

My question is, how are these standings derived, and how valid are they in really measuring the quality of our schools?

DR. RUSSELL: Well, you mentioned two lists; I will take your second list first. That is based on empirical data; that is, actual records of people in terms of SAT scores as to how they fare in those schools. These things are rather simple correlates to work out mathematically. They are just saying that in this particular college their success record is such that it is the span of SAT scores between A and B that seems to fit there. And as you move up to schools which make the effort to establish more rigorous academic standards it becomes possible to tell in terms of their admitting and excluding practices what happens to the kids when they are in there, and it is possible to get a mathematical figure for about how they are going to work. This, of course, assumes some constancy in the marking processes.

But I think that this is at least an indication that there is an intellectual base which has some validity. You understand that in any statistical situation the route to the statistical result is one which eliminates the individual case, by some kind of an averaging. So, it is always possible for Johnny to be an exception to these things, and they try in their literature to point this out; that you cannot be sure.

I remember once I put a kid into Columbia Law School. He was a student of mine at Johns Hopkins and he came up with a 390, or something like that, on the law aptitude test. And Columbia Law School would not consider anybody under 500. Basically they would not even pay attention to people much below 600. And this boy's score was hopeless. But it also happened that I had been the pre-law advisor in Columbia College. I had had a hassle with the Law Admissions Committee because they had admitted a student of mine who scored something like 772, who was an immature child; perhaps 18 years old chronologically, but he was not even that old.

They admitted him in advance; that is, after his third year of undergraduate work. I told them I thought the boy was immature and would not stand up under the discipline required in the Law School. They admitted him anyway and he flunked right out. And so, my stock was pretty high. I told the Law Admissions Committee,

"This Johns Hopkins boy is not bright; in fact, he is dull. But he has a fantastic hunger to be a lawyer and to