SCIENCE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 1, 1909

CONTENTS

MSS. intended for publication and books, etc., intended for review should be sent to the Editor of SCIENCE, Garrison-on-Hudson, N. Y.

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

AMERICAN STANDARDS IN EDUCATION AND THE WORLD-STANDARD[1]

FOR the most part, higher education in America has been carried on by institutions singularly isolated one from another. Each has been a law unto itself. The state has conferred upon them academic powers, but has not defined their academic responsibilities. In a little less degree, the same separatism has prevailed in our secondary education, and again in less degree in our elementary schools.

We were individualists in our education, with institutions as our units, before we became out-and-out individualists, with single students as our units. It is hard to see how this individualism could now be carried further, unless it might be by extending the elective system down through the grades and into the primary school. The most radical advocates of free election, however, balk at the offer to six-year-olds of a choice between learning to read and learning to make mud pies. Here at least the doctrine of equivalence breaks down, and indeed it seems doubtful whether the elective system will spread very far beyond its present boundaries. Its great vogue in our best universities, its long ascendency, the personal weight of its ablest advocates —even these considerations can not disguise the fact that, in the long sweep of educational history, it is a mode, a fashion, a phase, and not the ultimate solution of a problem of the ages. In more trivial and

[1] Address of the Vice-president and Chairman of Section L. Baltimore, 1908.

irreverent speech, such a phase is commonly called a fad.

The most of our so-called educational fads are at least half true. We believe in them with all our hearts until they run into their inevitable exaggerations. All of us here to-day undoubtedly believe in the elective system, and we can never go back to the educational views and practises which that system has displaced. But we recognize the fact that it embodies somewhat less than the whole truth regarding an educational curriculum. In other words the utter disorganization of studies can not be taken as the final stage in the history of studies. It is rather a wholesome and necessary preliminary to a better and more humane organization.

It is a significant fact that, just at the time when the elective system is attaining its widest acceptance and our scholastic individualism is reaching its utmost limit in the studies of collegiate students, a new movement toward institutional coherence is setting in among our schools and universities. The first decade of the twentieth century seems destined to be a turning point in the history of common educational standards in this country. I should like to point out some of the characteristic features of this new movement, and to show that it can not stop short of becoming a world-movement.

It is fair to say that we have not been without standards in our earlier educational history, however vague and inadequate those standards may have been. The most definite and appreciable mark of scholastic competence which we have had within our own borders has been the degree of bachelor of arts, as conferred by our better colleges. The four-year course of these colleges has represented our conception of the measure of liberal culture attainable by any considerable number of our citizens, and the entrance requirements of these same colleges has been our norm for secondary education.

Such a standard, informally accepted by the country at large, might serve the purpose reasonably well while we were getting our systems of elementary and higher education for the first time into working order. Its inadequacies became manifest when we deliberately set about combining higher education and elementary education into one national and democratic system. And those inadequacies were accentuated when we found ourselves deliberately combining general education with special education, the liberal with the vocational, to provide a full-orbed preparation for the life of our time.

There were many ways in which such inadequacy appeared. One of the most baffling elements in the situation was found in the fact that our ready-made system provided no method for determining what were the really standard colleges. Harvard and Yale were the names that came most readily to the lips. But common report could not be deemed sufficient to decide the question when the actual and tangible interests of other widely scattered institutions and of their alumni were at stake. Even if Harvard and Yale were accepted without question as embodying the American standard, there was no obvious and adequate procedure by which other institutions could be measured up against them. And Harvard and Yale had differences of their own.

Some of the first steps toward the definition of a standard other than that of a single institution were taken by certain states, in the prescription of conditions governing the incorporation of colleges. Inasmuch as the power to grant academic degrees is by common consent in this country a power derived directly from the

state, this method of fixing a standard within state limits has been available from the beginning. But the states have been slow to apply it. The state of New York, in its university of the commonwealth, has had at hand the apparatus for making effective a legal provision touching this matter. With its growing sense of the possibilities of this organization, in recent years, it is not strange that New York has led the way in the making of definite requirements for degree-giving institutions.

The university law of 1892 authorizes the regents of the University of the State of New York to incorporate educational institutions and provides that no institution shall be given power to confer degrees in the state of New York unless it shall have resources of at least $500,000 and shall have suitable provision, approved by the regents, for buildings, furniture, educational equipment, and proper maintenance. Among the ordinances adopted by the regents under this enactment is one which provides that

> An institution to be ranked as a college must have at least six professors giving their entire time to college and university work, a course of four full years of college grade in liberal arts and sciences, and must require for admission not less than the usual four years of academic or high-school preparation or its equivalent, in addition to the pre-academic or grammar-school studies.

An act of the legislature of Pennsylvania approved June 26, 1895, provides that no institution of learning shall be given power to grant degrees until the merits of the application from an educational standpoint shall be passed upon by a College and University Council created by the act. The act further provides that

> No institution shall be chartered with the power to confer degrees, unless it has assets amounting to five hundred thousand dollars invested in buildings, apparatus and endowments for the exclusive purpose of promoting instruction, and unless the faculty consists of at least six regular professors who devote all their time to the instruction of its college or university classes, nor shall any baccalaureate degree in art, science, philosophy or literature be conferred upon any student who has not completed a college or university course covering four years. The standard of admission to these four-year courses or to advanced classes in these courses shall be subject to the approval of the said council.

Where there is present a state university of high grade, this institution can be made to serve as a rough-and-ready measure for the state. This is what was done in California, where the definite need of a scale of requirements arose when the licensing of teachers for public high schools was separated from similar provision for the elementary schools.

The provision referred to was enacted in 1893 and provides that no credentials for high school certificates shall be prescribed or allowed unless the same, in the judgment of the state board of education, are the equivalent of a diploma of graduation from the University of California. This law, therefore, makes of the state board a body for the classification of higher institutions, with the university of the state as the standard of measurement.

In 1907 the state educational board of examiners of Iowa were granted authority to accept graduation from the regular and collegiate courses in the state university, state normal school, and the state college of agriculture and mechanic arts, and from other institutions of learning in the state having regular and collegiate courses of equal rank, as evidence that a teacher possesses the scholarship and professional fitness for a state certificate. They were authorized also to validate certificates from other states where such certificates were issued upon scholarship and experience equivalent to that required under the laws of Iowa.

While such provisions as these have been adopted in a few of the states, there have

been numerous beginnings made in the past few years, by educational boards and associations of wider scope, to set up standards in different portions of the educational field.

The Association of Collegiate Alumnæ, which was organized in 1882, admits to its membership graduates of institutions whose work and equipment have been approved by the Association. Inasmuch as the association deals only with institutions to which women are admitted, its scope as a standardizing body is limited to colleges for women and coeducational institutions. The standard adopted by this Association has not been published and is understood to be in process of revision.[2]

The Association of American Universities was organized in 1900 for the purpose of considering matters of common interest relating to graduate study. Among the important items mentioned in the invitation to the conference which resulted in the formation of the Association was the consideration of means to secure in foreign universities "such credit as is legitimately due to the advanced work in our own universities of high standing." The initial membership of the Association consisted of fourteen universities. At the present time there are eighteen members.[3]

In 1906 a committee was appointed by this body to report on the aim and scope of the Association. The committee's report was made and unanimously adopted at the meeting at Ann Arbor, Michigan, in January, 1908. It recommended that in addition to a strong graduate department, which had previously been the sole condition of membership in the Association, there should be adopted as a second criterion for membership the requirement of one or more years of college work as a prerequisite for admission to professional courses, the combination being so arranged that no professional degree should be given until the satisfactory completion of at least five years of study.

In order that no substantial hardship might be imposed by a strict enforcement of both requirements at the present time, the committee recommended that in universities which have professional schools and a graduate department, the graduate department shall at least be creditable, and that the arts and technical work prescribed for professional degrees in at least one professional school shall be not less than five years. The Association undertook, through a special committee, to make a list of the colleges of the country whose degrees are to be regarded as of equal value with the college degrees conferred by members of the Association.

The College Entrance Examination Board was organized in 1900 to bring about as rapidly as possible an agreement upon a uniform definition of each subject required by two or more colleges for admission; to hold or cause to be held a series

[2] Since this paper was written the Association of Collegiate Alumnæ has published a revision of its standard. Summarized briefly the conditions for eligibility to membership include entrance requirements demanding at least four years of secondary school work; graduation requirements corresponding to amount of work ordinarily included in four years of serious college study; the number of full professors, total property, and productive endowment shall not be less than the minimum in institutions already admitted to membership; the ratio of full professors to students and of instructors to students, number of laboratories, number of books in the library and number of departmental journals shall be at least as large as the average number in institutions of the same type already admitted to membership; no preparatory department shall be under the government or instruction of the collegiate faculty; the salaries of the teaching staff shall not be lower than the minimum for the same grade in institutions already admitted to membership where the living conditions are similar.

[3] This number was increased to twenty-two at the annual meeting held in January, 1909.

of college admission examinations, with uniform tests in each subject; and to issue certificates based upon the results of such examinations. The constitution of this Board provides that a college or university may, upon application, be admitted to its membership, provided that in the college applying for admission:

(1) There shall be specifically defined and consistently carried out, whether by examination or certificate (or for the admission of special students), requirements for admission which shall in every case be equivalent to a four-year course in a college-preparatory or high school of good grade, able to prepare its pupils for admission to the colleges already belonging to this Board. (2) The members of the faculty shall have an academic training adequate to maintain a high standard of teaching; they shall bear a proper proportion to the students to be taught, and shall be sufficient in number to permit of proper specialization in the subjects assigned to each individual instructor. (3) The breadth of the college curriculum, the standard of graduation, the grade of work and the amount of work demanded, shall be proper subjects of inquiry by the Executive Committee, and shall constitute factors in determining their decision. (4) There shall be no preparatory department under the government or instruction of the college faculty. (5) There shall have been for at least three years preceding the application for admission an average of at least fifty students in the regular entering classes (courses in arts and in science to be reckoned together for this purpose). (6) There shall be a free income-bearing endowment yielding in no case less than twenty thousand dollars annually, or in the case of state universities and colleges an equivalent annual appropriation from public funds, expended exclusively on the undergraduate department; as well as libraries, laboratories, buildings and equipment adequate to maintain the degree of efficiency and the standard of scholarship contemplated in the above provisions.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching was created in 1905 for the purpose of administering a fund for pensioning college professors. Its governing board adopted, in April, 1906, regulations fixing an educational standard for the institutions which should be counted as eligible to participate in the benefits of this fund. The definition of a college adopted by the Foundation is practically that in use by the regents of the University of the State of New York. It is stated in the following terms:

An institution to be ranked as a college must have at least six professors giving their entire time to college and university work, a course of four full years in liberal arts and sciences, and should require for admission not less than the usual four years of academic or high school preparation, or its equivalent, in addition to the pre-academic or grammar-school studies.

A technical school to be eligible must have entrance and graduation requirements equivalent to those of the college, and must offer courses in pure and applied science of equivalent grade.

To be ranked as a college an institution must have a productive endowment of not less than two hundred thousand dollars.

Because of its ability to give or withhold valuable grants, and its declaration that these grants will be made only to institutions of a certain academic grade, and further because of adequate provision in the office of the Foundation for the investigation of all institutions applying for such grants, this establishment has become one of the most powerful agencies for clearing up and unifying our standards in higher education. It is doubtful whether all of the agencies working directly to this end, taken together, have thus far accomplished so much in the fixing a norm of collegiate education in this country as has been done, under far-sighted direction, in the short term of its activity hitherto, by the Carnegie Foundation.

The National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools is an outgrowth of two annual conferences of delegates from a number of the associations of colleges and preparatory schools of the country, the first of which was held at Williamstown in 1906. At the third annual meeting of delegates from

these several associations in April, 1908, the National Conference Committee[4] was organized. It adopted a resolution urging the organizations represented in the committee to collect data concerning the standardization of colleges and universities and to give special attention to the study of this subject.

The National Association of State Universities appointed a committee on standards of American universities in November, 1905. A report was presented to the Association in November, 1908, which included the following recommendations: That the standard American university be defined as an institution which requires for admission the completion of a standard four-year high school course or its equivalent; which offers two years of general or liberal work; which offers a further course of two years so arranged that the student may begin work of real university character leading to the bachelor's degree at the end; which offers professional courses in law, medicine and engineering, based upon the completion of two years of college work; and which offers in the graduate school an adequate course leading to the Ph.D. degree.

Thus far attention has been called to the steps which have already been taken by states and by various national bodies, toward a better determination of the grade of our collegiate institutions. In addition to these acts and resolves, some notable efforts have been made to fix the standards of our professional education. Two instances of unusual significance may be noted here.

In 1904 the American Medical Association created the Council on Medical Education to act as its agent in efforts to elevate the standards of medical education. This Council holds an annual conference and makes recommendations concerning the improvement of medical education, which recommendations are then presented to the Association. It has classified the medical colleges of the country according to the percentage of failures of graduates of these colleges before state medical examining boards; it has published lists of medical colleges making certain admission requirements; and it has proposed what is held to be an ideal scheme of medical education.

The National Association of Dental Examiners was organized in 1883. It has formed a list of reputable dental schools, which list is revised from year to year. It works in close relations with the National Association of Dental Faculties, in the endeavor to advance the standards of dental education. Many difficulties have attended this undertaking and its history is full of interest.

This is by no means a complete list of the agencies now engaged in the effort to give at least an ascertainable significance. But as it stands the showing is noteworthy. It leaves no doubt that widespread and serious attention is now directed to this subject. The reproach against our American education that it means anything or nothing according to circumstances, is not merely resented or ignored, nor is it merely accepted as inevitable. Steps are taken to remove the sting from that reproach by making it no longer applicable. We see more clearly the difficulties of our situation, but we see also the hope of

[4] The committee consists of delegates from The New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools; New England College Entrance Certificate Board; Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland; College Entrance Examination Board; North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools; Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Southern States; National Association of State Universities, and Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The United States Commissioner of Education is *ex officio* a member.

remedy. For now some fifteen or twenty years the movement toward a betterment has been going on, but its more definite and encouraging developments belong mainly to the new century.

The question can now be fairly put to the legislatures of the several states: Is it just and right to incorporate institutions for the instruction of our people and authorize them to give academic degrees and certificates, with no provision for determining the meaning and worth of those scholastic labels? It is not merely an academic question. It is a moral question. False pretenses in the realm of education are a peculiarly flagrant form of fraud, for they cheat our American youth of their American right to a fair chance. They operate no less disastrously when the fraud is unconsciously committed, that is, when incompetent teachers and school authorities offer an inferior grade of instruction under the delusion that it is as good as the best. The well-meaning no less than the dishonest need some impartial test by which their educational offering may be proved, of what sort it is.

The pure-food agitation has undoubtedly lent new point to this standardizing movement. It has strengthened the conviction that the public is entitled to know what it is getting, in a matter that vitally affects human health and human life. It is extremely difficult to devise and carry into effect a plan that will secure such publicity without doing violence to personal rights. But since these difficulties have not proved insurmountable in the case of foods and drugs, we have courage to believe that the greater difficulties attending a standardizing of education will not prove insurmountable. There is even more of human welfare at stake in the case of education than in the former case.

It should be said at this point that to adopt a standard does not mean to bring all institutions up to an actual level. Even if that were possible, it would not be desirable. A new institution in a sparsely settled region, for example, may fairly aim at being ultimately a university, and yet may render its best service through all of its earlier years by maintaining only a good secondary or preparatory school. Whether it shall follow this course or not is a local question, to be determined in accordance with local needs. But if its real high school is allowed to stand as a make-believe college, we have a case of false pretenses, and grievous wrong is done the state, the community, and, most of all, the students of the school. Another illustration comes to me in a personal recollection. The head of a law school, himself a thoroughly trained university man, once told me of the standing of his school. Its requirements for admission were lower than those of the best law schools, but were distinctly announced for what they were. Its requirements for graduation were less severe than those of leading schools, but they were clearly stated and strictly enforced. The faculty was made up of competent men, each of whom gave to the school only a part of his time, but gave regularly what was announced as his part. Summing up, my informant said to me, "This is not a first-class school. It does not pretend to be. But it is a first-rate second-class school. I find a need for a law school of this grade in the community and we are meeting that need."

I can conceive that in many communities there may be some need that can best be met by a second-class school. But if that school declares itself to be what it is and makes itself a first-rate school of its class, it may render an honorable service to the community and may even be a force making for righteousness.

We have had two or three notable instances of late of institutions which have deliberately renounced the name of *university* to take the more modest title of *college* or *institute*. The training school for teachers which I attended in my youth was burdened by law with the title *state normal university*. It made no pretense, however, of being a university, and I well recall hearing its downright president declare repeatedly before the assembled students, "This is not a college. It is a normal school."

It is, then, the moral gain that is the chief good to be had from a clear definition of our standards. But other advantages, too, are obvious. For many institutions, to define their standard is to raise their standard, and this is gain, save in the few instances where the higher standard may represent requirements that are really excessive. The possibility of measuring the work of institutions even far remote from the centers of population and culture, will give needed encouragement to groups of devoted teachers who are worthy of such encouragement. Small and isolated colleges will gain new hope of winning and holding each a local constituency, and so of making strong local centers of science and cultivation, when their claims to academic competence can be fairly tested and approved.

There are two further advantages which call for special emphasis, one of them material and the other in the nature of sentiment. Where common standards are widely understood and applied, the graduate of a given institution will find no difficulty, even in remote parts of the land, in securing recognition for his scholastic credentials. This is of especial importance when those credentials have to do with his occupation in life, as is the case with teachers, physicians, and those engaged in other professional pursuits. Even where the practise of the profession is guarded by regular examinations, a professional diploma is important, as establishing the holder's *prima facie* claim to recognition. It is desirable, too, that our diplomas and professional certificates may become so clear in their meaning and so reliable as regards the conditions on which they are issued, that they may safely take the place of professional examinations, or at least of the more elementary and vexatious portions of such examinations. The lack of comity as between the several states with regard to the practise of the professions is one of the extremely unsatisfactory conditions affecting our professional life at the present time. We can not accept this condition as necessary. It can undoubtedly be remedied. But the remedy lies in making the meaning of our academic and professional credentials at least an ascertainable datum. Here is a consideration, having serious relation to our material needs, which strongly accentuates the movement we are reviewing.

Then the sentimental consideration. Our state pride and our institutional loyalty are both of them factors in our real and effective life. But our state pride suffers when we find the schools of our state disparaged or even discredited by comparison with those of other states; and our loyalty to our own institution, even if it be of no higher grade than that which goes by the name of "college spirit," insists that our college shall not fall below the grade of the best colleges in the land. The comparison is inevitably made with what is believed to be the best in other parts of our common country. A national standard is recognized even when it can not be clearly set forth. And the state or the institution which undertakes to grade its own educational performance without reference to that national standard soon suffers embarrassment and eventually suffers a positive disadvantage and loss, both for itself and for its graduates.

What has been said thus far with reference to the imperative need of national standards as a corrective of merely local and provincial standards, leads up, I believe inevitably, to the view that no national standard can be adequate or stable until it has been consciously referred to the world-standard of our time. In endeavoring to establish American standards, we must not stop short of this ultimate step, the critical comparison of the standards proposed for our own land with those recognized by the rest of the civilized world. Otherwise we shall simply have passed from one provincialism to another—a broader, more conspicuous, and therefore more glaring—provincialism.

It may be said of the world-standard in education, as was said of the national standard, that it is already in existence, but only dimly apprehended as yet. There is so much of free intercourse between the culture-nations of the modern world, that a comparison of scholastic ideals and processes is continually going on. An important section of our current educational literature is devoted to such comparisons. But these comparisons are still for the most part unsystematic and fragmentary. The attempt has hardly been made as yet to determine to what extent a consensus of international opinion has already been reached in any of the central questions involved, or what sort of agreement is attainable by conference and by the systematic interchange of instructors, students, and practitioners in the several professions.

It would be an interesting academic exercise to trace the gradual and unnoticed development of this international standard since the time when modern nationalism replaced the cultural unity of the medieval world. We may be sure that such an investigation would bring many surprises. But our present problem is practical rather than historical. The same needs and forces which have made the question as to national standards a pressing and vital question, are operative to-day on the international plane. Within the past three years this question has repeatedly come before the Department of State at Washington, on representations from officials of our diplomatic and our consular service. American citizens—physicians, dentists, candidates for higher degrees in foreign universities—have repeatedly found themselves at a disadvantage owing to the lack of a basis for comparison of their scholastic credentials with the requirements of those foreign countries of which, for the time, they are residents. It is not generally known how delicate and embarrassing are some of the difficulties which have been encountered in this field, and how little progress has yet been made toward a satisfactory adjustment of those difficulties.

Not only the practical exigencies of the case, but national sentiment as well, must prompt us to seek for such provisions as shall place the products of American education on a basis of fair comparison with those of other great educational systems. In so far as our works suffer by the comparison, they should be improved. In so far as the comparison places us in an unfavorable light because of a misunderstanding of what we are actually accomplishing, we must see to it that our system shall be more adequately set forth. Our educational relations with the rest of the world can never be on a satisfactory basis till we are in a position to do our full part in determining what the world-standard shall be.

We do not seek to prescribe standards for the rest of the world. We are not willing that the rest of the world should simply prescribe standards for us. But we do seek to gain and maintain an acknowledged position among the foremost culture nations, such that our influence shall not

be less than that of any other people in determining what shall be the universally recognized norms of scholastic competence.

In this discussion I would not blink either the difficulties or the dangers of the standardizing movement. The dangers are many and real, chief among them that of imposing on our educational institutions a flat uniformity, which would take no account of wholesome individualities nor of provision for local and special needs. This is a serious danger, even where the standard is imposed by influence only, and not by authority. The difficulties of the situation, too, are vastly greater than any superficial inquiry would reveal. The chief of these is the difficulty of finding criteria by which the real effectiveness of educational systems may be measured. Certain time measures most readily present themselves —the number of years in the course, the hours of instruction per week, the number of students per teacher, the years of special training which the teachers themselves have enjoyed. These are obviously inadequate, yet they serve a useful purpose. They measure the skeleton and so reveal the stature of a course of education. But more subtle measures are needed to measure the flesh and blood and spirit of instruction, that which gives it its power and human significance. And how shall we ever gauge that finer inspiration which makes of some schools a center of creative and re-creative energy!

Incalculable differences there must always be even among schools and systems that are classed together. But the need for some working estimate of comparative values remains and can not be put aside. Even a rough measure of the stature of institutions of learning will serve a purpose and such a measure is urgently required in these days.

It is clear that the question of equivalence among widely different materials and processes must enter into this problem. It is a question which presents great difficulties, both theoretical and practical. Yet some rough-and-ready estimate of equivalence has long been made in the highest educational institutions. Wherever the degree of Doctor of Philosophy is bestowed, for work done and not *honoris causa,* a common designation has been applied to the most various attainments. The substance has been largely ignored in the bestowal of this degree, and attention has been directed instead to the mastery of method. Where so great divergence has been allowed without loss of essential unities, it would seem possible that recognition can be freely extended to widely different educational systems, even if those differences be international, without renouncing all claim to a common and lofty standard.

This is one point for which we of the United States will undoubtedly have to contend in any world-concert as regards education. We are committed to a fair range of individuality in education, both institutional and personal. We do not assume in advance that any form of education is inferior because it is different from others. And we can not permit the rest of the world to judge any part of our education as inferior simply because it is different. Probably a majority of marked variations will prove to be of inferior quality; and others that are on their way to the highest excellence will seem inferior for a time, until their character is fully established. But with us the variant is to be welcomed and given its fair chance, for our system is always alive to the hope of far-reaching improvement. We shall be able to justify this attitude before the rest of the world so far, and only so far, as our educational achievement in general shall show a sustained and appreciable excellence.

The argument comes to this, that our American endeavors to set up definite edu-

cational standards can not be permanently successful till they are fully related with the larger movement, the movement toward the determination of world-standards.

It has been necessary to limit this discussion by taking account only of higher and professional education. The movements of the time, however, relate as well to education of secondary and elementary grade, and some of their most interesting results may be looked for on those lower and broader fields. But as professional and higher instruction must in some measure determine the bounds of all instruction, it is natural that, as an international question, we should have first to do with standards in these departments of teaching. The bachelor's degree, the doctorate in philosophy and science, and the certificate of competence to practise medicine, are pivotal points as regards the international question.

The devising of practical procedure in this matter will call for serious consideration. With reference to such procedure, I beg to offer, in closing, the following suggestions:

On its academic side the standards-problem must be wrought out in this country chiefly by concerted action of the institutions concerned. It is of the utmost consequence that these institutions should find ways of working together, and avoid the danger of working at cross-purposes. The National Government has to do with the matter directly as an international question. Whatever diplomatic representations may be made in the matter from time to time must, of course, pass through the Department of State, and in these matters that Department acts ordinarily in consultation with the Department of the Interior. The Bureau of Education accordingly, for the Department of the Interior, forms the connection between the Government and the academic bodies which are concerned with the formulation of our American standards. It seems desirable that a consultative council for higher and professional education should be attached to the Bureau of Education, with a view to the effective handling of this and related questions, and that competent specialists should be employed on the staff of that office to deal with such questions. Direct conference between the educational bodies and educational leaders of this country and those of foreign countries, touching agreement concerning educational requirements and credentials, becomes increasingly desirable. Within the next few years it is to be hoped that such conferences may be frequently held. It should be a part of the program of American education to further the holding of such international conferences, and to bear our fair part in the proceedings of such conferences.

ELMER ELLSWORTH BROWN.

THE GEOGRAPHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE STUDENT BODY AT A NUMBER OF UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

THE accompanying table explains the geographical distribution of the student body of twenty-one American universities, five New England colleges for men, five colleges for women, two technological schools and one Pennsylvania college and engineering school for men, for the academic year 1908–9, the summer session students being in every case omitted. *Indiana, Iowa, Johns Hopkins, Kansas, Nebraska, Northwestern* and *Stanford* have been added to the list, and the institutions have been separated into groups as they were last year.

Comparing the attendance by divisions of the six eastern universities (*Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Yale*) with the corresponding figures for the same universities in a similar table