opportunity of doing so at a trifling cost of one dollar per year from each registered pharmacist. For this amazingly small sum we not only insure each one of us against sickness and impoverished old age, but in doing so, create a *National Pharmacy Welfare Fund* that will show the world how we do things in America.

This fund should find a home in the Pharmacy Headquarters, from whence will flow loving sympathy and practical help for those who are sick, incapacitated through old age or other causes.

In this spirit of "one for all—and all for one" we can add more dignity and respect for our profession and incidentally to each member of the profession who may go about his business feeling that should misfortunes or sickness overcome him or poverty stare him in the face in his old age, a nation-wide body of his brethen stand willing and ready to provide relief and a permanent assistance.

Should this national appeal to the common sense and dignity of our brethren result in action being taken and a committee be proposed, the writer requests that a capable man be picked out as chairman, as he neither deserves this honor nor would he be able to cope with the work entailed, because of age and physical infirmities.

The seed is planted—having the germ of human kindness and sympathy all ready for growth—a growth that may be made to produce the richest fruits for the benefit of our distressed brothers. Independent of a Pharmacy Flag—this National Pharmacy Welfare Fund should be made possible so that *American* pharmacy can function in self respect, dignity and benevolence.

Pharmacy should care for its own!

### WHY CANDIDATES FAIL STATE BOARD EXAMINATIONS.\*

A STUDY IN DISTRICT NO. 3.

### BY RUDOLPH H. RAABE.

When it became generally known that a very high percentage of the graduates of recognized colleges of pharmacy were failing in the State examinations, steps were taken to learn, if possible, the causes of these failures. Plans were made whereby the state examining boards and the colleges could have joint conferences on matter of pharmaceutical interest. One of the first problems discussed was "failures in the state examinations."

In Ohio, the joint conferences between the State boards of pharmacy and the colleges proved very helpful. It gave the examiners an excellent opportunity to get the viewpoint of the colleges and *vice versa*; much good resulted. Discussions along this line in the district and national meetings also proved to be highly worth while and very helpful.

Inasmuch as these discussions (district, state and national) did not reach the instructors in our colleges in the most forceful form, or, perhaps, did not reach them at all, your humble servant decided he would bring this matter to the attention of his teaching staff by placing the following circular and questionnaire before them:

<sup>\*</sup> Section on Education and Legislation, A. Ph. A., Rapid City meeting, 1929.

## To the Instructors of Pharmacy Students:

Efficiency of college graduates (pharmacy) again requires our attention.

Young men and women, the sons and daughters of no mean parentage, come to us well recommended by high school authorities and in many instances by others of good repute. These same young men and women pursue their objective until they satisfactorily complete a prescribed course of study...then comes commencement...state examination...field of practice.

No attempt will be made at this time to further study our responsibilities respecting successes or failures in the field of practice. This study will be limited to the failures in state examinations.

Do you believe that all graduates of reputable schools of pharmacy should be able to pass the state examinations on first attempt?

Do you believe that the failure of a graduate in a state examination indicates that the instructor is inefficient?

Approximately 40 per cent of all college graduates fail state board examinations. What is wrong?

May we have your assistance in answering these questions? Early replies directed to the Dean or personal conferences will greatly aid this office in giving the true viewpoint of our staff of instructors on these questions.

(Signed) RUDOLPH H. RAABE.

The questionnaire created much interest and most of the instructors wanted a conference with his Dean before answering the questions, feeling perhaps that a diversity of answers may lead to wrong outside impressions. They were told that these questions had been discussed in state, district and national meetings and that now we wanted the opinion of each member of the teaching staff on these questions. Nothing was said in the private conferences that would in any manner have any influence upon the answers. Each member of the staff seriously and earnestly discussed the questions; each one felt that these were very important questions and that it was a very serious piece of business.

Because of the wholesome stimulation thus far created by the questionnaire and for the interesting replies received, it was deemed advisable to enlarge the field of inquiry. In response to this desire five copies of the questionnaire were sent to each of the Colleges of Pharmacy in Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, hoping that the questionnaire would be of interest to them and that a tabulation of these opinions would be sent to them if they would be kind enough to assist in getting the data to us.

Inasmuch as the state boards are vitally interested in this phase of pharmacy and that they could reasonably be expected to assist in this work, the questionnaire was sent to each member of the Board of the states just mentioned.

Number of questionnaires sent to State Boards	30
Number of questionnaires sent to Colleges	85
Total	115
Number of replies from State Board members	19
Number of replies from College faculty members	31
Total	50

Answers to first question (Pass state examinations on first attempt?)

Boards. Colleges. Total.

Yes, 14; No, 5 Yes, 14; No, 17 Yes, 28; No, 22

Colleges.

Total.

3

8

3

8

Boards.

Answers to second question (Instructors inefficient?)

Y	es, 0; No, 19	Yes, 0; No, 31		Yes, 0; No, 50		
Answ	ers to third question (	What is wrong?)		<i>a</i>	<b>.</b>	
			Boards.	Colleges.	Total.	
a.	High School not suffi	cient	. 2	2	4	
ь.	One year pre-pharma	cy course	. 2	0	2	
c.	Faculty experience		. 5	0	5	
d.	Nervousness at Board	d examination	. 5	9	14	
<b>e</b> .	Faculty grammar sch	iool	. 2	3	5	
f.	Student satisfied with	n minimums	. 7	3	10	
g.	Colleges too lenient.		. 2	6	8	
h.	Nothing wrong		. 1	0	1	
i.	Poor judgment		. 5	1	6	
j.	Low standards for en	trance	. 1	4	5	
k.	Individual himself		. 1	1	<b>2</b>	
l.	Colleges too ethical.	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	. 1	0	1	
m.	Colleges don't give re	eviews for examinations	. 2	1	3	
n.	Boards ask practical	questions	. 1	0	1	
0.	Unfavorable social lif	e	. 2	0	<b>2</b>	
þ.	Field too large		. 0	2	<b>2</b>	
q.	Boards and colleges of	lo not have same viewpoint	. 0	12	12	
<u>r</u> .	Ambiguous questions		. 0	3	3	
<b>s</b> .	Unfair questions	,	. 0	3	3	
t.	Teach more pharmac	eutical chemistry	. 0	1	1	

Many of the replies to the questionnaire have elaborate answers. A few of the following quotations will serve to illustrate:

#### Boards:

w. Boards not up-to-date...... 0

# Colleges:

<sup>&</sup>quot;Failure to pass the examinations the second or third try may reflect on the school."

<sup>&</sup>quot;Passing state board examination lies entirely with the student."

<sup>&</sup>quot;I do not believe in cram courses but I think the college owes it to the student to give some attention to training the man so that the knowledge he has can be used to answer board questions."

<sup>&</sup>quot;Have more failures in college and less failures in State examinations."

<sup>&</sup>quot;The fault is undoubtedly due to the instruction somewhere."

<sup>&</sup>quot;Colleges do not grade close enough."

<sup>&</sup>quot;High School graduation hardly prepares for study of pharmacy."

<sup>&</sup>quot;Viewpoint of examiners and instructors do not coincide."

<sup>&</sup>quot;Lack of coördination between college curriculum and Board examination."

<sup>&</sup>quot;Consistent failures in any one branch is a clear indication of inefficiency of the instructor."

<sup>&</sup>quot;Habit of graduating students on the basis of attendance rather than on scholarship."

<sup>&</sup>quot;Weed these individuals out early." (Poorly prepared.)

<sup>&</sup>quot;They (Board members) may not have more than a minimum education. Usually their education was obtained some years before and they have not kept 'up-to-date.' Boards are to be congratulated in some instances for keeping unfits out of the profession."

<sup>&</sup>quot;As far as I know only two of our graduates have failed since 1898."

<sup>&</sup>quot;A preconceived correct answer, right from candidate's viewpoint and wrong from that of the examiner's."

"Lack of appreciation on the part of the student of the vast amount of material he must cover. In consequence he fails to keep his work up. Then in the last few weeks he starts in a wild effort to cram up on all his work. As a result he has a great mass of material which gives him a bad case of mental and confused indigestion."

"The fault lies...with the fundamental principle of education...the student now goes on through high school and even through college....Any instructor recognizes this but what instructor will fail half his own class?"

#### CONCLUSIONS.

A careful study of the answers and comments in the replies to the questionnaire leads to the following conclusions:

- 1. Preliminary education and training may be at fault.
- 2. Conservative entrance standards should be carefully observed.
- 3. Students who are indifferent toward their college work should be dropped.
- 4. Joint conferences between Boards and Colleges should be established.
- 5. Applicants for registration should not feel that they are about to receive the "Third Degree."
- 6. State Examiners should be fully conscious of the trust reposed in them and to be able to ask such questions as will enable them to properly judge the candidate.
  - 7. The cause of failure lies not with any particular group.

# ABSTRACT OF DISCUSSION.

In reply to a question relative to the percentage of failures, the author stated that in the district dealt with, the percentage ranges around 40 per cent.

- F. W. Meissner was of the opinion that deficiency in preliminary education contributed largely to failures. He was of the opinion that in examinations there were quite a number who had been unsuccessful in previous trials.
- A. H. Clark said that conferences of board members and members of faculties are helpful in correcting matters of the kind under discussion.

Chairman Winne referred to the proposal for postgraduate study to be established under the direction of the N. A. B. P. He asked Professor Cook to speak of cooperative study with faculty members.

Responding, the latter said that the study by members of boards could be supplemented by laboratory demonstrations and talks in colleges near to where the board examinations were being held; the coöperation of boards and colleges would prove helpful.

Chairman Winne supplemented the remarks of the foregoing speaker, stating that board members would gain by such conferences in renewing their knowledge on a number of subjects and gaining knowledge of subjects which have more recent application.

- A. H. Clark, said that a dinner affords an occasion for discussing subjects in which both board members and teachers are interested.
- F. W. Meissner was of the opinion that all board members should be members of the American Pharmaceutical Association; that the discussions, such as this, are helpful to all participants and it is hardly possible to have such opportunities otherwise.

Louis Emanuel agreed with Professor Clark. He was of the opinion that much information could be derived if, out of an examination, the papers of a certain number who had made highest marks, a like number of those who had just made passing grade and a like number who had made the poorest records were submitted for study by members of boards and members of faculties. He thought this would be a postgraduate subject of profitable interest.

The author of the paper was of the opinion that the candidates' papers are sometimes marked according to the method employed, whether U. S. P., whereas another method given may deserve favorable marking.

Leonard O'Connell suggested that careful study of board questions sometimes indicates that more weight is given to isolated fact data than to the principles upon which the work depends.