	3.1	4.4	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

An all around "tremendous" teacher. Very interesting. In 110 he dramatizes many symptoms and is extremely interested in what the student has to say. Take him. (Rec: ALL)

PENDLETON, R. B.

3.8	3.6	5.5	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.8	3.0	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He gives interesting lectures and is a fair grader. Upper-division courses are poorly organized. He takes sadistic delight in overburdening the student with outside work in 130. Demands more work than a PhD program. Wants each student to consider all of the major problems of psychology in one semester, with a complete search of the literature. His ad lib thinking is muddled: he's got all the facts but can't apply them. Class work is O. K. The test key has more errors than the class average (make him justify every answer). (Rec: for the MASOCHIST)

PETERSON, D.

1.6	2.0	2.3	2.5	3.3	3.2	2.5	2.7	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Lectures from the book. Shy. Stutters. Shows movies once a week. Unorganized. Can't answer questions. (Rec: AVOID like the black plague.)

PLANT, W. T.

2.3	2.6	3.0	2.9	3.3	3.6	3.8	4.1	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Boring lectures that tend to wander with a lack of organization. In 117A has a few guest lecturers that add a lot to the course. He has a sense of humor. Tests are fair and mostly on the text. Very interested in the student and likes to B.S. (Rec: LD:SOME; UD: MAJORS ONLY)

RICHARDSON, H.

2.5	2.6	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.2	3.2	3.1	13
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Lectures are boring. Book-tests. Receptive to criticism. His assigned readings are extremely interesting. "An average instructor". Don't take for Statistics. (Rec: LD: ALL (TF and MC tests in 55) UD:SOME (Oral report for 116)

RUSMORE, J. T.

2.5	2.8	2.7	3.1	3.2	3.5	3.5	3.0	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

His material is not well organized and he presents it uninterestingly. Tests are multiple-choice and given once a week (allows 5 to be missed) and are taken from the book. (Rec:ALL)

RUTHERFORD

2.6	3.4	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.5	3.4	3.6	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Very interested in the student and in giving fair exams. The tests are in 2 parts: objective from the readings and essay questions on the lectures. Note-read lectures cover research and are monotonous. His appearance is "sloppy". (Rec: LD insufficient evaluations; UD:SOME)

SAWREY, J. M.

3.5	3.3	2.8	3.3	2.8	3.3	3.3	3.5	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A good personality combined with a sense of humor that pervades

his usually interesting lectures. Tests are on the book supplemented by the lectures. He's considerate to the students. Grades are EARNED. A critical thinker and expects the same of the student. (Rec: ALL)

SCHOCK, A.

1.4	2.5	2.2	2.5	3.4	3.5	3.1	3.1	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Presents dull unnecessary book-lectures. Hard of hearing. However, he is fair and gives the student the benefit of the doubt. (Rec: ALL AVOID (especially Majors))

SELTZER, L.

2.1	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.6	3.0	3.7	3.3	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

A very boring lecturer. Speaks in a very slow monotone. Better than Nytol for sleep. Poor organization. Does respond to questions, and helpful if you go in and talk to her. Has a pleasant disposition. (Rec: LD: SOME; UD: AVOID)

SEMENOFF, W. A.

2.8	3.2	3.3	3.7	3.3	3.5	3.6	4.2	13
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Gives dry monotonic lectures while pacing the floor. Tests are on the text. He is very willing to help the student. Very fair, he respects the student as a person. (Rec: SOME)

STEELE, J.

4.3	4.0	3.0	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.5	4.5	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A quiet lecturer who has high regard for the student and their problems. A "great teacher", down to earth and "above reproach". A clinical psychologist. (Rec: ALL)

THOMSON, C. W.

3.5	4.0	3.5	3.8	3.2	3.8	3.7	4.2	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

A reasonable, fair grading instructor who covers the pertinent material quite adequately. Lectures are interesting and he injects his own (good) sense of humor. More than willing to help the student having a rough time. In Psych. 120, write the papers for his reader's biases for Dr. Thomson doesn't read them. For this course he's very hard. (Rec: ALL)

TIEDEMAN, M. R.

2.8	3.7	3.6	4.3	2.9	2.5	3.7	3.7	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

The students teach themselves group dynamics by working in 7-8 member groups. She expects a lot of work but is very willing to help. (Rec: SOME)

TUTKO, T. A.

4.3	3.9	3.2	3.5	3.1	3.5	3.8	4.2	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

A clinician with an excellent sense of humor who relates many experiences that add a practical note to his usually stimulating lectures. He's very receptive to student questions and enjoys a good discussion. In Psych 110 he enacts the role of a psychotic or neurotic and lets the class try to diagnose the symptoms he portrays. Class members are also allowed to go to Agnews and visit a patient for a few hours each week for the

whole semester. A fair grader. (Rec: ALL, especially Psych 110)

WALLAR, G. A.

3.2	3.8	3.2	3.0	3.6	3.8	4.0	4.8	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

An informal "nice guy" who is fair but gives very complete tests where only a cursory knowledge of the text is insufficient. (Rec: ALL)

WITTE, R. S.

3.5	3.9	3.5	3.2	1.8	3.0	3.5	3.6	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A good, interesting lecturer, however grades too hard. Well organized. You need a mathematical mind for his statistics course. (Rec: Experimentally oriented majors only)

ZASLOW, R. W.

3.6	3.4	3.2	3.6	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.6	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A slow talking interesting lecturer with a good sense of humor. Fair. Helpful in class. Tests are difficult. Requires papers. (Rec: ALL, especially 142 and 102)

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION (see Political Science and Public Administration)

RECREATION DEPARTMENT (Insufficient ratings were received to evaluate the professors in this department)

REMEDIAL AREA (Insufficient ratings were received to evaluate the professors in this department)

SCIENCE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

APPLEGARTH, A. G.

2.2	2.5	3.2	3.1	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	16
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Students' opinion on him is split; either they like him very much or dislike him. Lectures somewhat boring and elementary, due in part to nature of courses. Very interested in helping students. (Rec: SOME)

HARRINGTON, E. J.

4.1	4.2	3.2	3.9	3.0	3.7	3.8	3.1	19
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Lectures are well organized, making it easy to take notes, but some students complain that he covers material too rapidly and talks too fast. Gets across elementary concepts. Makes effective use of slides in illustrating his lectures. The student is left to do his own lab work, but he is available for questions. (Rec: ALL)

HASSUR, R. L.

4.4	4.3	3.1	3.2	2.8	3.7	4.1	4.2	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A very interesting lecturer and know his material well. Has excellent rapport with students, good-humored, human. Ratings from lower division students. (Rec: ALL)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

ROBERTSON, R. S.

3.2	3.7	3.2	3.3	3.0	3.7	3.7	4.0	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

An "average" prof. in most respects. (Rec: ALL)

SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY DEPARTMENT

BENDER, D. R.

2.5	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.7	2.9	3.2	2.9	17
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

A man of considerable knowledge with a weak, uninteresting, and disturbingly disorganized presentation. He has a great number of nervous habits and conveys the impression that he is afraid to say anything positive. Essay tests are confusing. Don't think creatively for Bender; just memorize. (Rec: SOME)

CADWALLADER, M. L.

3.6	3.5	2.9	3.7	2.6	2.6	3.1	3.5	28
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

An extremely provocative, intensely interesting man who is dedicated to the most crucial problems of today and tomorrow. Knows tons of relevant facts on important contemporary issues. Impatient with traditional solutions to modern problems. Seeks dynamic thinking in his students, and tends to bias his final grades on that basis. Gives notoriously ambiguous T-F tests. Cadwallader is an experience which every intelligent, fast-thinking student should undergo. (Rec: ALL MAJORS, SOME OTHERS)

ESSELSTYN, T. C.

3.7	4.3	3.0	3.5	2.8	3.7	3.5	3.2	18
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

He is an exceptionally well-educated prof, and an expert in his field. Presents good, well organized (though occasionally dull) lectures. Many feel that he remains aloof from out-of-class contact with most students. (Rec: ALL)

HARDY, D. W.

2.0	2.0	2.4	2.5	2.7	3.1	3.2	2.7	13
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

This man's effect on students is similar to the neutron bomb - physically the student remains intact, but mentally he has ceased to exist. Tests may be ambiguous and for some courses are "out". Grading runs the gamut of favoritism. (Rec: AVOID)

HESTER, J. A.

2.1	3.6	3.4	3.5	2.6	2.8	2.7	3.0	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Profound knowledge of his field. Lectures are dry and speaking habits are poor. Demands a lot from his students and requires long, exacting term papers. (Rec: MAJORS)

HODGES, H. M.

3.7	3.2	4.3	3.6	2.4	2.7	3.2	3.7	17
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

A warm, dynamic personality who inspires enthusiasm and interest. Soc. 70 course - lectures are always interesting. Requires a large amount of reading, most of which is exciting. Often talks above the general class level, however, and his tests require a good vocabulary on the part of the student. A fascinating course. (Rec: ALL MAJORS, Most others) Upper Division courses - Lots of reading. Lectures a little unorganized. Tests frustrating. Transmits knowledge and enthusiasm, however. (Rec: MAJORS)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

LANE, C.

2.9	3.6	3.2	3.1	2.8	3.3	3.3	3.2	20
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Lectures are monotonic and dull to all. Lane must resort to class discussion to break the lethargic spell. However he will research any topic in which the class shows interest. Likes small classes where good discussions are possible. (Rec: SOME)

NOBLE, K.

2.2	2.3	3.3	3.4	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.0	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Potential quality ruined by a very poor speaking ability. Has trouble getting his point across clearly. Unorganized. Self-conscious. Fair in grading. (Rec: AVOID)

PIERCE, J.

4.4	4.3	3.2	3.7	2.0	3.6	3.7	4.5	24
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

A top-flight instructor. Excellent lectures are flavored with his personal experiences. Invariably holds student interest. Requires intensive study of material he presents, and for this reason is considered quite difficult. A good grade is well-earned, but even students who receive low grades consider him unimpeachably fair. Glad to help students with their problems. Unquestionably worthwhile. (Rec: ALL)

PITCHFORD, H.

4.2	3.7	3.5	4.0	2.9	4.0	4.0	4.6	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Great instructor. Interesting and stimulating. Often gets off the subject. Brings about lively class discussions. Extremely interested in students and their opinions. Knows his subject. Fair in discussions, grades, tests, and outside work. (Rec: ALL)

PUTNEY, G.

3.7	3.4	3.1	3.4	3.0	3.4	3.4	3.7	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Good instructor. Interesting and worthwhile. Fair in tests and Grades. Makes good use of personal experiences. (Rec: ALL)

PUTNEY, S.

4.7	4.7	3.7	4.4	2.2	3.9	4.1	4.7	26
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

A fascinating individual and an outstanding professor. Intensely interesting. Sensitive, dedicated, sincere, stimulating, flamboyant, and controversial. Register early for this man. (Rec: ALL)

RUDOFF, A.

3.0	3.8	2.8	2.8	2.7	3.6	3.4	3.0	15
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Some like him; some don't. Lectures are very well organized and well presented. May seem a little boring to some. (Esp. lower division students with low and average G.P.A.'s), but others find him more interesting. Knows his material. Tests are very fair and center around lecture notes. Not overanxious to help those who aren't interested. (Rec: SOME)

RUSH, G. B.

2.9	3.0	3.2	2.8	3.0	2.9	3.0	3.1	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

A new prof who presents fairly interesting lectures and displays a good sense of humor at times. Could be more tolerant of differing views. Tests could be better. (Rec: SOME)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

PRITCHETT, D.

4.0	4.5	1.7	4.5	4.2		3.5	5.0	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--	-----	-----	---

Interesting class and instructor. Takes an interest in students. Generous grader. No tests and very few (but very good) lectures. Highly recommended to all who "dig" a good course. (Rec: ALL)

RENDAHL, M. B.

2.8	2.8	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.8	3.3	3.5	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Best characterized as an average instructor. Popular opinion seems to indicate that his lectures are boring and his manner is unstimulating. (Rec: SOME)

SMITH, W. R.

3.2	4.0	4.2	3.7	2.5	4.0	3.0	4.0	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Little data returned on Smith. That which is available, however, indicates that he is young and likeable, although occasionally nervous and boring. Outside reading could be more interesting. Essay tests are fair and general. (Rec: SOME)

WILSON, R. H.

3.6	3.0	3.0	3.4	3.4	2.4	3.2	4.4	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Interesting. Conducts a good class and utilizes good teaching techniques. Willing to help the student. (Rec: SOME)

STIRLING, B. J.

3.1	3.0	3.2	3.2	2.9	3.2	3.2	3.4	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Some find her boring and some consider her interesting, but all consider her informative. The higher G.P.A.'s tend to like her a little better. (Rec: SOME)

TIGHE, L. W.

1.3	1.7	3.5	2.4	1.7	1.5	2.1	1.7	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Boring, uninspiring, and unpleasant. Generally poor tests often cover material not given. No real lectures (asks questions about text for whole class periods). Alienates his students with a picayune manner. (Rec: AVOID)

VUCINICH, A.

3.7	4.0	3.5	4.0	2.1	4.0	4.0	3.9	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

This truly intellectual scholar knows his material thoroughly, transmits it well to the student and tests the student's ability to think and apply knowledge. (Rec: SOME)

SPEECH AND DRAMA DEPARTMENT

BALGOOYEN, T. J.

3.6	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.4	3.5	3.6	4.9	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Makes a required course interesting although somewhat easy. Provides outlines for his lectures. Makes the speaker feel at ease, which can be the greatest asset of a speech teacher. Very interested in students. (Rec: ALL)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

BROOKS, C.

3.0	2.6	3.4	3.2	1.9	3.6	2.2	2.9	12
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Much agreement that favoritism is shown; some feel it is best to be a male or a major. Play her "sweet" little game and everything will be "Hunky-Dory Dahlings". If you're not willing to play - stay away. (Rec: AVOID - unless you're a gambler)

BUCKMAN, R. E.

1.9	2.5	2.6	2.6	3.0	2.6	3.3	3.0	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

He is a boring lecturer when he shows up - which isn't often for 7:30 classes. Known as "Old Marble Mouth" by some of his students, which is very poor for a person attempting to teach speech. However, he is excellent in an unstructured situation. Attempts to be too "Joe College" for a class situation. (Rec: AVOID - his speech class)

CRAIG, H. R.

1.3	1.1	2.3	1.3	2.1	1.5	1.8	2.5	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Impossible as a teacher. You learn absolutely nothing, unless you can adjust to his strange manner of teaching. (Rec: AVOID)

DAVEE, P. W.

1.8	2.2	3.3	3.1	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.5	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Speaks in a dull monotone when addressing the class. Shows very little enthusiasm for the courses he teaches. Possible far above the students and this could be the cause of his lack of interest.

FLICK, C. E.

1.6	2.3	2.6	2.7	3.7	3.3	2.8	2.0	12
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Our rating sheets were filled out by persons concerned in a recent shake-up of the administration of KSJS in which Dr. Flick is felt to have played a key role. Therefore, they may be slanted on the low side. Among non-majors, ratings tended to be higher. Some felt he was very helpful. (Rec: SOME)

ELLIOT, D. H.

4.4	3.5	3.0	3.6	2.8	3.1	4.0	4.5	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

These numbers are based on 8 of the 10 samples. The other two people were in complete disagreement, and claim bias. The 8 gave exceedingly high ratings: "Good guy," "friendly, communicative," "teaches more philosophy than speech," "very fair," "large amount of student dialectic" (which was what the minority didn't like). (Rec: Only if you like informal, interesting learning)

ELLIOTT, R. B.

2.8	3.0	3.4	2.7	4.0	3.0	3.5	4.0	11
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

Most feel his bark is worse than his bite. A few find him unpredictable, "A pious attitude," "hypocrite." Take him and learn, but be wary. (Rec: SOME)

GREENLEAF, F.

3.0	3.2	2.6	2.7	2.6	3.2	3.2	4.2	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

An average teacher teaching an average course. Willing to aid

the student, especially foreign students. (Rec: ALL)

HADLEY, D. S.

3.2	2.8	3.8	2.9	1.4	2.8	1.8	1.6	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

(Seems to be fighting some psychological problem of her own) Does not respect the feelings of others; uses poor taste in address, etc. Some feel her grading standards are not what they should be. (Rec: AVOID)

HYLTON, C.

3.4	3.8	3.3	3.8	2.0	3.1	3.1	3.4	7
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Good lecturer but tends to be highly critical of the students. Not an easy teacher, but a good one. Expects promptness and consistent attendance. One of the better instructors of the speech department. (Rec: SOME - those who want to work to learn.)

LOEFFLER, E. M.

3.6	3.0	3.4	3.8	2.1	3.3	3.4	3.6	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

She is not the easiest grader, but she knows how to act and direct. Classes are informal and stimulating. Some students complain that she plays "favorites". (Rec: SOME)

MC CREATH, H. W.

2.5	2.7	3.3	2.3	3.5	3.3	3.1	3.0	6
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A poor lecturer, especially for a speech teacher. Extremely knowledgeable and effective in Humanities courses. Somewhat easy going but beware of the Final. Content of speeches is very important. (Rec: ALL)

MC KENZIE, R. H.

4.3	4.6	4.0	4.6	2.1	3.6	3.9	4.5	8
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A charming woman who is not only interested in communicating material, but also in developing the personality. Very capable of arousing enthusiasm for the subject in most students. Dr. McKenzie supplements her lectures with visual aids and "personal experiences". The student is expected to work hard. Excellent for voice and diction. May not appeal to Speech 2A students. (Rec: SOME)

MILLER, H. P.

3.5	3.5	4.2	3.8	2.0	2.3	3.3	3.6	9
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Stand-by for classroom histrionics in lecture. At least you won't go to sleep. Can appear mean, especially to younger students for he has been known to make little girls cry. Knows his subject extremely well and does his best to help the students learn. (Rec: ALL - unless you have a thin skin.)

MITCHELL, N. L.

2.7	2.8	3.8	*	2.4	2.4	2.2	3.6	5
-----	-----	-----	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

There seems to be criticism of grading standards, with males and majors having an edge. *Her oral interp. seems to be more interesting than Sp 2A. Helpful not to disagree with her. (Rec: SELECTED FEW)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

MOUAT, L. H.

1.7	1.7	2.7	2.3	3.3	2.0	2.2	2.5	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Good department head but his only justification for being in class is to criticize. Has a tendency toward favoritism. (Rec: AVOID)

NEESON, J. H.

4.7	4.7	4.3	5.0	2.5	5.0	4.5	5.0	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

A good instructor with high ideals. It is an educational experience just to talk to him. (Rec: ALL)

RAY, J. L.

3.5	3.4	2.6	3.9	2.9	3.5	3.2	3.8	10
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	----

"instructor is fun and fair"; what more can be said other than "for students who like to think for themselves." (Rec: ALL)

SCHAFFER, P.

3.5	3.5	3.3	3.8	3.8	3.3	3.3	4.3	4
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Well organized; alert personality, accomplishes a great deal in one semester of speech. (Rec: ALL)

SMITH, A. H.

3.0	3.2	2.8	3.6	3.2	3.4	3.6	3.2	5
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	---

Knows his material well and can put it across. Some students feel he picks on some and favors others. (Rec: SOME)

IN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

TO MR. G. M. NELSON FOR HIS INSPIRING AND
UNSELFISH DEDICATION TO THE CAUSES OF TAU

DELTA PHI