

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

Room 101, Law Building, Monday, March 27, 1950

The Faculty Senate convened in special session at 3:40 p.m. on Monday, March 27, 1950, in Room 101 of the Law Building. Twenty-seven members were present, with President McCormick presiding.

FIVE-YEAR PHARMACY CURRICULUM, REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON: Dr. Solve, Chairman of the special committee appointed to study the proposed five-year program in Pharmacy, called attention to the published report of the Committee. This report quoted the resolution published in the Pharmaceutical Survey of 1948 as follows:

"That, by the extension to four years of the period of formal education and training, and by securing recognition, on a country-wide scale, of this as a standard preparation, prerequisite for examination and licensure, the professional status of pharmacy has been strengthened and safeguarded. The steps immediately ahead for further progress appear to be, (1) continued better selection of students, and (2) the focusing of the attention of the colleges and schools of pharmacy to securing the maximum professional results from the established four years of preparation. At the same time those institutions, adequately equipped, staffed and supported, may be encouraged to adopt plans (a) for enabling students to secure specialized preparation for professional services other than for the characteristic retail drug store, (b) for the setting up of programs of study, on a sound graduate level, with special reference to the effective qualification of students for teaching and research, and (c) for enriching the period of undergraduate instruction."

Dr. Solve explained that any requirement establishing a five- or six-year program in Pharmacy could be effected only by a change in the By-Laws of the American Association of Pharmaceutical Colleges and that action could not be taken before the meeting in April of 1950. Also quoted from the Survey in connection with the statement of aims and ideals was the following:

"The pharmacist must be a professional man who understands thoroughly what he is doing, who comprehends the scientific bases of drugs and drug action, who is able to evaluate critically the products he handles, who is competent to advise physicians and members of the other health professions concerning drugs and their uses, who works at his profession creatively and advances its service.

"Those who are concerned that pharmacy shall continue as a profession in fact recognize the changing character of much of the work of the pharmacist. They are thinking of how pharmaceutical service will be provided in the next quarter of a century when medical and other forms of health service will become more generally available than at present. Under the new arrangements for various types of medical centers and stations the pharmacist will play an increasingly important role. He will be thrown into intimate professional contact with members of the other health professions in ways that are now found chiefly in hospital pharmacies."

The Committee's report, however, suggested that there is a limit to the scientific education necessary for one whose ambition is to become proprietor of a small town or community drugstore.

The report also included a summary showing the material and amount of work required for the degree in pharmacy. Of thirteen institutions checked, all but two have four-year programs leading to a B.S. in Pharmacy. Six have graduate degrees of M.S. in Pharmacy and/or Ph.D. degrees for work given in the Graduate Colleges of those institutions. The University of Southern California is reported to be changing to a six-year program, beginning in September, 1950, without going through the five-year stage. It has, at the same time, arranged to abandon its four-year degree program. Idaho State College went to a six-year program in pharmacy this year. Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska, went into a five-year program last September. Oregon State College goes to a five-year program in 1951, Montana State in 1952.

At the San Francisco meeting of the AACP, a resolution was adopted approving in principle the proposed optional six-year program in pharmacy. That gathering also adopted the following:

"Be it further resolved, that the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy authorize the member schools to offer the Doctor of Pharmacy degree for a six-year course of study, and direct the appropriate Committee to provide any necessary changes in the Constitution and By-Laws."

At the Jacksonville meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy (reported in A.J.P.E., July, 1949) the following resolutions were adopted:

"BE IT RESOLVED that after the fall enrollment of 1955, no students be accepted by member colleges for enrollment in a four-year curriculum leading to the degree of Bachelor of Science in Pharmacy; and that, beginning with the fall enrollment of 1956, all member colleges of the A.A.C.P. require two years of collegiate instruction, comprising a minimum of 64 semester hours, or their equivalent, of specified and elective subjects for admission to a professional curriculum in Pharmacy comprising four years of collegiate instruction of not less than 128 semester hours, or their equivalent.

"RESOLVED that it is our opinion that the adoption of the above resolution is tantamount to a change in the membership eligibility requirements as stated in the Constitution and By-Laws. Such a change requires advance notice to the member colleges and we recommend that the Executive Committee arrange to have the necessary changes in the By-Laws sent to the member colleges in sufficient time to permit a roll-call vote at the next annual meeting of the Association.

"BE IT RESOLVED that such member colleges as have the facilities and staff be encouraged to inaugurate a six-year program at the earliest possible date.

"The Committee on Resolutions approved this recommendation and moved its adoption. Carried."

The following objectives for the six-year program were set up by the Curriculum Committee in the report at the Jacksonville meeting:

1. A high level of professional education
2. Training for business
3. Education for citizenship
4. Preparation for graduate study
5. Opportunity for specialization in one of the accepted branches of professional activity

The report also stated that a poll taken of Deans of Colleges of Pharmacy showed wide diversion of opinion regarding the length and kind of program preferred.

"50 out of 65 deans replied.

"21 deans were in favor of retaining the four-year program and gave no indication of considering any other plan.

"9 more did not contemplate a change immediately but indicated a longer program was desirable. They were divided as to whether a 2-3 or a 2-4 program was more desirable.

"2 deans expressed a preference for a 1-4 program in the immediate future.

"7 deans favored a 2-3 program by 1953.

"11 deans expressed a first choice for a 2-4 program sometime before 1960."

The report further stated that: "The Arizona State Board of Pharmacy is important both as an examining and licensing body, and also as an accrediting agency. A pertinent paragraph from the Arizona Code, 1939, follows:

"Section 67-1508: Examination and registration of licentiates in pharmacy--
Qualifications.--Every applicant for examination and registration as a licentiate in pharmacy shall be not less than twenty-one (21) years of age, of good moral character and temperate habits, a graduate of a school or college of pharmacy, or department of pharmacy of a university recognized by the board of pharmacy and shall file proof satisfactory to the board, substantiated by proper affidavits, of sufficient service and experience in a retail pharmacy under the supervision of a licentiate in pharmacy to make a total, together with actual time of college attendance, of at least four (4) years of pharmaceutical training, and shall pass an examination satisfactory to the board of pharmacy; provided, that in all cases the actual time of attendance at a school or college of pharmacy or a department of pharmacy of a university to be credited on the required four (4) years of pharmaceutical training shall not exceed three (3) years."

"A letter from the Secretary of the Arizona State Board explains that the statement 'at least four (4) years of pharmaceutical training,' not more than three of which shall be at a college or university, sets up the minimum. The regulations of the Arizona State Board provide that 'a candidate must be a graduate of a school or college of pharmacy, recognized and accredited by the American Council on Pharmaceutical Education and must have obtained the degree of Bachelor of Science in Pharmacy from a school or college of pharmacy and in addition the candidate must have had not less than one year of practical experience in conformance with the requirements for apprenticeship training as set forth by the Board of Pharmacy.'

"Presumably, the Arizona Board would change its requirement to another degree, plus one year of experience, should the B.S. in Pharmacy be abandoned. "The Arizona Board of Pharmacy," writes Mr. Newell Stewart, "and the American Pharmaceutical Association are both desirous of a lengthened course of instruction..."

The five-year program upon which the Senate was asked to vote at its last meeting appeared to be rather hastily extemporized, the report stated. There appeared to be overlapping between courses to be offered by the College of Pharmacy with those in other departments. In short, the report stated, it appears that the College of Pharmacy is organizing as a self-sufficient unit that, except for the basic sciences, does not intend to make use of subjects already taught in other departments.

"The proposed one-four Pharmacy program has very little in it but basic science and pharmacy. It achieves no more than the present four-year course in liberalizing the offerings and makes no advance toward certain objectives set up by the Curriculum Committee of the National Association, such as 'Training for business' and 'Education for citizenship.'

"It is more concentrated than the programs of any of the colleges whose catalogues were examined by our Committee. It does not seem to fit the needs of the graduate who may find employment in the drug store at Benson or Tombstone."

In summary of its general statements and in consideration of its findings the committee report was completed as follows:

"Summary:

- "1. The American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy is, in a period of ten years, trying to create a learned profession out of what was only yesterday a trade. As a long-range program the ambition may be laudable, but it does not seem realistic, because it seems to forget that most graduates will continue to be employed in the corner drug store, will at least serve several years in that capacity, at a low salary.
- "2. Only a few universities have anything more than a four-year program; some, such as the University of Iowa, offer the M.S. and the Ph. D. in Pharmacy in the graduate school.
- "3. The six-year program is not mandatory until 1956 and according to the Curriculum Committee report at Jacksonville needs further study. The By-Laws of the A.A.C.P. Still have to be amended before the six-year program becomes a requisite for membership.
- "4. The program at Arizona needs further study and revision. The five-year plan presented to the Senate for approval is unworkable in its present form.

"Conclusion:

"The accreditation of the pharmacy college of this university is not in jeopardy. It already exceeds the minimum requirements of the Arizona State Board of Pharmacy, although that body favors an extension of the program.

"In a letter to Louis C. Zopf, Secretary-Treasurer of A.A.C.P., dated March 8, the following questions were asked:

- (a) After 1956, will the six-year (two-four) program leading to the Doctor of Pharmacy be necessary for full accreditation?
- (b) Will the four-year program leading to the B.S. in Pharmacy continue to be acceptable for accreditation, or will the four-year program be abandoned?
- (c) For approval of the six-year program, will there be specific requirements in the first two years concerning the inclusion of liberal arts and business administration courses?
- (d) In the interval between the present and 1956, what will be the status of the four-year colleges of pharmacy as to accreditation?

"A reply dated March 18 states: 'The curriculum committee has recommended to the association the adoption of a two-four program. It is the thinking of the committee that the two years will be listed as pre-pharmacy years and that the four years will be confined to the professional curriculum.'

"The resolutions of the Jacksonville meeting are then repeated, after which follows: 'The association will vote at the annual meeting at Atlantic City, April 30, May 1st and 2nd on proposals to change the constitution and By-Laws which will permit member colleges to award the degree of Doctor of Pharmacy (Phar. D.) upon the completion of the six-year curriculum. They will also consider the recommendations as outlined in the above paragraph.'

"The recommendations referred to are the Jacksonville proposals given earlier in the report. The answers to the questions above are inconclusive or not given, probably because the whole matter has to wait upon the vote at Atlantic City.

"We must conclude therefore that the part of wisdom for this university is to wait. We are in no danger of losing anything we have. There is no reason why Arizona, but lately in the field of Pharmacy, should lead the procession. There is no evidence to show that the pharmacy accreditation group has any authority to push us into a five-year or a six-year program. Probably the Atlantic meeting will give such authority and probably it will clear up a number of other things.

"Many of us have opposed major changes in curricula except in years when a catalogue is printed; 1950-51 is not a catalogue year. Notice a year or two in advance should be given prospective students of the inauguration of important degree requirements, a procedure that the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy wisely observes in setting the date for change-over to 1956.

"Because of these many facts, your Committee recommends that no action on change of curriculum be recommended to the Regents by the Senate at the present time; that the College of Pharmacy be asked to prepare a five-year plan and, if they wish, a six-year plan, in accord with the developments and resolutions that will come out of the Atlantic City meeting next month, to be submitted to the usual committee procedure for the next catalogue."

Dr. Solve made a motion, which was seconded by Dr. Cardon, that the Senate approve the recommendation of the Committee as found in the last paragraph, with the condition that the invitation to submit the five- or six-year plan be without commitment on the part of the Senate.

In reply to the report, Dean Lyman, reading from a prepared statement, pointed out that quotations included in the report without direct relation to the context lacked significance. He stated that apparently the Committee made no effort to obtain information from qualified professional men. No member of his office was consulted in connection with the committee's study. In substance, the proposed program raises the question of whether or not the entrance requirements to Pharmacy shall be increased and the College of Pharmacy permitted to add to its professional courses.

Dean Lyman emphasized the fact that the program in Pharmacy has not been hastily extemporized, and he took definite exception to the statement that the College of Pharmacy is intending to organize as a self-sufficient unit.

He further pointed out that pharmacy is basically medicine and that the curriculum in pharmacy has been developing over a period of many years to meet increasing demands on the profession. It was necessary, he declared, that the pharmacist in the small town be as adequately prepared for his professional work as the pharmacist in the large city.

Dean Lyman reported in connection with the accreditation of the College of Pharmacy that such an approval had been given largely in consideration of the plan to have Arizona's program in pharmacy extended first to a five-year curriculum and then to a six-year plan. He felt that there was no good reason to defer the extension of the present four-year curriculum and that failure to do so would be a backward step. The plan, he emphasized, was one which conformed to the progressive thinking in the profession, and it was his opinion that the Senate should accept the judgment of the faculty of Pharmacy in determining policy.

Dr. Nugent stated that, while many colleges were satisfied to require a somewhat synthetic course of preparation in Pharmacy, Dean Lyman since coming to the University had insisted on substantial preparation for students going into the profession. The four-year program, according to Dr. Nugent, offers no real opportunity for inclusion of the humanities, social studies, business courses, and electives. He felt that the pharmacist should be a well-educated person and suggested that, if the Senate elected to deny the request for a five-year program as proposed, such a program be approved with provision for final determination of a proper curriculum.

Dean Harvill stated that Dean Lyman had always desired that his pharmacy students take advantage of all possible courses in other colleges and that he preferred to have his students compete with the students in other colleges rather than to have special sections for pharmacy students in science and other courses. It was Dean Harvill's opinion, however, that there were some courses given by other departments which might offer in sufficient amount the material required by the Pharmacy College, specifically work in chemistry and in bacteriology.

Dr. Roberts commended the Committee on an excellent report and Dean Lyman on his zeal in behalf of pharmacy. He stated that he had served on the original committee to found the School of Pharmacy and at that time nothing was ever said about considering anything but a four-year plan. He also felt that persons other than experts in a field were qualified to judge a curriculum in that field. The five-year plan as presented, he pointed out, has no more elective credits than are now allowed in the four-year plan. He also called to the attention of the Senate the fact that the AAFC resolution proposed a five-year optional program.

Dean Lyman again reiterated the fact that the pre-pharmacy year was in the hands of the Liberal Arts College. The Pharmacy faculty merely suggested that a year of the basic sciences be given, along with the first year of chemistry.

Dr. Solve told of speaking with several druggists on this matter. He found that they were absolutely opposed to the five- or six-year plan. They felt that in most cases the remuneration is insufficient. However, they did feel that further work on the graduate level should be offered for those who wish to continue.

Dr. Roberts pointed out that the maximum salary for a pharmacist for the government is \$3777. He felt that this was a small return for six years of college study. Upon questioning as to the prevailing rate a pharmacist is paid, Dean Lyman told of an instance where Mr. Newell Stewart had told a druggist he would have to pay \$350 a month for a pharmacist.

President McCormick reported, in response to a comment by Dr. Roberts, that an accrediting committee had been set up by the joint membership of the Association of State Universities, the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, and the American Council on Education which will have as its purpose the

examination of accrediting agencies in order to determine which of these should be recognized.

The President then spoke of the high esteem in which Dean Lyman is held by the University faculty as well as by members of his profession all over the country and congratulated Dean Lyman on the fine program in pharmacy which has been established in the University and which in a short time has achieved noteworthy recognition.

The question being called for, the motion deferring action on any five- or six-year program in pharmacy was passed.

STATE RETIREMENT ACT, REVIEW OF: President McCormick reported briefly on the status of the Retirement Act which was included in the Governor's call for the special session of the Legislature. He explained that three bills which had been prepared never got farther than the Committee.

A suit has been instituted to determine the Constitutionality of the Act, and the State Supreme Court has indicated that it will give the case some priority in order to have its findings available prior to the next meeting of the Legislature. A point particularly at issue has to do with the status of city and county employees.

There was a suggestion, according to the President, that if nothing is done at the next legislative session to implement the Act, an appropriation should be made so that the University can withdraw its contributions plus 4% interest, in order to return to the Teachers' Annuity plan without any loss.

In response to a question by the President, the Senate expressed itself as being favor of a general faculty meeting, in order that members of the faculty can be informed regarding the status of the Retirement Act.

Answering a question put by Dr. Roberts, President McCormick further stated that the measure might be put on the ballot again as an initiative measure.

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.


C. Zaner Leshner
Secretary

mle