

It was noted then that a number of colleges and universities have given up the use of class-rank statistics, in part under the pressure of Selective Service requirements and in part because of a growing comprehension that there are no absolute standards or criteria as between fields of study or as between professors. This is particularly apparent in the humanities and social sciences, where it is evident that the judgment of a human being's performance by another human being in any non-quantitative field is subject to substantial error. For that reason, it is growing less common to use class-rank statistics in colleges and universities. The exact number of institutions eliminating the use of class rank is not known, but it is known that practices vary widely. Some figure such statistical records annually; some semi-annually. Some figure transfer credits in; some exclude them. Some use "pure" statistical approaches, with statements of probable error or standard deviations (which permits the quip that in some institutions as many as 60 per cent may be in the top half.)

A growing number of institutions are revising entire grading systems, using such designations as Honors, Pass, and Fail (which does not permit ranking). Bowdoin College is an example in this general category.

Others using Pass-Fail systems or Pass-Fail options affecting the computation of class rank to some degree are:

Oberlin	Carleton
Mt. Holyoke	Un. of California at Berkeley
Cal Tech	Columbia
Queens (N.Y.)	Muhlenberg
Knox	Juniata
Brown	Franklin and Marshall
Un. of Pennsylvania	Colgate
Stanford	Beloit
Princeton (which started pass-fail)	Florida Presbyterian

While technical arguments are not of great moment in the recommendation that the \$200 bonus be eliminated, they do suggest that it is nearly impossible to certify the eligibility of winners with any degree of certainty or equity. Most compelling, perhaps, is the fact that the offer of the bonus abrogates the sound basic philosophy of giving aid to deserving students with intellectual potential, with the amount of that financial aid being related to their financial need.

Mrs. GREEN. I have one final question.

In the Higher Education Act we have a program called talent search which is designed for the early identification of that student who is very bright and might not otherwise go to college without special assistance.

There is a similar program called upward bound which is not administered by the Office of Education. Does the American Council have any position on combining upward bound with the talent search to bring about a better program?

Mr. SPALDING. I have a personal interest in this as Mr. Morse knows and so is being quiet at the moment.

We have a quite unusual upward bound program at Franklin and Marshall College. We see no sense in their not being identified and in line with the talent search program.

The new proposed program, by the way, in counseling and tutoring, and so forth, is a logical sequel to that. The fact is that embedded in the OEO legislation is a requirement for the Office of Economic Opportunity to treat institutions of higher education as though they were municipalities, as though they had some tax base, as though they could call on additional funds.

Therefore, we face increasing need for funds for a program that is outside, or rather, is important but tangential to the mission of the college.