

"In the preparation of plans for a hospital one constantly faces demands which are far beyond the purse of the institution, and in the eventual adjustment of the program those demands are most frequently recognized which have the strongest support from the clinical and occasionally from the administrative staff. The pharmacy frequently gets less space than it ought to have, even for its routine work."

In an attempt to find out how many hospitals employ registered pharmacists the writer has consulted the Secretary of the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy¹ and has secured data from the Hospital Library and Service Bureau and elsewhere. The results of this investigation will be presented as a separate contribution.

SUMMARY.

This paper presents an outline of the hospital pharmacy problems of an administrative type as ascertained by a compilation of the requests for information on the subject received by the Hospital Library and Service Bureau.

Comments based upon the writer's experience are given.

EDUCATION FOR PROFIT.*

BY WORTLEY F. RUDD.

Manifestly this subject has more than one interpretation. It may mean profit to those who are educated, and certainly there is a decided net money profit to the educated on the one hand as compared with the uneducated on the other, *e. g.*, the average income of the untrained man is estimated at \$1200 per year, that of the high-school graduate \$2200, and of the college graduate \$6000 per year. That means that in a lifetime, say 60 years, the total earnings of a man in each class would be \$45,000, \$78,000, and \$150,000 respectively. Furthermore, it is estimated that while the untrained man at the age of 55 begins to drop towards dependency, a college man reaches his maximum earning capacity at 60.

Granted the relative accuracy of this data, education pays in money value certainly to those who receive the training.

Again, education for profit may be interpreted as referring to that great proportion of our people who are the beneficiaries at the hands of those who are educated. The sick get better service because doctors are better educated. Students are better taught by better educated teachers, and so on.

These, however, are not the interpretations which I desire to emphasize in this connection. I see in this subject a third possible interpretation, *viz.*, the profit that comes to those who do the educating. It is this interpretation and about this class that I want to speak very briefly.

Now what are the teacher's profits? Has he any? It is a terribly hackneyed subject; every teachers' convention discusses it; sob artists write poems about it; cartoonists satirize it. Educators themselves could probably form within their own group a great debating society with the ranks about equally divided on either

¹ National Association Boards of Pharmacy, H. C. Christensen, Secretary, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.

* Section on Education and Legislation, A. Ph. A., Des Moines meeting, 1925.

side of the question. Yes, there is profit. No, there is not. And the debate is going to continue long after this paper is read, printed, and forgotten. The truth is, I am not going to discuss even this phase of the subject but rather one simple phase of it, *viz.*, how far are we sacrificing ourselves, how far we should do so, and what principles should guide us in deciding upon our course of action in this connection. I desire to limit the study to teachers in professional schools and especially to pharmacy.

If the statement made above is correct, *viz.*, that the average yearly earnings of college graduates amount to \$6000, there is no question that pharmacy teachers, many of whom are college graduates, do not measure up in earning capacity to the average in their class. It may properly be said in this connection, however, that many teachers in the pharmacy schools of the country have no other than the ordinary Ph. G. degree and have therefore really not completed a regular four-year college curriculum, as is probably referred to in the term, college graduate. And too, it may be said that in the teaching profession as a whole the average salary of honest to goodness college graduates probably does not average far above half of the earnings of college graduates as a class. All of this simply shows that granting the training and native ability of teachers to be up to the average of all college graduates, we do make some financial sacrifice. Why do we do it? There are many reasons. In the first place many of us do it because we are in it and just can't get out into something else more remunerative. Some men and women too love to teach and would not exchange their jobs for any other kind at any ordinary salary. There are a great number of this class, I believe. Now there is a third class that has seen in certain kinds of teaching the opportunity to impose upon the ignorance of the public and gather to themselves many and large fees for preparing young men and women to take certain examinations as required for the practice of some special work such as medicine, law, dentistry, pharmacy, etc.

For a long time medical, dental, and pharmacy schools were profitable organizations, *i. e.*, financially profitable. Some of us here are old enough to remember those times. In fact, even to-day some professional schools are able to make rather large net profits. I know personally a teacher in a dental school that relies wholly on students' fees for income who is paid a salary of \$10,000 a year. I suspect this is about as much as the highest paid teachers in our well-endowed or state-supported institutions receive. How does it come about that such a thing is possible? Are the privately owned institutions more economically and efficiently run than are those with other income for support? Do those of us who have more or less public funds for support, as in my own school, fail to get a quid pro quo for the dollars we spend? Does the fact that one group does not have any income except from student fees effect the final educational output of such institutions? These questions are much easier to ask than to answer. I am sure that I haven't sufficient data to warrant any conclusion on my part. My own experience, however, may help some to analyze the psychology of the situations cited. At the present time our school seems to function best when we have an entrance class of from fifty to sixty. Our fees from this number, combined with nearly an equal amount from state appropriations, just about take care of the cost. Now I find myself extremely anxious to get in this number of freshman each year. Half this number would cripple us financially. A half more would enable us to pay better salaries but would distinctly

overcrowd our present teaching facilities, and so it goes. The temptation is probably common to most of us who have to do with the business end of education. There can be but one safe guide and it is extremely difficult to follow, *viz.*, plan so that we can give sound fundamental education, not sham. We must be absolutely fair to those whom we matriculate, for they trust us. We are almost completely moulding the ideals and practices of pharmacy of the next generation. Absolute honesty, devotion solely to the best interests of those whose pharmaceutical needs we are responsible for, is the only safe guide and it is hard to follow.

Frankly when I sit quietly and reflect that upon the school of pharmacy of the Medical College of Virginia the whole people of the state are largely dependent for high, clean, efficient pharmaceutical service, I am overwhelmed with the responsibility and am convinced that this feeling is shared by my co-workers. Surely if we are ever able to even approach our ideals for this service, we will have no trouble in putting at least one correct interpretation upon the subject of this paper, Education for Profit.

PHARMACY TEACHER-TRAINING.*

BY FREDERICK J. WULLING.

During the past year I have had eighteen requests to nominate men to teacher positions in colleges of pharmacy, none of which I could comply with because none of our students or recent graduates except one had chosen the field of teaching. To fill the vacancy that occurred in our own faculty instructor division, our lowest and beginning rank, we had fifteen applicants, none of whom had any special training in the art of teaching. With very few exceptions, the faculties of professional schools are made up of men and women who have had no special training to fit them to become teachers. Their qualifications, in their respective technical fields, it is to be presumed, are sufficient. Their qualification as teachers may or may not be adequate but my own recent experience in engaging pharmacy teachers, and that of many others with whom I have discussed the matter, reveals a distinct lack in applicants for teaching positions of teaching training. The wonder is that there are so many good teachers among the faculties of professional schools. Of the many who are admittedly poor instructors, we need not speak here.

Because of the recent and accelerating advancements in pharmaceutical education, the demand for teachers of pharmacy is increasing rapidly. There appears to be no sufficient recognition of this demand by students generally and many to whom this demand has been made known appear not to be interested. The few who are interested and to whom the necessity nowadays of special teacher-training in addition to professional training has been pointed out, find no provision in our schools of pharmacy for that kind of training. That a growing need for such additional specialized training exists must be apparent to all executive officers in schools of pharmacy if not to the executives of professional schools of all kinds. The old belief that a technically trained person is also a good teacher has experienced so much adversity and embarrassment of late that it must and is

* Section on Education and Legislation, A. Ph. A., Des Moines meeting, 1925.