

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF PHARMACEUTICAL FACULTIES

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN CONFERENCE OF PHARMACEUTICAL FACULTIES.

CHARLES W. JOHNSON.

In 1903, the first president of this Conference remarked in my hearing that all colleges of pharmacy should strive for membership in the American Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties, for the reason that only through close association and frequent contact of the faculties of the colleges, could pharmacy hope to progress and finally take its rightful place among other professions. The faith of this first president in the influence for good of this organization has, to my mind, been amply justified in the years that have followed. We have progressed slowly but surely. We have seen the apprentice system gradually replaced by systematic training in colleges and I venture to predict that it will not be many years until the experience requirement, for becoming a registered pharmacist, will be wholly discarded and that the colleges will take over this part of the education of the student by well-organized apprenticeship courses. It is the duty of the colleges of pharmacy to encourage and bring about the closest possible relationship with the retail pharmacist. Why isn't it possible to secure the co-operation of these men so that through an organized apprenticeship course their influence may be felt in the training of the student?

Although this conference has been influential in bringing about advancement in pharmaceutical education we must in all seriousness

Retail pharmacists in many instances desire cheap help and the colleges have in the past been willing to turn out poorly trained men in order to furnish cheap help. Such an attitude will never bring pharmacy the recognition that we believe it deserves. Is there any other profession that is satisfied with less than four years of training? Even the profession of business now demands more training than does pharmacy. In most large universities you will find colleges of business administration that require four years of training for a degree. These colleges have ten or more times as many students enrolled as do colleges of pharmacy. If business demands a type of training equal to four years of a regular university course why is it that pharmacy cannot demand similar training?

Is pharmacy a profession, or to be more specific, is pharmacy a "learned profession" is a question that has recently been brought forcibly to the minds of pharmacists. I quote in part from an editorial appearing in the June 1924 number of the *Pacific Drug Review* of Portland, Oregon. The editorial is headed "The



CHARLES W. JOHNSON.

admit that we do not as yet maintain requirements equal to those of other professions nor have we secured the recognition and standing of a profession that pharmacy should have. We know that the public should have a type of specialized service from the pharmacist that is the equal of that received from any other profession. Public health demands this. If pharmacists are to give this service the colleges must turn out graduates with a higher type of training than our present short courses afford.

Learned Professions." It calls attention to "A young Russian pharmacist having relatives and friends in Portland. He had fallen outside the immigration quota for his country and since the law expressly makes exception of members of the learned professions an effort was made to obtain for him the recognition to which in all fairness he was entitled. The telegraphic correspondence concludes with the following from the assistant commissioner-general of immigration at Washington:" "Graduate Pharmacist not recognized as belonging to a learned profession and may not be admitted as such in excess of quota."

The editorial continues to discuss the question but enough has been said to bring to our minds very clearly what other people think of pharmacy as a profession. We believe that pharmacy is a profession that should be classed within the learned group but public officials and the public in general will not take our word for it. We must clearly demonstrate this fact first. There are two organizations that can do much to bring about this much-desired result. They are the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy and this Conference of Pharmaceutical Faculties. It is the hope of some that the Boards of Pharmacy will take the lead in fixing higher standards so that the colleges of pharmacy may safely follow. It is my hope that the Conference may cooperate fully with the Boards so that real progress may be made, but in any case there is nothing to prevent colleges that can do so from going ahead more rapidly than either of these organizations may dictate and clearly defining the profession of pharmacy as nothing short of full four years of training.

In January and February of this year some correspondence was carried on between Dr. Edward Kremers, of the University of Wisconsin, and the U. S. Civil Service Commission regarding the requirements for the position of "pharmacist" in the service of the United States. Dr. Kremers in a letter to the Civil Service Commission referred to announcement No. 11072 concerning examination for pharmacist which set forth the preliminary requirement of graduation from a two-year course. Dr. Kremers urged that the United States could well afford to take the stand that pharmacy is the equal of other professions and that the Civil Service Commission demand a minimum training of at least graduation from a recognized four-year course in pharmacy. I quote the letter as received by Dr. Kremers:

"United States Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D. C.

February 8, 1924

Mr. Edward Kremers,
Director of Pharmacy,
University of Wisconsin,
Madison, Wisconsin.

Sir:

The Commission acknowledges receipt of your letter of January 11, and in reply to the inquiry contained therein makes the following statement.

The prerequisite educational attainments necessary for admittance to the profession of pharmacy are, in general, lower than those required by the medical profession and also lower, in general, than those required for the engineering and chemical professions. Therefore, an equitable comparison of the educational standards for pharmacists could not be made with the educational standards for these other professions.

For your information it is stated that if such a time ever arrives when the majority of the State Boards of Pharmacy require as prerequisite for admittance to the examination for registered pharmacist graduation with a bachelor's degree in pharmacy, the Commission will then give immediate consideration to a revision of its requirements for the position of pharmacist in the Government service.

The Commission thanks you for the interest displayed by your inquiry and assures you that it is ready at all times to consider revisions and welcomes criticisms.

By direction of the Commission:

Very respectfully,
JOHN T. DOYLE, *Secretary.*"

I do not bring these matters to your attention in order to belittle pharmacy. There is no one who has a higher regard for pharmacy than I have. I believe, however, that pharmacy should perform just as high type of service for the public as is possible for any other profession to perform. I believe the public needs this high type of service. It is well, however, for us to face squarely the attitude of practically all public officials and to consider that if public officials have this attitude that the public in general, in all probability, thinks the same. We need, therefore, to take every step possible to correct this very serious condition. We know that the Government does employ men in positions, that demand pharmaceutical training of not less than four years of college, and frequently five or even seven years are demanded. The men holding these positions however, are not labelled "pharmacists." The term "pharmacist" is frequently given to a supply clerk, or a man performing a pharmacist's duties may be called a supply clerk. I suggest that the Conference urge the U. S. Civil Service Commission to use the term "pharmacist" wherever it employs men in positions requiring pharmaceutical training and that we urge the Commission to adopt as its minimum requirement for the position of "pharmacist" graduation from a recognized four-year course in pharmacy. There is no lack of men now fully trained to supply all of the immediate needs of the Government on this basis. Recognition of pharmacy on the part of the United States Government as outlined above is of such great importance to American Pharmacy that I wish to have this matter presented in personal conference rather than by formal letter. If you approve the above recommendation I would further urge that Dr. Edward Kremers be requested to present this matter in personal conference to the U. S. Civil Service Commission at the earliest possible opportunity. We must not overlook any opportunity or any means of having pharmacy clearly labelled by every agency possible as the absolute equal in training and rank of any other profession.

Since writing this address my attention has been called to the proposed classification of pharmacists, by the "Personnel Classification Board" of the U. S. Government, in the sub-professional class along with 7000 sub-professional workers grouped as follows:

Laboratory apprentice, laboratory helper, scientific helper, playground assistant, director of playgrounds, gardener's helper, social worker, educational assistant, scientific illustrator, economic aid, map reproducer, engineering field aid, draftsman, engineering inspector, hospital attendant, dental hygienist, medical technician, psychiatric aid, physio-therapy aid, occupational theory aid, pharmacist, dietitian, nurse, hospital supervisor, training assistant.

Do we wish to have pharmacists remain in this sub-professional class? I wish to point out that pharmacists are themselves to blame for having their profession classed as sub-professional. No one is going to think better of us than we think of ourselves. If we are satisfied with low requirements, the public and all special agencies will classify us as below the standard of a professional class. I believe, however, that we should make vigorous protest against this classification. I therefore recommend that the executive committee be instructed to file a protest with the "Personnel Classification Board" and that we request this board to place "pharmacists" in the professional class. I also suggest that this matter be placed before the American Pharmaceutical Association, the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy and the National Association of Retail Druggists in the hope that concerted action may be had by all branches of organized pharmacy.

You will notice that the main point of my remarks so far is that we should embrace every opportunity and use every influence to have pharmacy definitely catalogued as the equal of other professions. No outside influence affecting American Pharmacy of greater importance has ever come to us than that of the study now being carried on by the Educational Research Committee of the Commonwealth Fund. You will listen to a report of the progress of this study at this session and I believe you will be impressed with the thoroughness of the work that is being done. I believe that this study when completed will have a profound

influence on the future standing of our profession, hence it behooves each individual interested in pharmacy to do his utmost to see that all available data is in the hands of the men making this study so that when the work is completed there can be no criticism regarding the thoroughness of the investigation. I believe the results of this study will have great influence not only on the teaching of pharmacy but also on the present-day retail pharmacist. Pharmacists in each state wish to have their legislative bodies grant them special privileges. They want the shop keeper and the vendor eliminated. They want the drug store clearly defined and they want the sole right to compound, dispense and sell medicines. These special privileges will be granted pharmacists only after it has been clearly shown that pharmacy is a profession and that very special training is necessary in order to properly safeguard the public in the preparation and dispensing of medicines. I am confident that the final outcome of this study will prove to the world many of the things that pharmacists have long contended to be true. This study was initiated a year and a half ago without our knowledge. It is being carried on under the direction of a man who is wholly unbiased either for or against pharmacy. The study is being reviewed from time to time and will finally be passed upon by the Board of Directors of the Commonwealth Fund. The findings, therefore, will have great weight, hence, I wish to urge not only the members of this Conference but also the pharmacists of the United States to render every assistance possible so that this study may be complete in every detail.

It would appear that the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching is in close touch with the Commonwealth Fund and that it will do nothing in regard to the study of the teaching of pharmacy until the Commonwealth study is completed. It is my belief that if pharmacy is clearly defined as a profession by the Commonwealth study that the Carnegie Foundation will immediately take up its part of the study of pharmacy. I do not want to anticipate the report of our committee on the Investigation of Pharmacy by the Carnegie Foundation but I do want to urge that this committee be continued in force and instructed to be ever on the alert to assist in bringing about this investigation on the part of the Carnegie Foundation when the proper time arrives.

The clock hour for the measurement of the amount of laboratory and classroom work of our colleges is to my mind not wholly adequate. The unit or credit hour basis of measurement along with a statement of the minimum amount of clock hours of laboratory and class-room instruction required per year should be in use. I would define a credit hour as one requiring three clock hours of work to earn. A recitation or lecture should require two clock hours of study in preparation and be classed as a credit hour per week. A laboratory period of three hours per week would give the student a credit hour. If two-hour laboratory periods are used, outside preparation in note-book work, or study, should be required to bring the time up to three hours of work for a credit hour. If fifteen credit hours were then taken as the basis for a week's work on the part of the student he would be putting in 45 clock hours of work per week in preparation, recitation, lecture and laboratory. If such a schedule were enforced and a high standard of work required of the student, this Conference would not need to longer worry whether a school was on a three- or a six-day a week schedule. Practically all University schools of pharmacy have this standard of measurement and require a school year of 36 weeks. I believe that the work of all colleges of the Conference should be valued on the basis of the credit hour as herein defined. I therefore recommend this plan to you for your consideration.

Colleges of pharmacy should make provisions for training their students in more than one type of work. There are several different lines of work that pharmaceutically trained men may follow. There are positions in the Government service and in pharmaceutical manufacturing houses where four, five or even seven years of training are demanded and the time is coming when the strictly prescription store will demand similar training. Curricula should be arranged to meet these

conditions. The University of Michigan has led the way in arranging a combined pharmacy and medical curriculum that if followed in other institutions where both pharmacy and medicine is located would be the means of creating a better understanding between pharmacy and medicine and, incidentally, would turn out a better trained medical man. We must not lose sight, however, of the fact that pharmacy colleges exist for the primary purpose of training men for present-day retail pharmacy. We must recognize that retail pharmacy is both a science and a business. We must train men in the first place who will safely, accurately and with understanding be able to prepare and dispense medicines. When that is done we should next train him in business methods so that he may be a financial success as well as a professional success. In most of the large universities there have in recent times been organized colleges of Business Administration. If you will look at the enrollment of these colleges, you will be interested to learn of the number of men and women eager to learn of the profession of business. Ask the dean of any college of Business Administration and he will tell you that business is a profession. If this is true then pharmacy should not be backward in recognizing it. You will find ten times as many students enrolled in colleges of business administration as are enrolled in pharmacy. If modern retail pharmacy demands both scientific and business training, the colleges of pharmacy should be ready to recognize it and arrange curricula to meet the conditions. It is my firm belief that with the three-year course well established we will find students ready to stay in college one more year and earn a real degree. This has been found true in colleges of pharmacy where the three-year course is now well established. I would therefore urge our schools to make full use of the courses as given in colleges of business administration in so far as they can be applied to retail pharmacy and arrange four-year curricula to meet present-day problems of retail pharmacy. Courses in Economics, Psychology, Business Law, Retail Buying Problems, Retail Selling Problems, Advertising, Accounting, Apprenticeship-courses, etc., can all be applied to retail pharmacy. The retail pharmacist needs this training and our colleges should furnish it. Attractive four-year courses which will lead the student to realize that he should go to college at least four years will do much to solve our problem of whether we should in the near future drop the three-year course. I believe that we should instead of trying to legislate too much within this Conference use our energies more in making our courses within our several colleges so attractive that no student will be satisfied with less than four years. As teachers we should continually inspire our students to greater effort and to an ambition for more extensive training instead of allowing them to think that we are satisfied to turn them out only partially prepared. I have found by personal experience that no conflict will develop in arranging different curricula within a college of pharmacy to meet the needs of different students. We must study our students, however, learn their capabilities and know their ambitions and then lead them in the right way and ever hold ahead of them an ideal to strive for.

Colleges of pharmacy should insist on having well-trained teachers. I do not mean that degrees mean much to the old experienced teacher but I do mean that we should not advise four-year graduates that they are ready to take up teaching as a life work. Better urge them to think in terms of the master's and if possible the doctor's degrees as a preparation for teaching. Teachers in other fields are so equipped. Should pharmacy be satisfied with a teacher of less training than is a department of chemistry or a department of foreign language? I believe not, if we are to fully maintain that pharmacy is the equal of any profession or calling. Young men who show ability for teaching will train themselves properly for it, if we do our duty in guiding them for this type of work. Incidentally, this means the development of graduate work that should be a part of every college of pharmacy. Pharmacy located in institutions where the degree of doctor of philosophy is given should insist that pharmacy be granted the right of a major for this degree. I do not know that the Conference as a body can do much to assist in this very im-

portant part of our work except to approve of the principle that only highly trained men be employed on our faculties as teachers.

Our By-Laws provide that a school or college shall have been in existence for five years before making application for membership in this Conference. This is in general a wise provision. We have, however, colleges of pharmacy organized within old and well-established universities that should not be required to wait five years before having some official contact with this body. I would urge, therefore, that we provide for a class of associate members that would allow colleges of the class just mentioned partial recognition. The college should be held to all other requirements of the Conference except the five-year rule. At least one year, possibly two years of existence, should be insisted upon as a requirement for associate membership. If after five years of existence the associate member was not then found worthy of full membership, he should be dropped from our rolls. The associate member should enjoy all the privileges of this Conference except voting and its delegates should not hold office. I believe this type of contact with this Conference would be of great help to the school and in the end materially strengthen our membership.

Our By-Laws also provide that no work of the college shall be done in the manner usually termed as work "in absentia." Since this By-Law was written conditions have materially changed in many of our larger universities. Fourteen universities having colleges of pharmacy holding membership in this Conference have well-established Extension Divisions through which work by correspondence is given and regular university credit allowed. Students may earn credit in English, Foreign Language, History, Psychology, Philosophy, Economics—in fact in practically all departments except where special laboratory equipment is needed. As we advance our curricula to include work in some of these departments and students come to us with credit earned by correspondence in these courses through extension divisions of recognized universities, we are in duty bound to recognize this credit and our By-Laws should not be interpreted to mean that such credit cannot be recognized. I also believe that certain non-laboratory courses in pharmacy may, with perfect justice, be given by correspondence. Students frequently find it necessary to drop out of school for a quarter, a semester or a year in order to earn money to return to school. A course by correspondence would not only keep him in touch with methods of study and his college life, but would lead him to believe that his enforced absence from college was not time wholly wasted. I am not prepared to state just what courses should be allowed to be given by correspondence but I do urge that this Conference recognize present-day methods of education and grant its members the right to make use of their extension divisions for such courses as the college believes it can give with absolute justice to a high standard of scholarship.

I wish to urge upon this Conference, that as we provide for higher standards and more extended requirements, that we try to make our provisions more general rather than more specific. No two schools are working under the same conditions and hence it is difficult to make certain specific requirements that all must follow strictly according to the letter of the law. We should regard that there is honor among colleges as well as among men and we should expect that all colleges of this Conference will honestly strive to do the highest type of work. When we find that a college is not living up to a recognized code of honor then it may be summarily dealt with, but each college should feel itself free to work out its destiny under general restrictions of standards rather than under detailed plans that may fit but few of the members of this Conference. I have endeavored to offer a few suggestions with this idea in mind. I have given no thought as to whether my suggestions will be adopted or not. I believe that if my suggestions are adopted that this Conference will in a measure be strengthened and that greater freedom of action will in certain instances be allowed. My desire is that pharmacy shall be clearly and definitely recognized as a learned profession and that we shall not longer

be placed in the humiliating position of going about telling people that it is so. Agencies are at work that will help us to this end. We must, however, make opportunities and grasp them that we may ourselves hasten this end. I believe this Conference has a great work to perform and I believe it will do it. While we are doing the work of today we must have a vision of tomorrow and strive to attain it, for only by setting a high ideal and then reaching for it will we ever progress. It has been an honor to serve you during the past year. It has been a year full of work and of closer association with many of this body. I have learned much and have thought more deeply than ever before of the problems of our profession. Whatever advancement has been made during the year has been possible only through the work of the committees of this organization. All honor is due the men who give time and money in committee work trying to solve the many problems that confront us. These problems may not be solved to-day but time and effort will solve them tomorrow. That has been the history of this organization now for 24 years. I have absolute faith in its future and in the future of the profession that we represent.

DEATH OF PROF. HENRY KRAEMER.

News of the death of Prof. Henry Kraemer was received before completion of the JOURNAL. He died September 9th, aged 56 years. A sketch will be found on p. 581 of the July JOURNAL A. P. H. A., 1918. Further notice will appear in next issue.



Courtesy of Pharmaceutical Era.

THE PASSING OVER OF A \$25,000 CONTRIBUTION.

Chairman H. A. B. Dunning handing check from William R. Warner & Co. for Headquarters Fund over to Chairman James H. Beal.

LEECHCRAFT IN ANCIENT CHINA.

W. T. Yetts states in a contribution printed in the "Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine" (January 1924) that "The Chou Ritual" contains a detailed account of the state medical service, comprising five departments, under the control of the prime minister, or "officer of heaven." The first of these five was what we may perhaps term the ministry of health, presided over by a chief medical officer (i-shih) whose staff numbered thirty. His functions were to supervise medical practice and pharmacy throughout the state, and himself to treat the emperor and high officials. At the end of each year he put his medical officers through an examination as to their success or failure in treating their patients, and he adjusted their rank (and presumably also their pay) accordingly. Then there was a department, with a personnel of eight, charged with treating the maladies of the common people. Another separate medical department was that concerned with abscesses, ulcers and other septic conditions. The fourth department was composed of two medical officers charged with supervision of the imperial dietary. This elaborate state medical service existed during the Chou period from about 1100 to 300 B. C.—Through *Journal A. M. A.*