

**Papers Presented to the Joint Session of the Section on  
Education and Legislation, A. C. P. F. and N. A. B. P.**

**QUALIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR TEACHERS IN COLLEGES  
OF PHARMACY.\***

WILLIAM C. ALPERS, SC. D.

The question, "Who is a Professor?" was brought to my notice during the last year at three different occasions. The first was a letter received from Dr. H. H. Rusby, in which he asked my opinion on the proper salaries of professors in schools of pharmacy. He had been appointed the chairman of a committee to gather facts on this point and report at the next meeting of the Conference of Faculties. When I tried to answer him, the thought naturally arose in my mind, what does he, or his committee, understand by a Professor? Is it a man who devotes his whole time, his whole life to pharmaceutical education, or is it a man who has all kinds of commercial interests, rushes to the school a couple of times a week, pulls out a manuscript, reads off a number of pages, and goes back to his work that he considers the object of his life?

The second occasion that brought this question to my mind was a letter received from a friend who is a member of the Board of Trustees of a certain college. On this Board, he is one of the few who advocate higher preliminary education, while the majority are opposed to it. In a discussion of this question, one of the Trustees closed his argument by saying: "All this talk about high school education for our students is nonsense, as long as our professors themselves have no such education."

The third occasion is the fact, well known to those who teach in schools of pharmacy that are connected with universities, that the pharmaceutical professors are often looked upon as an inferior class, not equal to the others, and simply tolerated. This fact was brought home to me at various occasions during the last year.

The main object of the joint meetings of the Conference of Faculties and members of Boards of Pharmacy is, without doubt, the desire and the hope to raise pharmaceutical education to the same standard as that of other professions; to have the same recognition for the teachers as well as the schools, and to gain equal respect for all members of our colleges. Dr. Albert Schneider, the former President of the Conference, in his annual message, pointed out in very terse words why the Conference has failed in many points, and why the progress made is remarkably slow and small. It is timidity that blocks the way. It is the fear of offending each other. It is the dread, natural to every man of education, of hurting his neighbor's feelings. While this tendency may be justified to some

\*Read before the Joint Session of the Section on Education and Legislation, Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties and National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, held at San Francisco, August 11, 1915.

extent, and is in most cases traceable to a certain courtesy or gentleness, it is yet out of place in a movement for progressive reform, in an enterprise with a distinct aim and well-defined purpose; in an undertaking where frankness and courage must be the leading qualities. It must be understood that such a reform must be a reform for the future; that no measures adopted can be intended to have retroactive force, and that under no conditions should personal feeling or prejudice enter into the discussion. Nor should those who believe in conservatism indulge in obstinacy. The claim that we got along very well so far, and can get along just as well in the future; the argument that because our forefathers did not have a certain thing we do not need it, should not even be thought of. If such talk is of any value, there will be no progress of any kind. It is simply the argument of the stupid longshoremens who tried to destroy Fulton's first steamboat, because such a devilish invention would take their bread away. We must therefore look into the future. We must depict before our eyes a nobler and higher temple of pharmacy, built on a foundation of knowledge, education, truth and enlightenment, and must go to work with all our efforts until this noble structure is erected.

Let us, therefore, see who, in an acknowledged higher institution of learning, is called a Professor. Columbia University of New York, as well as the universities of Harvard, Yale and Princeton, have the following custom: The young man who wishes to enter the academic career is first employed as an *Instructor*, with a yearly salary of \$1200. He receives an increase of \$100 per year until \$1600 is reached. At the discretion and pleasure of the Trustees, he is then appointed *Assistant Professor*, with a salary of \$2000, with a yearly raise of \$100 until \$2600 is reached. At the pleasure of the Trustees he may be appointed *Associate Professor*, with a salary of \$3000, with a yearly raise of \$100 until \$3600 is reached, and then receive the appointment of *Professor*, with a salary fixed by the Trustees.

You will notice that it says: 'he may be appointed' in each case, provided there is a vacancy and his services have been of such a nature as to make their continuance desirable. This system does not exclude that a particularly able man may be advanced, in one or two years, from the position of Instructor to Assistant Professor, and so on. No young man is employed, however, as Instructor unless he has an academic degree; that is to say, a degree for which he has worked, and which was conferred by an institution of equal standing; not an honorary degree, or a self-conferred degree, such as unfortunately there are quite a number in pharmacy. This rule, however, does not exclude to call a particularly able man to a professorship without reference to his former position, although cases of this kind are very rare.

In these universities it is supposed that the professor devotes his whole time to his work, and any outside occupation that would require his absence from the college for a number of hours every day, is not allowed. This same system prevails in many other universities in the West, although it may vary in the number of years of service and the height of salary. But the underlying principle is adhered to in every first-class university, and no university can join the Conference of Faculties until the system of appointment of professors has been passed upon.

These rules, adopted several years ago by the leading universities, do not refer

to men that were appointed before their adoption, under different conditions. It is evident that by such a system only able and earnest men will reach the goal of their life. It is clear that this system will create an atmosphere of education, learning and enlightenment throughout the halls of the university, and that the students will constantly see before them their superiors in knowledge and devotion.

Can such a system be applied to pharmacy? A number of the members of the Conference, particularly those whose schools are connected with state universities, will quietly reply that it has been applied for years in their schools. But these cases are not the rule. In a great many schools there is neither order nor system in this respect. In fact, there are Trustees who believe that a man with an academic degree thereby becomes unfit to teach. The question, however, is a very important one and should be considered and argued in the utmost frankness and earnestness. It seems to be wrong to judge and register a school of pharmacy solely by the pre-requisite requirements for the students. A school consists of teachers as well as students, and if reforms are recognized to be necessary, they should be made throughout.

I am fully aware that an academic degree, as such, does not make a man a good teacher and should never be the sole criterion of a man's ability. But if we deny the necessity of establishing some kind of a standard for the future professor in pharmacy, why are we so anxious to uphold such a standard for students and licentiates? A certificate from a high school, as such, does not necessarily make a good student. A diploma from a school of pharmacy does not necessarily make a good prescription man; and a license from the Board of Pharmacy is no guarantee that the holder will make a good proprietor. But we require all these credentials as a certain safeguard for the public against ignorance and impositions; and in the same way we should establish a standard for the future teacher as a safeguard for the students.

The desire for a higher education in all professional lines is not a local one, nor is it a passing wave of excitement. It is rather a firm conviction, based on long and careful observations of well meaning and thoughtful men that the time has arrived for a forward movement in this respect; a movement that extends through the whole country from one end to the other. It is, therefore, not only desirable, but it is our plain duty that we should approach this question with sincerity and earnestness; that we should discuss it in all its phases, arrive at a uniform result, and lay out a clearly defined way for future action. If we fail to do this, the legislatures of the different states or the national government will soon interfere. In fact, in some states they have done so already, in a tentative way. I, therefore, recommend this question to your earnest consideration.