

11. Worth Hale, *Hyg. Lab. Bull.*, 74, 25, 1911.
12. A. Sluyters, *Ber. klin. Wochensch.*, 56, 802, 1919.
13. M. Cloetta, *Arch. f. expt. Path. u. Pharm.*, 88, 113, 1920.
14. Digalen Report, *J. A. M. A.*, 63, 881, 1914.
15. H. Baljet, *Schweiz. Apoth. Zeit.*, 56, 77, 84, 1918.
16. G. Joachimoglu, *Arch. f. expt. Path. u. Pharm.* 91, 156. 1921.

THE VIRGINIA EXPERIMENT.*

BY WORTLEY F. RUDD.

The Legislature of Virginia defeated prerequisite legislation in 1914 and again in 1916. In 1918 the bill was again offered in its original form, *i. e.*, requiring college graduation and two years of drug store experience for examination.

Everything went well with the bill until about the middle of the Legislative Session, when the writer, and others, who were working for its passage, received notice that something had happened and that our presence at the Capitol was urgent. We were astonished to find that some of the leading members of the State Senate had determined to vote against the bill unless the experience clause was deleted. In our attempt to argue the question with these gentlemen, we were told frankly that we could take our choice—delete the experience requirement and they would pass the bill, leave it in and they would immediately defeat it. It is needless to say that we deleted it. This was surely an anomalous situation; bound as we were by tradition to the experience feature good sensible laymen had to tell us pharmacists where we were in error in educational policy.

The point of all of this is that now we believe they were right. These laymen have laid the foundation for an experiment in pharmaceutical education, which is called by some the most progressive step yet taken by any state in the Union and by others rank radicalism.

Naturally, it took us a little time to catch our breath—the thing was so new and so different—but our law-making body had spoken and it was our duty to make the plan fit the needs.

There is but one school of pharmacy in Virginia, and this a state-aided institution. The problem then was squarely up to this school. It must provide facilities for training its students in practical dispensing so that they might go out from the school directly and serve the people safely and efficiently. A careful study of our potential facilities for doing this brought out the following facts: first, our close affiliation with the medical school, which conducts an out-patient clinic of approximately thirty thousand patients per year, could be used even more effectively than in the past; second, the ownership by the college of three hospitals, *viz.*: The Memorial, St. Philip and the Dooley, offered a field which had heretofore never been utilized as a pharmaceutical clinic. Here, then, was an opportunity to develop our practical work two- or even three-fold. On July 1st of this year (1922) the dispensing work for all of these institutions was taken over by our school of pharmacy and placed under the direct supervision of our professor of pharmacy, W. G. Crockett, and three other thoroughly trained men.

Our senior class, rarely numbering more than 25 or 30, will be divided into very small sections—probably not more than three or four students in each.

* Read before Section on Education and Legislation, A. Ph. A., Cleveland meeting, 1922.

From past experience we judge that about a half of each senior class will have had more or less practical drug store experience before entering college, but every man must serve in these dispensing departments until he demonstrates to all four of the instructors under whom he works that he is a safe and efficient dispenser. The time spent in this work by each student is not rigidly fixed, but the degree of proficiency alone is what counts and necessarily varies with previous experience, natural aptitude and application of each man. During the past session we had several men that we would not allow to apply for graduation because they were regarded as unsafe and inefficient in their dispensing work. These men must continue this work during the coming session until they are qualified. The personal supervision given the men in this part of the course is as good as we know how to make it.

Referring again to a statement made in the early part of this paper, that this may prove to be the most progressive educational step yet taken by any state in pharmaceutical training, this conviction grows upon us as our plans for more efficient teaching are perfected.

What system of apprenticeship affords the personal supervision of four trained prescriptionists until each one of the four is fully convinced that each student has been properly trained? What system of apprenticeship affords opportunity for acquiring the first principles of dispensing under conditions as nearly perfect as ordinary men can make them? What system of apprenticeship as practiced to-day impresses all the young men and women entering stores that the practice of pharmacy is one of the most honored and highly responsible lines of human endeavor? What system of apprenticeship will train prospective pharmacists under conditions as free from temptation to careless methods and short cuts?

We, in Virginia, realize that we are making an experiment—one which every state in the Union will watch with interest. We believe now that the lay members of the Virginia Legislature were wiser than we. We believe that the plans we have already tried and those we are now developing will finally put into pharmacy in Virginia a much higher type man on the average than has been going into it in the past. We believe that there are now too many pharmacists and too many pharmacies and that our new system of having to pass so critically upon every prospective pharmacist will materially lessen the number of men going into the work. We believe that this added responsibility upon the schools of pharmacy is the best thing that can happen to them.

We ask that you be not too critical of us down in Virginia until we can give the new order a chance to be tried out—it did not go into effect until April 1922. We know it is going to take several years to see the real result.

The Virginia school is facing its new responsibility with a sincere desire to give the new method a perfectly fair trial. No man can foresee what the outcome will be. It will be either a great step forward or a hopeless failure. True to our trust we will report these results faithfully. These results will either help you in your work or warn you against their adoption.

I cannot close without telling you what our lay friends of the legislature said when we tried to get them to leave the experience clause in our prerequisite bill. They listened patiently to us and when we were through their spokesman said very dryly, but very positively: "If the pharmacy schools are not able to arrange

their teaching so that their graduates can fill our prescriptions and sell us our ordinary remedies safely and efficiently without having to learn how to do it after they graduate, then the pharmacy schools had better quit and go home."

May we all be able to say Amen to this in a few years, is the spirit which heartens us of the Medical College of Virginia as we make the venture.

SCHOOL OF PHARMACY,
MEDICAL COLLEGE OF VIRGINIA.

FULL-TIME OFFICERS OF INSTRUCTION.*

BY C. W. BALLARD.

In the plan for the grading of pharmacy schools submitted by the Committee on Higher Educational Standards of the Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties the term "full-time professor" is employed but there appears to be no clear definition or even general understanding of the significance of this phrase. A literal interpretation can hardly be the intent for everyone realizes that collegiate teaching cannot demand that the teacher shall be actively engaged in instruction work eight hours per day and six days per week throughout the entire year. So the term "full time" as applied to the teacher is rather a misnomer and any definition agreed upon must differ materially from the business acceptance of the term. Undoubtedly the intent of those who use this term is to establish a distinction between teachers with whom education is a primary interest and those with whom teaching is merely secondary to some other business. Unfortunately, in past years and even to-day the faculties of some professional schools have included members to whom a faculty appointment was a means of self-glorification entailing no obligations of time, service or real interest. Provided it does not interfere with more important business these individuals are willing to undertake a few hours of class work for little or no recompense so that they may pose as a professor or use their college connection for furthering their business interests.

While specifications requiring the employment of full-time professors are of service in ruling out schools which make a practice of filling up their faculties with men who regard teaching as an avocation rather than a vocation, the term itself is capable of interpretations which are likely to prove detrimental to the best interests of the professional schools. This has been well illustrated by the situation in those medical schools which have rigidly restricted the outside interests of the members of their faculties. While literal and strict enforcement of the full-time rule has served the desirable purpose of forcing the resignations of a host who used the schools as a convenience, it has also resulted in the loss of men who fulfilled their academic obligations faithfully even though their outside interests were many and varied.

The annual report of President Butler of Columbia University contains the following admirable presentation of the situation and also expresses the liberal but fully adequate attitude of Columbia University toward the problem of outside interests and their relationship to teaching duties.

* Read before Section on Education and Legislation, A. Ph. A., Cleveland meeting, 1922.