SCIENCE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1912

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 MIGRATION OF STUDENTS[1]

A PLEA FOR THE INDIVIDUAL IN EDUCATION

THE chairman of our judicial council, Dr. Means, in a recent address on "The Relations of the Medical Colleges in the Matter of the Migration of Students," has stated that these relations should be adjusted on the basis of the Golden Rule. With this I heartily agree. I would, however, call attention to the wording of the Golden Rule, "Do unto others." This seems to imply that our relationships are multiple rather than duplex.

There is hardly a problem in ethics to be settled on the basis of "Thou" and "I" alone. No case of migrating students should be considered from the standpoint of the colleges alone. In every instance the public or state has a claim on our consideration, for we are the servants of the state in the making of physicians.

We are also in a peculiar and intimate degree responsible to the student himself. We take his money; we take what is more valuable than money, his time. We modify his whole life. To take out the human element from our work; to claim that the student acts always of his own free will; to make our colleges by inflexible rules mere mechanisms for grinding out as doc-

[1] Read before the Association of American Medical Colleges, March 1, 1912. Readers of this paper should bear in mind the legal restrictions on medical educational institutions, which other departments of education are not subject to. These cover such topics as length and number of yearly sessions required for graduation, admission, advanced standing, credit from other institutions, etc. It should also be noted that medical schools have on their faculties numerous professors who are primarily in medical practise and only incidentally acting as teachers.

tors those individuals alone who can fit the hoppers and cogs of the machine—to do these things is to take away all proper significance from education.

The more I consider it the more I am convinced that our personal duty to the individual student is our fundamental duty. If we can do right by the individual student, we shall do right to the other colleges and to the state. If we do right by the individual student, we shall see that his obligations are met; that his deficiencies are made good; that he is protected from his own misdirected inclinations; that he is kept, if need be, from a profession for which he is not fitted. I propose, therefore, to discuss the subject assigned to me from the standpoint of the individual student.

I would strongly emphasize that my argument is not to favor lower standards. The poor-boy story and the easy pathways to practise do not appeal to me. Any one who draws from my expressions regarding the rôle of rules and regulations the conclusion that I favor the removal of the safeguards to medical practise wilfully reads into them what is not there. On the contrary, I believe that the efficient judgment of the individual case, whether by entrance examiner or faculty or state board or all three of these, would constitute the best possible safeguard and one which ought to be added to the regulations and examinations, which at present constitute the chief protection against the inefficient and unprepared.

Strictly speaking, there is no such thing as equality. Variation holds everywhere in the social world, as it does in the animal and plant world. Every case is an individual case. Education will reach its highest when it becomes individual.

The individual student is not the student *en masse* nor the average student. The individual student means individual consideration. He means the breaking loose from rules and the consideration of pertinent facts. He means the application of principles rather than formulas. He is a difficult problem not to be solved by engineering handbook nor plotted in two dimensions.

I am provoked just here to the further platitude that we have in our political and social life, as in education, too many rules, too many laws, regulations, prohibitions. (I suppose this is because we are so infernally human that we can not be trusted to apply the Golden Rule, which our chairman rightly considers our standard.) At the same time that we are burdened with laws we have no adequate mechanism for securing justice to the individual. This is true in every relation of life.

Let us glance for a moment at the legal restrictions placed upon medical education. The law compels every man who desires to enter the medical profession to attend four sessions in a medical school. It takes no cognizance of the fact, recognized, I am sure, by every man here, that some men would be competent in three years, more competent, in fact, than others in thirty years.

The law provides that the four sessions shall be in four separate calendar years and disregards the fact that some students could work to advantage eleven or twelve instead of eight or nine months in a year. Why should the law permit the doctor to practise twelve months in a year but allow him to study only eight or nine?

The laws[2] do not permit that any time credit be given for attendance in a college of arts or science, yet in particular cases the work done there is better than that of some medical schools.

[2] True of most states. The laws of a few states still permit graduates in arts or science to obtain the M.D. in three years.

Now, I am not arguing that these laws are bad. Some of them are undoubtedly artificial. But even these have probably been necessary as applied to average students and average colleges. The trouble is that no arrangement is provided by which the particular case can be excepted. The law, we are told, is no respecter of persons. So much the worse, I retort, for the law. And the law by the way is beginning to recognize this fact, as witness the more enlightened way in which it is beginning to deal with juvenile offenders. Each case is settled on its merits and by careful judgment of experts.

In our association also we have laws. With much labor we have formulated a curriculum from which no college can deviate in any particular more than 20 per cent. Yet to-day I have in my laboratory a young man who shows talent as an investigator. He desires to become and I am sure will become a professional physiologist or pharmacologist. I should be a traitor to my science if I compelled or advised that young man to take the straight, fixed curriculum. He should have a special course laid out to meet his special needs.

But some one objects, "This is unsafe; this young man may later go into practise." My critic is laboring under the belief that our fixed curriculum contains all the subjects and only the subjects without which one can not safely go out as a physician. My answer is, I know the man and his ability. The curriculum, I may further remind my critic, is literally a race course. We do not use the same kind of track for automobiles and aeroplanes and steam yachts.

This criticism and my answer to it lead me to state the first condition for dealing properly with the individual student, whether as regards curriculum, migration or any other matter. *Some one has got to know that student and the facts about him.*

A second critic may have said to himself when I suggested a special curriculum for my student in physiology, "It will be against the Constitution of the Association." My reply is, in the famous words of the practical statesman, "What is the constitution among friends?"

And that leads me to enunciate the second condition for dealing with the individual student. *There must be a body of friends, friends of the student, friends of education, friends of the public, who shall determine when, where and how the constitution (i. e., the rules and regulations) may safely be broken.*

You catch the drift of my thought: a college may be run in two ways. It may be run by inflexible rule. Students are received, classified, advanced, rejected, graduated, by regulation and statute. All that comes in, whether iron, steel, lead, copper, brass, silver or gold, is drawn through the same hole to wire of the same size. Such a college is not a human being. It is a machine, and it makes no mistakes. It needs no intelligent supervision. You just start the wheels going and watch the rollers turn merrily on.

Or a college may be run for the individual. It may have small regard for paper standards, have few regulations, have a flexible curriculum, care little for classification, permit specialization. It may make wire of iron and steel. It may turn the lead over to the plumbing industry. It may make scientific apparatus of its copper and brass. It will surely make jewels of its silver and its gold. Such a college is human. It makes judgments, choices, designs. It is not a machine, and it makes mistakes. It can only avoid making many mistakes by the most intelligent supervision and the combined judgment of experts.

If I may change my figure of speech, the rules, regulations, precedents and formulas for running a school correspond to the reflex mechanism in an animal. They adjust it well to the average conditions of environment and govern certain subordinate functions. But the animal which is purely reflex stands low in the scale. And so does the college that runs by rule and formula. What is needed in the animal is a superposed cerebrum, which can inhibit reflexes and regulate behavior in accord with a greater complexity and continuity of stimuli. Speaking as a man of the street—and not as a scientist nor as a theologian—what the animal needs is a soul. And that is just what the college needs. The soul of the college should be such an organization of experts as can exercise safe and sane judgment under varying conditions. This paper will be concerned, first, with the organization of such a body of experts; secondly, with the methods to be used by them in taking care of migrating students.

Regarding the first topic, organization, I believe that it is unsafe to leave to the dean alone the decision of important matters relative to the individual student. The dean even in the case where he devotes a large share of time to his office can not know the work of the student in all departments. He may, it is true, have the record of grades, but these are not the intimate personal data on which the individual case must be settled. The grades constitute a part of the regular reflex machinery which disposes very well of the average student. They are of value, but should not be the sole criterion for deciding questions regarding particular students.

Another reason why the important individual case can not be left to the dean is that he is almost always a professor, and looks with the usual jealous but magnifying eye on the importance of his own department. The individual student must be considered from all sides.

If the dean can not dispose properly of the individual student, much less can a secretary or registrar, who is usually not an educational officer in the proper sense, but strictly a part of the reflex machinery.

The individual student, furthermore, can not be considered properly by the faculty. This is not easily done in a school of arts or science, and is even less feasible in the average medical school, where many of the professors are in medical practise and give only a portion of their thought to educational problems. The word of a clinical professor lecturing one or two hours a week is of less value as regards an individual student than that of a paid assistant who meets the student daily in the laboratory. Moreover, faculties meet infrequently, and the individual case needs immediate consideration and action.

A committee of the faculty, provided it has power to act, can do the work better than the faculty, but here again there are objections. The faculty usually consists only of professors, and a large proportion of them do not come into intimate contact with the students. The committee is likely to partake of the same character and often degenerates to one man control.

Finally the case of the individual student should not be referred piecemeal to the individual department heads. Take the case of a migrating student, for example. If he is sent in turn to the professors of chemistry, anatomy, etc., each settles his part of the case without reference to the others. One exaggerates the value of his own teaching and will give no credit for work done in another laboratory. Another is too lenient or does not wish to be bothered. Conditions are imposed without regard to general time schedule, and no consideration is given to the char-

acter and needs of the particular student.

The case of the individual student should be referred and the power to break rules and precedents should be given to those who by training in educational methods and experience with students know the individual case and what may safely be done. These are essentially the paid, full-time instructors, with such few others, perhaps, as have demonstrated that they are pedagogues as well as practitioners. The full-time instructors are educators, not physicians. They are paid to do work of the kind we are considering as part of their "teaching." They can be called together frequently.

In the school that I represent the paid teachers (with the addition of four heads of clinical departments) constitute the council. All paid teachers except student assistants are included. This council has full power to settle all questions relative to students. The remainder of this paper will be chiefly concerned with the methods by which the council disposes of migrating students.

In presenting the work of our Council I would particularly disclaim a new discovery in education. Somewhat similar methods are used elsewhere. Nor would I claim that our organization in its exact form should be generally adopted. Each school must work out that form of government which best suits its environment. I use my illustrations from my own experience not because they are noteworthy or unique, but because they constitute my store of available facts.

Taking up now the specific topic of discussion, migrating students may be classified as follows:

1. Good students who come from "good" schools.

2. Poor and doubtful students who come from "good" schools.

3. Students who come from "poor" schools.

(By "good" school, I add parenthetically, is meant a school which one considers as good as or better than the particular school one individually happens to represent! I consider Western Reserve a good school. My friend Waite considers St. Louis University a poor school. I pass on the compliment by considering certain nameless institutions poor schools. The point is that in this matter of migrating students the American Medical Association classification is of little value.)

Referring to my first class of migrating students, it is a lamentable fact that few good students come from good schools. The migration of students for the sake of coming under different environment, varying methods and special professors, so common in German universities, is almost unknown in America. This type of migration has always been discouraged by the colleges, and the fixed curricula have not facilitated it.

A few good students change colleges for reasons unconnected with education. A few change on account of legitimate personal grievances. (I can not agree with Dr. Means, who states that he has never known such a case. On the whole, however, we will all agree that tales of personal grievance are to be taken in homeopathic doses, with plenty of water.) Whatever be their reason for changing, provided it is honorable, the good students who come from good schools should be accepted on the basis of equivalence of discipline, rather than exact equality of subject matter. If the student, let us say, has had 600 hours of anatomy and 500 hours of physiology, whereas your curriculum requires 1,000 hours of anatomy (heaven save you!), and only 300 hours of physiology (heaven save you again!), it is neither necessary nor

just to condition the student in anatomy. If you are satisfied that the teaching is good and thorough in the other school, you can overlook differences of this kind. Of course if some important subject has been omitted on account of difference of curriculum, it must be made up. On the whole, the good student should slip in easily on his record.

Allow me to introduce here a paragraph on the general subject of migration of good students. I believe it should be encouraged. If we could implant the idea that the goal of the student's desire should be thorough knowledge of anatomy, of physiology, of medicine, and not the possession of a certain piece of sheepskin, we should be on the way to better things. And if to the student specially interested in physiology I should say: "Professor Blank is one of our best physiologists; why don't you take a year with him?" I should be giving scope to that student's interest and broadening my science at the same time. If we proceeded in this way, the time might come when students would select men instead of schools. And when that time comes, a professorship will be worth working for and worth working to keep, having been attained. When those good days arrive, we shall not find it so difficult, perhaps, to find men willing to enter the laboratory sciences as a career. But whether these good results follow or not, I believe that the migration of students should be encouraged from the standpoint of breadth of culture and training. And our purely American whoop-it-up notion of "college spirit" and school loyalty should be somewhat abated in favor of a better ideal.

Taking up the second class of migrating students, the poor students from good schools, we have our most difficult proposition. When a man with a poor record comes from Washington University or Michigan or Missouri, I have chills. And when he tells me he comes because of our superior facilities, I have an internal spasm. Such a man may have a "good constitution." He may "recover," but the prognosis should be "guarded." The council of our school has, therefore, found it necessary to decline to receive such students into our senior class. The reason is based on my first principle enunciated above. We must know the student, and we can not do that in the senior year.

A second provision is that much of the credit allowed is contingent. For example, histology may be credited, provided the student makes a good grade in pathology; or credit in dissection may be made contingent on topographical anatomy. We believe this arrangement is logical, and it certainly has a good effect on the student.

If the student has a failure from his former school, he is obliged to take further work in that subject. But we have no hard and fast rule about repeating laboratory courses. Too much repetition of elementary work is discouraging. Short special courses are better; and we have frequently organized such courses, primarily for the third class of migrating students, but to the great advantage also of the second class.

Even if the student is to be classed as a junior, we always hold him for one intensive laboratory course, commonly topographical anatomy (cross sections), which is a hobby of ours and on which we have a taskmaster not to be evaded, tricked or cajoled.

We find our summer school of great value in whipping delinquents into line. This is true both of our own backward students and of those who come from other colleges.

Taken all in all, the second class of migrants are not altogether a discouraging body of men. Frequently they see the

error of their ways and settle down to business. Sometimes discouragement in one environment is followed by a better spirit under new conditions. The mentally deficient, the ill prepared, the congenitally slothful, the habitually dissipated, must of course be dropped. Our primary idea is to keep the student long enough under the close supervision of the paid instructors to know whether these qualities were the cause of the original failure.

The third class of migrating students includes those who come from poorer colleges. Mr. Flexner has discussed these in some detail. He shows how a student who originally could not enter a college may eventually come in with advanced standing through attendance in one or more inferior institutions. The student thus evades the rules of entrance of the first school. This seems deplorable and is certainly unfair to the other students who were obliged to come up to the standard of preparation before entering their freshman year. And for the particular condition that Mr. Flexner discusses, there is only one proper procedure, and that is to enforce the same rules of preliminary education on students who enter with advanced standing as on those who enter the freshman year. I shall say nothing further on this point.

On the other hand the assumption that a student from an inferior school is himself necessarily inferior is absolutely wrong. In fact, my experience is that such a student is generally a very good man who desires to better his condition. And in contrast to the heart failure with which I meet the incoming migrant from Michigan, might be mentioned the welcome accorded the students from several nameless institutions.

Now, how should such a student, as an individual, be dealt with in justice to himself, to the college and to the public? As to the public, it is plain that the student should not be graduated till he is competent. As to the college, it is evidently bad policy (to put it narrowly) to graduate him before he is safe. As to the student, he has put in his time in the inferior school and has presumably gathered something. To refuse all subject credit and make him repeat all the previous work arouses revolt, and in my opinion is unjust. To refuse or diminish time credit beyond what is needed to know the student and his capabilities is also wrong. Time is not money, gentlemen. Time is life, and not to be handled carelessly; not to be required of the student as from inexhaustible store, but rather as that which not enriches us but makes him poor indeed.

I shall be obliged to discuss this class of students, as previous ones, from the standpoint of my own experience. The student is brought before the council; his credentials and grades are presented; he is questioned as to the nature of his previous work; and the decision, which is always a tentative one, is based not upon fixed rules, but upon careful consideration of that case.

The principle of contingent credit is frequently applied. For example, credit in dissection, if he passes in topographic anatomy. This procedure is safe, and it is sound pedagogically.

The principle of additional required laboratory work is applied, particularly by demanding attendance in summer school or on short special courses.

The principle of examination is applied, but not universally. For example, I frequently credit a student in freshman physiology if he passes on the sophomore work, although the topics considered in the two courses are different. I think I can discover whether he can think physio-

logically as well from one part of the subject as another.

The principle of requiring a sufficient attendance to give us knowledge of the student is insisted on. No student from an inferior college is received into the senior year.

To the furtherance of our knowledge of the student's ability as a laboratory worker, we always require at least one complete laboratory course, even if the student is admitted to the junior year.

On the other hand, we are not particular that every course which the student has had shall be of the same length, character and strength as our own. If he has had a fair course in bacteriology, but not so good as ours, I am willing to give him credit and let him take instead an intensive course in, let us say, pharmacology. Our idea is equivalent discipline, not parallelism of curricula.

That the students from poor schools have usually succeeded is shown by our experience during the past five years. The leader in our present senior class is a student who came into our junior class last year from a school which would be unrecognized by many members of this association. Of course, some have fallen by the way, and either voluntarily withdrawn or been dropped by the council.

There are a few more self-evident propositions to be considered. For example, the school from which the student comes should be conferred with. Not only should the grades of the student be asked for, but all facts concerning him which will assist in properly disposing of his case. That all obligations to the first institution, including the payment of fees, should be satisfied, is a clear demand on the student as an honorable man, seeking to enter a gentleman's profession. We should refuse him unless he meets such obligations.

There are certain institutions, on the other hand, which refuse to respond to requests for grades or information regarding students who wish to enter another school. I hold that such students may properly be received on their class grades or attendance certificates only.

In the enjoyable correspondence which I have had with Dr. Means in regard to this paper, he has raised several specific questions of interest. "For instance," he says, "a student applied for admission to the Starling-Ohio last fall with credentials of having completed his sophomore year and wanted junior standing. The card showed six or seven conditions on regular examinations, and that they had been removed by subsequent examinations—three or four subjects requiring two efforts. I could not have given him," continues Dr. Means's letter, "more than sophomore standing, which he refused to accept and returned to his old college."

This is one of my heart-failure cases. I believe the best way would be to refuse the student altogether. But we have never reached that stage yet. Our council would probably have allowed the student two years' time credit, but we would have loaded him up with conditions and summer-school work enough to test him pretty thoroughly. Dr. Means's even more drastic action is commendable. One thing is certain; if you grant these students full junior standing, you will suffer for it. You can not catch these migratory birds in the junior and senior years. The cages are too full of holes.

This case brings up another topic, that of giving students passing grades on condition that they go to some other school. This is a despicable practise. Some schools not only pass on their lemons to other institutions, but give them certificates as oranges. We ought to swear by the shade

of Hippocrates never to be guilty of that injustice—for injustice it is to the student, to both colleges and to the public.

Another experience is that which Dr. Dodson and I so frequently had at Rush Medical College ten years ago. A certain university gave only the final standing of the migrating student, without stating that he had been conditioned or failed and subsequently passed. It did not give numerical grades, but merely said "passed." We were led to suppose that such men were all right, whereas they had been weak students with repeated deficiencies. It was only after much disastrous experience that we learned the truth. In St. Louis I had similar experience with schools which gave credentials indicating the final standing but not the intermediate deficiencies of students. This practise seems to accord with the gold-plated rule, "Do others." The credentials should show every condition and failure, whether removed or not. Every important faculty action should also be set down, such as required repetitions, demanded withdrawals, etc.

Should the receiving school be governed in its treatment of a student by the advice of the school from which he comes? Theoretically we may answer "yes." But in my experience, the latter institution, as a rule, has little advice to give. It is usually glad to get rid of the man and does not care what becomes of him. There are, of course, exceptions; and in such cases the credentials and correspondence should be of great weight in deciding the action of the receiving institution. On the other hand, standards and methods vary; and I do not think a college has necessarily just cause for complaint if its emigrating student is received on different terms from those which it would itself impose on him.

An interesting case somewhat under this category has occupied the attention of Dr. Barlow, Dr. Means and myself this year. A student spent three years at the Los Angeles Division, University of California. He passed with good grades in all except three minor subjects. In these branches he failed to attend 80 per cent. of the exercises, as required by the college and the California statute. The faculty, therefore, ordered that he repeat the junior year.

This student came to St. Louis, giving as his reason the fact that we have a summer school, and that he desired to make up his time deficiency by attending a summer session. In addition to credentials and letters establishing the above facts, he presented letters from the instructors in the branches mentioned, stating that he had done the work and had passed the examinations, but that these were not allowed to stand on account of deficiency in time requirements, as previously stated.

Our council went over the case and voted that he should be admitted as a conditioned senior, with the understanding that he should take a summer course and, if all his work proved satisfactory, should be graduated at the close of the summer school. It was further provided that this action should be contingent on its approval by the dean of the Los Angeles Division, University of California.

I submitted the action to Dr. Barlow. He submitted it to the California Board and the board submitted it to the chairman of the Judicial Council of this association. As a result our action was not approved, and we were obliged to classify the student as a junior.

Now I have nothing to say as to the disapproval of our action. I have no doubt the disapproval was founded on the state law and could not be avoided. What I do maintain is that so far as the good of that student was concerned, our action was justified by all the circumstances; and if

there were any national body, similar to our school council, clothed with power to consider the individual case and settle it on its merits, this young man would probably have been saved one year of valuable time.

It is of course easy to answer that the man knew the rule and should have governed his attendance accordingly. But from my point of view the rule is a device for securing proficiency. As a general thing it promotes proficiency and is therefore a good rule. But in this case it was not necessary, as the documents show. Justice to the individual, therefore, made it desirable that the rule be not enforced. You say this would create a bad precedent. I answer it would create a good precedent that, for good reasons, exception may be taken even to a good rule.

Dr. Means has asked me to comment also on the action of the instructors who gave the young man statements of having passed their courses subject to the time requirement above mentioned. As I do not know the conditions at the Los Angeles school, I think it would be unfair to express a specific opinion. In general it may, perhaps, be claimed as the just prerogative of an instructor to give to any student a statement of the work he has done and the proficiency attained while studying under that instructor. For administrative reasons, in schools hemmed in by legal restrictions like our medical schools, it is well that this prerogative be exercised with caution. In our school it is a matter of custom that no grades be given out by the instructors. If any chose to do so, I should not complain. But it is clear that a grade so given does not constitute school credit, for that depends on other factors, such as registration, payment of fees and legal attendance.

SUMMARY

Migrating students have been divided into three classes. The good students who come from good schools should be accepted on the general principle of equivalence of discipline rather than exact parallelism of courses of study. Migration of this kind of students should be encouraged. Poor students from good schools, what Dr. Means calls "lame ducks," need very careful consideration and supervision. Their standing should be provisional and contingent on good work. Each case should be considered on its merits, and the student given a fair opportunity to redeem his record. But he must be held rigidly enough to test his ability and knowledge. It is not wise to take such students into the senior year.

The third class consists of students from inferior schools. It can not be ascertained in advance whether they are capable or not, as the grades from many of these schools are of no value. These students likewise should not be taken into the senior year, but by two years of selected work, supplemented in many cases by summer school, many of them can be graduated on a par with the regular members of a class. These students are usually men who made a mistake in their original choice of a school and who are earnestly desirous of bettering their condition. Each student must be considered individually, and his credits and studies adjusted to meet his personal needs. Hard and fast rules can not be followed, but certain principles find more or less general application. These are considered in the body of this paper.

For the adequate consideration of the individual student, whether in the matter of migration or any other phase of school life, a body of trained educators must be constituted with ample powers. It is recommended that this body be composed primarily of the paid, full-time instructors. In most medical schools this would not be too large a number to be effective. This

body should be free to use its judgment for the best interests of the individual student. Rules and precedents have their value for the regular progress of the student body, but must be considered a means and not an end. Justice to the individual is our fundamental duty. Broadly considered, just action for the individual carries with it justice to the other schools and to the public. We must beware lest in our blindness and in our sloth and in our preoccupation we bow down to the wood and stone of rules and regulations. Let us set up rather the god of individual education, which is a spirit and not a formula; the spirit which so successfully wrought in medical education in the days of preceptor and student; the spirit which has produced such apparent prodigies as Carl Witte and young Sidis; the spirit which makes an educational institution, not a machine nor a purely reflex organism, but a human entity with a human soul.

E. P. LYON

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-four American universities, five New England colleges for men, five colleges for women, one eastern and one western school of technology and one Pennsylvania college and engineering school, for the academic year 1910–11, the summer session students being omitted in every instance. The corresponding figures for 1909–10 were not compiled; those for 1908–9 may be consulted in the issue of SCIENCE for October 1, 1909, those for 1907–8 in the issue for October 30, 1908, those for 1906–7 in the issue for July 26, 1907, and those for 1904–5 in the issue for October 6, 1905. To the table for 1909–10 have been added the University of Syracuse, the University of Texas and Washington University, St. Louis.

Comparing the attendance by divisions of six eastern universities (*Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Yale*) with the corresponding figures for the same universities in 1908–9, we note that there has been a gain for these universities, taken as a whole, in every division, the largest increase in the actual number of students, leaving the North Atlantic division—in which all of these six universities are located—out of consideration, having been recorded in the North Central division, where there has been a gain of 310 students. The South Atlantic division comes next, with an increase of 126 students, followed by the Western division with a gain of 117 students, the South Central with 89, foreign countries with 27 and insular and non-contiguous territories with 23. The total increase in divisions outside of the North Atlantic in the two years under comparison is 692, as against a total increase of 527 in 1908–9 over 1906–7. Calculated on a percentage basis, the total gain of the six universities in the North Atlantic division between 1909 and 1911 amounted to 11.6 per cent., as against a gain of 13.3 per cent. outside of the division mentioned. In 1908–9 the percentage of increase in the North Atlantic division over 1906–7 was 7.6 per cent., as against a gain of 11.4 per cent. in the other divisions combined. In the North Atlantic, South Atlantic and North Central divisions and in the insular and non-contiguous territories all of the six universities with the exception of *Yale* show an increase in 1911 over 1909; in the South Central division all of the six institutions have made gains, in the Western division all show an increase except *Princeton,* while in foreign countries all have