

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF PHARMACEUTICAL FACULTIES

[EDITOR'S NOTE.—Late in February of the present year the Chairman of the Executive Committee sent a letter to the deans of the schools holding Conference membership and to a few other prominent educators not holding this executive position. The contents of the letter is covered by the following statements and request:

An individual can make but little progress unless he has a well-thought-out program which he attempts in the main to follow. The same is true of an organization. Now that the Conference has gone to a four-year high school requirement for entrance and has definitely agreed upon dropping the two-year course beginning with 1925, I am raising the question as to what you think is the next most important step or steps for the Conference to take in its educational program. Will you not give me the results of your thought in a clear-cut statement? This statement with those of the other men will be published in the Conference section of the JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION at an early date. This will enable every man to know what the other men are thinking and it will be very helpful to the Executive Committee in formulating the program for the Asheville meeting in September.

The replies received to date are presented in this issue. The Chairman hopes that every one will take this opportunity to present his views and contribute to a constructive program.

RUFUS A. LYMAN, *Chairman and Conference Editor.*]

CHARLES H. LA WALL OF PENNSYLVANIA: The next definite step which should be taken by the Conference schools, following the inauguration in 1925 of the three-year minimum course for a pharmaceutical degree, which was agreed upon at the Washington meeting in 1920, is the establishment of full time courses in which the work is spread over a minimum of five days a week.

This change should go into effect by 1926 or 1927, if possible, following the established custom of giving adequate time for the change to be made. This will not necessarily prevent the student without means from earning his way through college if he desires to take a partial course and attend a longer time to complete his credits and obtain his diploma.

There are other improvements that can be carried on simultaneously, but the foregoing, in my opinion, is the most important.

W. F. RUDD OF VIRGINIA: Replying to your inquiry as to what should be the next step in Conference work, now that the four-year high school requirement goes into effect in 1923, and the three-year course in 1925, I am convinced that immediately we must undertake two more reforms which are sadly needed, especially in some of the larger schools in the East.

In the first place the three day a week curriculum is now nothing less than an anachronism.

In my judgment this system is indefensible, and the Conference should go on record at the 1923 meeting withdrawing membership from any school that has not arranged its curriculum on the full weekly basis by September 1924.

Another problem of outstanding importance is the rapid increase in the number of students entering pharmacy schools.

It would seem that the real needs of the public should largely determine the number of men that should be educated as pharmacists. At the present time, many of our institutions are matriculating numbers far in excess of what may be safely absorbed by the legitimate pharmaceutical needs. Is it not the plain duty of the Conference to tackle the problem of what effect this is going to have on the whole question of pharmaceutical welfare? It seems to me the time has come when our Organization must stand squarely for policies that will give the public a chance to have a type of pharmaceutical service comparable with other professional service.

If schools of pharmacy are willing to stretch their capacity to the breaking point, giving no consideration to the real needs, what hope is there for the future of pharmacy?

C. B. JORDAN OF INDIANA: The American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties has for years had a minimum requirement for a year's work that is altogether too low, far lower than the minimum requirement in any other line of college activities that I know of. I believe the time has come when pharmacy must demand a training comparable to the dignity of the profession; therefore, I believe that our next step is to raise the minimum requirement in hours for

a year's work. I believe our minimum requirement for a year's work should be not less than 1000 hours, distributed judiciously between lecture and laboratory work.

T. J. BRADLEY OF MASSACHUSETTS: A good general, after making progress in a campaign, stops from time to time to securely "consolidate" his position before he proceeds further, to insure his army against the danger of loss of such advantage as has been gained. I think the Conference is in an exactly similar situation in the matter of entrance requirements and length of course and that it will be a mistake to try for any further advance along these lines at this time.

It is my feeling that we shall have enough of a program for this year if we take care of routine matters and do any effective work on the project of the classification of pharmacy schools. This is already on the program and it is an important and delicate subject.

W. B. DAY OF ILLINOIS: I think the Conference is to be congratulated upon the progress that has been made of recent years in the requirements for admission to schools of pharmacy. I doubt whether we can raise these admission requirements further in the immediate future, though I look forward to one year of college requirement as the next step when the schools have lengthened their courses to three years. I think we should then put a more definite valuation upon each year's work both as to the number of hours of instruction and the nature of the work, the distribution of lecture and recitation and laboratory courses, etc.

H. M. FASER OF MISSISSIPPI: In answer to yours relative to the next important step to be taken by the Conference, I would say—standardization of the schools.

L. E. SAYRE OF KANSAS: I am inclined to think that we should boost the educational requirements *as soon as practical* to at least one year of university work. I find that our high-school graduates *to-day* are lower in their scholarship than they were ten years ago. That is my impression. I may be wrong and my observation may be faulty but I am inclined to think that many of our students ten or fifteen years ago who were of the two-year high-school grade or even the eighth grade were equal to some of the present-day high-school graduate caliber we are now receiving. I am also inclined to the opinion that in accepting students from high schools we should see to it that they have as preparation a certain amount of mathematics, Latin, physics, and possibly chemistry, but if they do not have any chemistry they should be obliged to take an elementary course, if it is offered, at the university.

I am quite sure I shall find many who differ with me and who are quite as competent to judge as I am. I realize that I cannot speak for all sections of the country. Different sections have, perhaps, different material to start with and different machinery for preparation for professional training. I should be glad to hear what other members of the Conference have to say and I know I shall profit thereby. As a final word I wish to say, I think that our pharmacy schools might be making a mistake if we make it impossible for a bright fellow (capable of training, with good hereditary intelligent endowments and potential ability) to enter the pharmacy course even if he be only a two-year high-school man; I am not sure that the high-school sifting process (while perhaps it is the best we have thus far acquired) is quite perfect. It is a question whether we should insist unconditionally on a three-year course in 1925. If the high school prepares the student *properly* then he could accomplish the pharmacy course in two years, especially if the State Board requires two years of practical experience before registration, but if the high school fails to properly train them the three-year course should be made obligatory.

F. J. WULLING OF MINNESOTA: 1. In answer to your question what the next upward steps should be, let me say that, according to my judgment, nothing is more important at the present time than the necessity of a more careful selection of those who are admitted to our ranks. The within papers entitled, "Eliminate the Unfit at the Source" and "Should Students Be Selected?" cover the point.

2. The colleges should now strive to make their minimum course one of at least three full college years. We have already done so and are so crowded (one hundred thirty-nine in a building intended for eighty) that we are seriously thinking of making our minimum course the four-year course.

3. We are also working on a university academic year beyond the high school before entrance upon pharmaceutical work. We have this matter fairly well under way and I firmly believe that before very long this college can again point the way in the respect mentioned. For further elucidation along these lines, I enclose a copy of a paper entitled "An All-University Freshman Year" which I hope will interest you.

H. C. WASHBURN OF COLORADO: I think two problems stand out rather clearly:

- (a) to eliminate the three-day-a-week course, and
- (b) to go to the conventional length of college year.

Both of these are important, probably in the order named; I doubt if a teacher or a pupil can maintain a sustained interest in as broken a schedule as three days a week.

As to entrance requirements, I believe that graduation from a four-year high school should suffice for many years to come. I also believe that a three-year course predicated upon high-school graduation should serve the purpose for some time, although there will be schools that will voluntarily go to a four-year requirement as soon as all the others have advanced to three.

I do not believe that any attempt should be made at standardizing teachers; that is a matter that would be exceedingly difficult to accomplish, and it is a matter that will gradually adjust itself.

E. F. KELLY OF MARYLAND: I heartily agree with your statement that the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties has made real progress during its history, although this progress may not measure up to the ideals of all of its members. It would, however, be comparatively easy to call attention to many more or less important duties which should now be undertaken. Among others, two seem to me to be of the greatest importance, because they are fundamental to the further progress that the Conference can make.

The first is to secure, either by its own effort, or from some other source, a method which will show whether or not the standards so far adopted by the Conference are actually being carried out by its members, in order to give the Conference the assurance that what it has accomplished is of full value. I favor the Conference undertaking this work itself, rather than to await the convenience of some other agency, but believe that the work should be done in close coöperation with the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy and with the American Pharmaceutical Association.

The second duty is to take such action as is necessary to bring the course in pharmacy, now that the question of entrance requirement is settled, into proper accord with the generally accepted educational ideals. To discuss the necessary changes in detail in such a short statement as you wish would be impossible, even for those who have given collegiate education the proper study. Bring the course in pharmacy to such a point that it will be considered as of full educational value so as to meet the criticism that the course in pharmacy, however good it is, is too highly technical and does not afford the broad general education that the other scientific and professional courses do. This undertaking should not be delayed until the minimum course is four years.

The Conference, judging from its past performances, can solve these fundamental problems, and I hope to see them undertaken promptly and earnestly.

JACOB DINER OF NEW YORK: The most important thing the Conference can do now is to concentrate on the State Legislation with a view of making graduation from a college of pharmacy a prerequisite for admission to the Licensing Examination similar to the law now in force in New York State.

CHARLES E. MOLLETT OF MONTANA: As to the Conference I think the next thing in order is the standardization of the three- and four-year courses and their respective degrees.

ZADA M. COOPER OF IOWA: The American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties should make its next goal a full week of not less than five days for all of its member colleges. We have left behind the twenty-five-week year, we are pledged to a four-year high school entrance requirement and a minimum course of three years. The elimination of a three-day week is the next logical step in advance.

No matter how able the instructional staff, how ample the laboratory and library facilities, no student can get the maximum good out of his course with only half of each week devoted to school work. No matter how great the concentration, assuming that it can be crowded into three days, and the student be free to work the other three, when does he study, when does he find time for a part in other college activities that are not an unimportant part of his education if he is to go out a capable pharmacist and a well-rounded citizen? When one looks at the schedule of classes of institutions running thirty-six weeks in a year with thirty or more clock hours weekly, one wonders how it is possible to crowd fundamentals into three days. Let us have not less than five school days each week.

For some time the Conference has recognized the importance of an investigation by some outside agency like the Carnegie Foundation. Such an investigation would go far toward standardizing courses and degrees. Since there is no hope of such an investigation being made in the immediate future, any other means of accomplishing any of the same results should be encouraged. The National Association of Boards of Pharmacy has a committee at work on a plan for a classification of colleges. The Conference ought to lend its support to such an undertaking. It is obvious that such a classification would be of enormous value to the N. A. B. P. in administration of reciprocity regulations and to various boards in their administration of prerequisite laws. It is almost as obvious that it will be equally good for the colleges in a different way.

There are other tasks of importance, there always will be work ahead if we are to keep pace with progress, but we advance most rapidly when we put our efforts into a few things at a time. A full week seems the most important step just now and encouragement to the Boards in their classification of colleges.

EDWARD H. KRAUS OF MICHIGAN: Our group is unanimously of the opinion that the Conference has probably gone far enough for the present with legislation regarding admission requirements and with respect to the minimum college course. Inasmuch as these requirements are not yet effective it is thought highly desirable to wait until several years have passed after both of them have been in operation before an attempt is made to increase the length of the minimum college course. It appears to us to be much more desirable that a comprehensive and searching survey of the colleges of pharmacy of the country be undertaken at as early a date as possible, and since the Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of teaching will, in the very near future, have completed its survey of the colleges of dentistry, it probably would be well to again urge the Foundation to undertake a similar survey for pharmacy. As I understand it, the Foundation has on several occasions been requested to undertake such a survey but on account of projects already under way was unable to report favorably upon the request. In discussing the matter recently with a representative of the Foundation I was led to believe that conditions have changed somewhat more sympathetically than in the past. At any rate, I would suggest that if a special committee has been appointed on this question it should, by all means, take up the matter again.

C. W. JOHNSON OF WASHINGTON: Granting that the four-year high-school requirement will be met and that the three-year course is settled and all Conference colleges will obey the regulations the next step in line of advancement should be to raise the number of clock hours for graduation and to make the college year one of 36 weeks. I believe it would be fair to require a minimum of 900 clock hours per year or it might be stated as a minimum of 2700 clock hours required for graduation. This would require the colleges to run somewhere near full time for five days per week.

H. H. RUSBY OF NEW YORK: Inasmuch as the membership of the Conference consists of faculties and not of individuals, I submitted your circular letter of February 8 to our faculty, at a meeting held yesterday, and was unanimously instructed to submit the following reply.

It seems to us most important that the Conference should clarify the situation as to the authority of its rules as binding its member-schools, and as to the authority of its committees and officers to commit the Conference to such of their respective acts and opinions as have not yet been acted upon by the Conference itself.

All the schools of the Conference entered into a definite agreement to require high-school graduation after January 1, 1923, but this agreement seems to be a dead letter. If so, what is the use of agreeing to drop the two-year course after a certain date? We are not expressing the opinion at this time and place that such rules should be forcibly applied, but we think there should be some definite understanding on this subject. In the case of the high-school requirement, there was not merely a rule, adopted by a majority, with a dissenting minority, but a unanimous agreement, which has now been violated by the very schools that proposed it. This inevitably raises a question as to the force of any Conference agreement.

So far as we can learn, the Conference has not "definitely decided" to drop the two-year course in 1925. We all recall that there was a resolution that expressed the opinion that this would be desirable. None of us recalls any subsequent action. While I was in Minneapolis, Chicago and Ann Arbor last week, I made diligent inquiry regarding this, and could find no one

who knew of such definite action as you report. What appears to have happened is that an erroneous entry has been made in the Proceedings.

It seems to many of us that there is a disposition on the part of officers and committees, assuming—either with or without sufficient grounds—that their views represent the majority, to proceed on the basis that they may commit the Conference in advance of its action.

It also seems as though the aims and objects of the Conference should be frankly and impartially discussed. There is a growing feeling in the minds of many that the differences of view in regard to this subject between two groups of our schools may prove to be irreconcilable. The schools of this section are obliged to concern themselves with the great body of practicing pharmacists, and there is reaction as well as action. If we run away from the pharmacists, even if it be in an advanced direction, we end our usefulness. We must either carry the body along with us or give up, and we cannot carry the body very rapidly. It seems that some of the western schools dodge this problem, and give their whole attention to themselves and their students, and thus fail in one of their most important duties. Certainly, we should not dictate any other course to them, but it may be accepted as an irrevocable decision on our part that we will never imitate them in this direction. You must accept it as a fact that, with few exceptions, we are unselfishly devoted to our work, and are trying in the light of long experience to adopt that policy that will work out best in the long run. It is not to be expected that we will submit to misinterpretation and to martinet methods, a large part of which have no better basis than provincialism. Granting that both parties are sincere and earnest, the question arises whether it is possible to maintain a working arrangement by which different methods can and may be pursued. Perhaps not! It may be that the conditions are so different that two organizations could work more harmoniously and efficiently than one. There should be a more determined effort than has yet been made to determine this vital question.

We are at the present time endeavoring, through legislation, to restrict the opening of improper drug stores in this State. This will curtail the requirement for clerks, but even with this curtailment, the demand cannot be met. Even our daily papers teem with "want ads" for drug clerks. What would our State Association do to our entire program of progress if we were to take a step that would put a serious check on the supply of clerks?

The whole point that I am trying to make is that it will not do for the Conference to disregard the conditions and necessities that beset a seeming or technical minority.

The discussion of these matters must not be conducted in an intemperate and offensive manner. Decision and firmness do not require this. While this is a minor consideration, it is still true that such methods do not make for judicial decisions.

So far as we are concerned, you will have our firm and steady support in every effort to secure the best results, but we can never consent to be coerced into a course that will frustrate the comprehensive plans for betterment on which we are working. If the conditions absolutely demand a separation, let it be a separation by agreement, which will not tend to lessen the power and influence of either side in working out its particular problems.

HOSPITALS OF PAST CENTURIES.

In a recent issue of the *Philadelphia Public Ledger*, George Nox McCain discusses hospitals of ancient and modern times, from which the following abstracts are made:

The establishments for the sick of the early Jewish period were known as Beth Holem (houses for the sick). Beth Saida, famous in the New Testament scriptures, was supported by charitable (Saida) subscriptions. "Mostly, these hospitals were located near a pool or stream of running water. Many of these pools were supposed to be beneficial in cases of gout and rheumatism. There were attendants who helped the ailing and infirm into the water."

The Egyptians received medical attention in their homes, the poor in the temples. Ancient Greece supported houses for the treatment of the sick. A tablet unearthed near Pacenza, Italy, evidenced that Romans had hospitals and the one referred to on this tablet was endowed. Near Zurich, Switzerland, a Roman military hospital of the time of the Emperor Hadrian was discovered and excavated. "It contained fourteen rooms and was remarkably well outfitted for that day. It was supplied with many kinds of pharmaceutical and surgical apparatus, probes, pin-cers and tubes. Among other instruments found were medicine spoons in bone and silver measuring vessels and pots for salves and ointments."