

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.

“\*\*\*\*the plan for the development and strengthening of the Medical School has included making the professors of clinical subjects university professors in fact as well as in name, by calling upon them for full-time academic service and by providing for them adequate salaries. The Statutes of the University have for many years contained the following definition of full-time service. . . . “No officer of instruction shall be employed in any occupation which interferes with the thorough, efficient and earnest performance of the duties of his office.”

“The responsibility for determining when, in any particular case, this provision of the Statutes may seem to be violated rests upon the President. For these reasons it has not been necessary for the University, in establishing full-time service for professors of clinical subjects, to adopt any of the methods. . . . that are understood to have been proposed elsewhere. It has, of course, been necessary to break up what was left of the old-time proprietary system under which a clinical teacher frequently felt that his academic obligations were subordinate to his private professional practice. . . . On the other hand it is one of the main objects of the modern university to keep its teachers and organizers of research from becoming too academic, too narrowly limited to their immediate university work, and too remote from the happenings in the world about them. The modern college and university teacher, and most of all the teacher in a school of law, of medicine, of engineering, of architecture or of journalism, needs frequent and many points of contact with the practical affairs of life in order to increase his effectiveness as a member of the University. Arbitrarily to deprive a university officer of such contacts and such opportunities for practical experience, even when they bring pecuniary reward, is to decrease and not to increase his scientific and educational usefulness.”

It is to be particularly noted that in the above report no attempt at hard and fast rules is made. It is presumed that the officer of instruction has a sense of his obligations to the university. If this sense of obligation is lacking he can be very readily dismissed. While it is entirely desirable that we draw a sharp line of distinction between those with whom teaching is merely a means to some other end and those with whom teaching is a life work, we must keep in mind that many noted teachers in pharmacy schools did not give their whole time to teaching and could not be classed as other than part-time men under a strict interpretation of the full-time idea. The successful instructor in a professional or technical school is usually a specialist in the branch he teaches and it is unjust to require that he assume the monastic attitude of the Middle Ages in regard to outside activities for fear that he will lose his usefulness to the school or that he will gain financially. It is a well-known fact that a school acquires prestige through having men of acknowledged standing on its faculty, provided their connection is not merely nominal. It is also true that a strong faculty, even though some of the members do not give their whole time to teaching, is worth more educationally than a faculty of full-time but mediocre instructors.

We must impartially consider the advantages and disadvantages resulting from an instructor being engaged in professional work outside of his teaching hours. The disadvantages lie in the possibilities always latent in a divided allegiance and in the danger of the individual exploiting his college connection for commercial purposes. The question of a divided allegiance is the one which offers the greatest difficulty and is the reason for the uncompromising attitude of many schools toward the part-time instructor. Undoubtedly there is danger of the part-time man neglecting teaching duties for outside interests especially if the latter prove more lucrative than instruction work. However, this type of individual is not really interested in teaching and usually settles the problem for the university by voluntarily abandoning teaching when it conflicts with more profitable interests. On the other hand there are many men who conscientiously keep up their college work

despite the pressure of other duties and who are willing to sacrifice both time and money because they have a real interest in teaching. The question of a divided allegiance only presents itself in those instances where the instructor loses that sense of responsibility so essential in the teacher. In such cases he is a detriment to the college or university and his resignation should be requested. The exploitation of a college connection for business purposes is guarded against by regulations in most universities, and the use of official stationery for reports, analyses or opinions, especially if these are in a form which might be used for advertising purposes, is usually forbidden. Transgression of this regulation can be very readily checked.

Against the disadvantages noted in the previous paragraph we must set the advantages which a college or university may gain by permitting officers of instruction to devote a certain amount of time to consulting or commercial work. Educators still face the criticism that college graduates must get away from the academic viewpoint and learn the practical side of their business or profession before they can succeed. This supposed fault of a college education may be traceable to the fact that the instructor may not have had practical experience in the branch he is called upon to teach. The prime object of the technical or professional school should be the fitting of students for success in their chosen field and to fully accomplish this object the school must teach both theory and practice. Therefore it is to the advantage of the school and the student that the instructor not only possess the art of imparting facts but that he be equally able to show the relationship between theory and practice. The instructor who, apart from his teaching duties, is professionally engaged in his particular branch rarely shows any tendency toward monotony in his teaching. There is less chance of his getting into a rut because his outside interests may demand research and the ability to act as a consultant. His commercial or professional work enlarges his viewpoint, increases his abilities as a teacher and consequently makes him more valuable to the school. The instructor who is actively engaged in professional work is certainly more respected by the students than the man who lacks initiative and is content to teach in the same way year after year. While the same end may be accomplished by the teacher pursuing research work purely for its own sake, it is a fact that outside interests stimulate and provide topics for research which would hardly suggest themselves to the instructor wholly out of touch with the practical applications of his subject. If the teacher attains distinction in his professional work it is more than likely that his name will be coupled with that of the school with which he is connected. In olden times a university or college was known by its faculty and conditions are not so very different to-day.

What, then, are to be the factors in any determination of whether or not a given individual should be classified as a full-time officer of instruction? Perhaps the three outstanding factors will be the time element, the salary element and the relativity of outside interests to collegiate work. While all of these factors have an important bearing upon the question, no one of them is conclusive in itself nor can they be applied in all instances. If the teacher spends the greater part of his working hours in instruction work, preparation and research being included, and the major portion of his income is from this source, he would undoubtedly be classed as a full-time man. If, on the other hand, his school program does not require more than ten or fifteen hours' class work each week it is manifestly unfair

to debar him from engaging in outside work on the ground that it would be incompatible with his being considered a full-time instructor. Likewise if an instructor's income from these outside sources exceeds that received from the school we can hardly require that he restrict his activities so that the major source of income will be from teaching. More important than the time or salary elements is the relationship of his extracollegiate activities to his teaching duties. If the two are closely related and the outside interests do not interfere with the proper performance of his college work he should not be disqualified from classification as a full-time officer of instruction. A regulation providing that all outside professional work be performed in the college building appears to work out very satisfactorily.

It might be advisable and it surely is desirable that definite statements regarding the proper interpretation of the term "full-time officer of instruction" be formulated. While it is difficult to explicitly define this phrase, it is probable that the following statements would apply satisfactorily in a majority of instances.

1. One who gives the greater part of his working time to teaching in the institution by which he is employed.
2. One who receives the major portion of his income from teaching in the institution by which he is employed.
3. One who is regularly retained by the college or university on a yearly contract and who fulfils faithfully all academic duties assigned him.

COLLEGE OF PHARMACY,  
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

---

## STANDARDIZATION OF EDUCATION AND LEGISLATION.\*

BY B. OLIVE COLE.

The standardization of education and legislation is not a new idea, but is a serious duty which must be performed if pharmacists are to take their proper place in the life of this great nation; and the Section on Education and Legislation can be of great assistance in this very necessary work.

Pharmaceutical education and legislation have by slow degrees been advanced, but these advances have not been uniform in the different states. It is true that most of the schools of pharmacy are pledged to demand four years of high school training or its equivalent as an entrance requirement at an early date, which is a great step forward, but to enable American pharmacy to serve the public as it should, and at the same time secure for itself the proper position and prestige, an aggressive demand should be made that the schools of pharmacy of the entire country be standardized. Pharmacy should establish a concrete, practical intellectual ideal, and the public should be made aware of that ideal. A specified degree from a school of pharmacy should mean the same thing in every state. And it is desirable that this standardization be made from a more or less academic standpoint. This is brought out very clearly by Prof. J. G. Beard in the tabulations of "The Opinions of Teachers Concerning Degrees in Pharmacy" in the July number of the *JOURNAL OF THE A. PH. A.* The majority of teachers desire standardization of pharmacy schools from an academic standpoint. To further illustrate—

---

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