but some interesting relationships are

admission to 340 persons whom MIT rejected. Of the 193 replies received by both schools, 141 chose MIT, 16 chose RPI, and 36 decided to attend neither.

The figures for the second- placed school are not quite as may: 524 persons applied to both MIT and Harvard in 1967, of whom 88 were accepted by both, 209 rejected, for an aggregate of 56%. But MIT stood on negative acceptance to 221 whom Harvard spurred, while Harvard was willing to admit six persons whom MIT rejected. And of those accepted by both, eight were both MIT, 72 Harvard, and eight neither. MIT and Cal Tech made the same judgement of common applicants 76% of the time, but those admitted to both schools preferred Cal Tech by a margin of two to one.

The Profile reports that the Freshman Advisory Council sent a questionnaire to freshmen in 1968-69; 85% of the responses themselves; 85% of the grades were A's in physics subjects. Undergraduate grades were A's in first year, 91% the second, 72% the third; only 43% bothered in 1969-70. The Profile, though, indicates that the figures should be "representative, if not exhaustive." The first year, freshmen devoted 29.5 hours weekly to homework. Freshman of succeeding years grew increasingly indolent; in the final study in 1967-70, the figures were down to 24.8 hours, while their average course load had increased in the time period of the study by five units.

Other studies indicate that freshman attendance at lectures declined two percent per week in 1968-69; sophomores pooled off at 2.7 percent per week. The freshman attendance level first term ranged from 81 to 86 percent, but dropped to 62 to 74 percent the second. Pass-fail (then in its first year) did not affect lecture attendance; rates of freshman attrition for 1967-68 were essentially the same as the rates under the pass-fail experiment. Further, in the first year of pass-fail, 8.03 (a sophomore subject) was more poorly attended than freshman physics subjects.

The Profile analyzes undergraduate grades separately for first and second terms. 19% of undergraduate grades were A's in the first term (1969-70), 33% the second. By 1968-69, after steadily increasing percentages, A's represented 39% of the grades in first term, 40% the second. That second term, 35% of the grades were B's, 15% C's, while the remaining 10% failures or minimum passes. While the Institute had moved in that decade from C-centering to B-centering, the percentage of failures had remained roughly constant.

The average cumulative average (cma) for a term's course work was 3.2 in 1966-67, and had risen to 3.9 by 1968-69. In the last year before freshman pass-fail, freshmen averaged 3.3, sophomores and juniors 3.9, and seniors 4.0, reflecting the tendency, noted by the Profile, for course grading to become increasingly lenient as more advanced material is taught.

The Profile is intended as a convenient information source for anyone wishing to pop up a theory. Thus it refrain from drawing conclusions of its own, beyond simply pointing out unusual deviations from average, or mentioning a nearly incontrovertible conclusion. The data is what it is; we have (to be) more advanced material is taught.

"Youth Ski Packages make it real easy to enjoy the upcoming skiing season. Youth and adults can ski for a week or a month. They include bus transportation, hotels, meals, almost anything. And, 36; decided to 'attend MIT and Cal Tech made the same judgement of common applicants. 