Hiestand-Moore (E. M.)

REFORM IN THE GOVERNMENT OF MEDICAL SCHOOLS.

BY

ELEANOR M. HIESTAND-MOORE, M.D.,

WOODBURY, N. J.

From the Proceedings of the Twenty-first Annual Meeting, Alumnæ Association of the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, May, 1896.

REFORM IN THE GOVERNMENT OF MEDICAL SCHOOLS.

By ELEANOR M. HIESTAND-MOORE, M.D.,
WOODBURY, N. J.

In opening the subject of reform in the government of medical schools, as a premise to this argument, I assume that the fallibility of all human institutions, however well established and dear to our affections, is nevertheless freely granted. Nor do I anticipate any opposition to the claim that in the higher evolution of schools for teaching the theory and practice of medicine the perfect type of this specialization is not yet matured. Unfortunately, the law of natural selection is not freely operative in the perpetuation of professional schools. Poorly qualified students who are turned away from the front doors, guarded by an examiner, are by systems of probation and cramming smuggled in the back doors, and spurred upon a career for which they are manifestly unfit, or, being banished from one school, they fly to another less punctilious institution where diplomas are worried out of the faculty with greater ease. By dint of such patronage it is not only the fittest that survive. On the contrary, is it not true that many schools where a rigorous examination is required for entrance and a high measure of scholarship is the price of a diploma—is it not true that many such schools exist only because they are nourished by the full diet of private endowment? It is with a knowledge of the honorable poverty of many institutions whose high aims have never been realized simply because there was no money for the purpose; it is with deep sympathy for the irksome economies forced upon some of our best-intentioned faculties that I shall refrain from all cheap expressions of aspiration toward many of the splendid luxuries of science teaching which only a few of our more fortunate institutions can afford. Criticisms of that character can be dismissed with the rejoinder: Give us the money and we will give you the results. I shall, therefore, wait till the day of endowment dawns ere I say that we need better facilities for teaching, laboratories more completely appointed, not larger, but containing fewer students or more demonstrators; that we need gymnasiums, endowed chairs for special science training, and many other things.

It is my purpose to deal here with matters wholly practical, with reforms which depend for their accomplishment only upon a proper appreciation of their urgency and a desire for their fruition. In formulating the conclusions I am about to express, I have been guided by an experience of five years' teaching in a medical school in the capacity of demonstrator and instructor. During this term of service I have considered well certain phenomena occurring within my range of vision, and I shall endeavor to interpret those phenomena, comparing them with like manifestations elsewhere. In thus venturing to postulate reforms indicated by my humble experience, I make bold to say that one holding such a position as I have held has a special coigne of vantage for observing the reactions of that complicated organism we call student's mind, and that environment of knowledge of which the faculty is a concrete expression.

The importance of this subject of reform in the government of medical schools must be manifest to all alumnæ. I will leave to conscience an apprehension of the higher ethical grounds for our interest in this matter, and I shall speak only in defence of policy; for, if we can find no other motive, is it not true that every step which a college takes toward power and fame sets a new seal of honor on the diplomas of its graduates? Conversely, degradation of the alma mater would mean degradation to every graduate, and thus it is that in spite of passing years, in spite of the estrangement which absence and preoccupation too often foster, the interest of every medical graduate is indissolubly united to those of the college from which she or he had her or his degree.

In considering the relations of alumnæ to their colleges I have been impressed by the fact that the part of this particular association of alumnæ is not performed as it should be. What do we do individually or collectively to advance in a material way the interests of the college? What action do we ever take in the administration of its affairs? I have in mind one particular sin of omission upon which I have often reflected and spoken. It has been a matter for much curious speculation why it is that the college is so rarely made a beneficiary under the wills of charitable persons. The University of Pennsylvania accumulates endowments with enviable skill; Jefferson and even the Medico-Chirurgical College have a genius for getting appropriations, while in other cities the instances are multiplied to hundreds. But in the many years we have existed as an institution, how few legacies have fallen to our lot! We have always struggled in the mire of poverty; yet are we not in some measure to blame for our own impecuniosity? Perhaps there are not so many of our alumnæ as yet in a position to confer great benefactions on their own account—perhaps there will be much to rejoice over when the wills of some of our graduates

have been probated—but the needs of the present are urgent. Many women physicians who owe our alma mater an inextinguishable debt are called from time to time to attend upon rich patients with whom a word of suggestion would work wonders. How many of us have been sufficiently zealous to remind a generous testator of the existence of the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania and of its crying needs? When we hear people talk of the superior advantages of this and the other school, at Paris, Vienna, Zürich, or elsewhere, why not mildly suggest that if we had the money we could do what they have done? All things considered, the standard of a school depends more upon money than anything else. Does not the duty of securing money depend more upon the alumnæ than upon anyone else? Who will support our alma mater, if not her own children? Moreover, we should, I think, have a more active part in the administration of college affairs. At least two of the members of the Board of Corporators should be alumnæ. The most able and disinterested service of non-professional men and women can never accomplish singly the ends to be gained by association with individuals trained by experience to a point of view which can be attained only by persons having a medical education. The presence of two alumnæ on the Board of Corporators would facilitate the advantageous settlement of many questions which could not otherwise be fully deliberated. The senior alumna on the Board should then be made *ex officio* a member of the Executive Committee, while the junior alumna should be empowered to act for her in her absence. The importance of this kind of representation has been generally recognized in literary colleges. The alumnæ of Vassar College worked for fifteen years for representation in the Board of Trustees, and finally got it. This was at a time when the executive ability of women was still awaiting the demonstration now completed. If we had a Board of Corporators so constituted, it might be possible to secure a definition of its function, which seems now somewhat in dispute. As matters stand to-day, the faculty is constrained to dispose of much business, and the Corporators administer upon questions relating to the college-work. A better apportionment of duties might certainly be made if all matters relevant to the teaching of students and their graduation were left entirely to the Faculty, while the business was relegated to the Corporators. There is an immense amount of friction in the mechanism of a college, and it is a strain unfairly put upon those who carry the heavy weight of routine medical teaching. I am prepared to lay this down as a rule of general application. The faculties of medical schools have not the time, even if they have the ability, to attend to executive matters. The members of a medical faculty are men or women chosen for their ability and experience in special fields. These are the first and greatest requirements. Some-

times it happens and sometimes it does not happen that the celebrated physician becomes a great teacher, but the presumption is not always favorable. I speak as one who was lectured to for ten years in four different colleges where my spirit was much chastened by speech. It is quite unreasonable to suppose, unlike other creatures, a professor can be all things to all men. Business ability may crown his or her higher gifts, or it may not. It is certainly a mistake to assume that it always will. But even if a college faculty were always certain to be thus doubly endowed, it is a mistake in mental economy to charge it with business affairs when every precious moment is necessary either for the actual work of teaching, or for the still more laborious task of getting ready to teach. It is difficult to express what an endless labor lies before the conscientious lecturer who wades through floods of contemporaneous literature honestly endeavoring to keep up with the times. That such an one should be harassed to death by the *res augusta domi* of the college is certainly a mistake. Furthermore, if there were never any doubt within whose jurisdiction a matter properly fell, business would be more speedily executed; questions would not be shuttlecocked back and forth between the functionating bodies, and lost, as they sometimes are, in the swamp of executive etiquette. The order of precedence in faculties and boards of corporators is much more complicated than it is among the British peerage. A better state of affairs would certainly be brought about by leaving all matters which in any way concern the teaching of students, their grades, examinations, and the granting of diplomas, exclusively to the faculty. The election of professors and teachers should also devolve exclusively upon the faculty, inasmuch as they alone have the knowledge necessary to a wise choice. If, however, the existing methods continue, the presence of two alumnæ on the Board of Corporators would be a great gain in advantage.

While touching upon this subject of the election of instructors, I desire to say that personally I am opposed to that form of indulgence which gives preference to any applicant for position on the mere ground that she is a woman and a graduate of our College. Should there at any time arise a contest so close that these points alone turn the balance of favor, it might be just to consider them, but under ordinary circumstances such claims do not deserve serious recognition. What we want in our college appointments is the service of women or men who are best qualified to do the work they have undertaken, be they white or black, American or Sandwich Islanders. I am certainly in favor of encouraging women, and of honoring our own distinguished alumnæ, but only so far as their merits warrant. If a man presents himself and he be better qualified to teach than another applicant who is a woman, let us by all means have the man. We cannot consider the glory of

the incumbent more than the good of those who are to be taught. We have long insisted that there is no sex in medicine, and yet at this point we are tending to an apotheosis of the sex feminine which looks a little like vanity. Should not our pride forbid us to accept indulgence of this kind? Our dignity as women physicians asks only for justice. We must beware lest the egotism of sex should blind us. To be truly worthy of our high calling, we must be like that Junius Brutus who condemned to death his own son, seeking only the glory of Rome.

Suppose then that a teacher be fitly chosen, how shall he or she be remunerated? Has it ever occurred to you that there is something repugnant to taste in the prevailing system of many colleges which grants to professors a percentage on every ticket sold? It has always brought the mercantile idea so prominently before my mind that the lecturer dispensing tickets reminds me of a drummer selling goods on commission. This purely æsthetic objection is not, however, advanced as an argument for abolishing the custom and assigning to each professor a fixed salary. The system condemns itself by its manifest opportunities for abuse. Wherever it obtains, an increase of students means a raise in the salary of each professor, and *vice versâ*. It is not to be supposed, therefore, that a faculty so maintained can give utterly unbiassed support or opposition to any measure involving the question of the number of students to be admitted. How could any human being legislate with perfect fairness against himself? Suppose a professor in a department involving much descriptive teaching of an elementary character, should consider it advisable to relegate much of that work to a requirement for entrance. Could he be expected to advocate strongly a measure which would practically legislate him out of his chair? Being honest in his aims, would he not prefer to be so placed in relation to his salary that no temptation of self-interest nor taint of suspicion could disturb him in the exercise of his judgment? The system of ticket-tax as a revenue for professors should be abolished, moreover, because it discriminates unfairly against the more progressive members of a faculty. Consider once more the case of our professor of elementary science; suppose that he is convinced that the greater portion of the work of the first year in his department should be done at a preparatory school, which would reduce the length of his course to one year, unless the scope of the course were extended. The revenues of this chair would be under such circumstances reduced one-half, because those students who formerly bought two tickets would buy only one. Thus that professor striving for the best advancement of the students would be made to suffer for his noble purpose.

In some schools in which the useless reiteration of work done satisfactorily elsewhere is abolished, and students are admitted on examination to advanced standing, these same students are, nevertheless, required

to pay a fee for the course from which they are excused, or, in other words, they are required to pay for what they do not get. This curious practice is apparently peculiar to medical schools. What student entering the sophomore year, without conditions, would in any reputable literary college be required to pay for the freshman year he or she had passed? This system does not impress one by its honesty. Would it not be better for all colleges to fix upon certain sums as the regular salaries of their professors, and so to obviate the necessity of manœuvring to keep the revenue of certain chairs up to such a grade that there may be found eminent personages which will condescend to sit in them?

In reviewing the work of medical schools as it is now carried on, I am impressed with the fact that the fad for lecturing has been carried too far. The development of the didactic lecture in its earlier days was hailed by teachers as a happy release from the routine of elementary class-room work. It is certainly more agreeable to discourse for an hour upon a favorite theme than to sit for the same length of time dredging for truths lost in the fogs of memory. But it is to be noted that medical students, as a rule, are unaccustomed to lectures which constitute a mode of instruction requiring time for adaptation. The note-books of many first-year students show too plainly how little they assimilate sufficiently well to make a clear statement of it. There is needed, I feel sure, in all medical schools of the average class, less rhetoric and more homely demonstration. Much of the grinding done by students could be obviated by what we may call objective teaching. The best lecture I ever heard on the circulation was given by a Harvard man in his shirt sleeves and in a bloody apron, while he dissected on the lecture table an etherized rabbit. The bloody apron was not essential, but it was better than a dress coat and a buttonhole bouquet. We want to see abolished from medical schools the type of lecturer who sweeps into an awe-stricken audience and scatters broadcast a whirlwind of bewildering facts, then, having paralyzed the gaping students, sweeps out again, into a coupé, rolling off to see the old lady with a systolic murmur. Oh, the fine and distinguished art of teaching! If it could be better studied and more deftly practised, there would be fewer students going forth in pin-feathers.

It seems to me an inestimable advantage to have a professor do the better part of the teaching in his or her own department. It needs an omnipresent eye to guard against deceitful ignorance. A student once came to me for quizzing outside of my department. I was busy and asked her why she did not go to Dr. X., who was connected with the department in question. "Oh," she replied, "I do not wish her to find out how little I know." The better a professor knows his pupils, the less chance there is for a student to evade a proper sounding of the depths of his or her knowledge. The day of examinations is passing

away, but there are still too many of these implements of torture. Their complete abolition may not be a practical thing, and even their restriction within narrow limits is difficult. In proportion as they are set aside, professors are compelled to do more careful grading in class-rooms, and their work is largely increased. This is regarded as an evil by some teachers, but I cannot so regard it. It seems to me that we have the wrong idea of the professor. Appointment to a chair in a medical school is esteemed to be an allotment of great good fortune; a favor to be desired by anyone worthy to receive it; a means of increasing one's income without an undue amount of work, of legitimate advertising, and of general professional benefit. It would be perhaps unreasonable to ask that under the present rates of remuneration a professor should be required to neglect his or her practice for college duties; but it would certainly be desirable if a professor called to a chair should, like a lawyer called to the judge's bench, be so well paid for that distinguished service that outside interest would no longer distract the mind from a work which for its best accomplishment requires almost undivided attention. I do not suggest that a lecturer on practical branches shall abandon the practice of medicine. That would be a very poor policy for one whose success as a teacher depends on daily contact with disease and an ever-multiplying experience. But those who have been for years going the rounds know quite well how to limit their work within the bounds they choose to fix; and, if there were inducement to spend more time in teaching, the time needed would be found and spent. I have remarked with interest how much stronger a hold upon the student-mind may be secured by a teacher whose entire time is given to teaching, who in the hours of absence from college has leisure to brood upon the best means of creating true concepts.

It has been urged that it is quite impossible to increase the work of students, as they are already overworked. But I insist that more elementary teaching is a help rather than a burden. Students resort to private quizzes as a relief from overwork. The comfort of this extra class-work is so generally admitted that students regard it as a lazy way of getting through college. I admit that it may be abused, but we are far from that point just now.

Wherever possible the classes should divided and subdivided for the purpose of better teaching. No laboratory demonstrator can properly attend to more than ten students at once. We want more demonstrators or more hours. I presume the first alternative is the better. All schools of medicine detached from universities would be benefitted, I believe, by the establishment of auxiliary schools of science under the college management and preparatory to its work. Students who were poorly qualified could then be recommended to the preparatory school, and there fitted properly for work. I think that in such

a school—which could be established without great expense—the teaching of modern languages might be included. In the better academies and schools of art the languages are now taught as a preparation for foreign travel and study. In four or five years students of medicine could pick up a fair reading knowledge of French and German, at least, without great effort. I am rather of the opinion that this kind of study as a reaction from the exclusive pursuit of medical knowledge would be beneficial to the mind. Moreover, if this preparatory school were well managed, it would certainly attract many outsiders and the college would gradually gain in the number of students and in friends. I have observed and thought much, also, concerning the office of dean in medical schools, and I have concluded that on general principles it is a mistake that the dean should be elected from the members of the faculty. The deanship is an executive office. It should be more than it is in most medical colleges, a position of great power and prominence, with duties so particular as to require special aptitude for their performance. This is not true at present. The deanship of a medical college is an office permitting such limited exercise of authority that the appointment demeaned by a miserable pittance of a salary stands for little more than a clerkship to the faculty. This is, in my judgment, a serious mistake. The dean of a medical school should be its highest functionary, an officer bound to neither the faculty nor the corporators, a chief executive, endowed with the power of propagandism. In literary colleges of high standing this is the custom. The president of the college has power to ratify the action of the dean, and from this there is no appeal. It is obvious that an officer with such power would need to be chosen with special reference to his or her fitness. The members of the faculty might include an ideal dean, and again they might not. In any event the dean should be an impartial officer, not committed to any interest, and, for this reason, should be elected from the profession at large because of distinguished executive ability. There should be such a salary connected with the office as would warrant a well-qualified incumbent in devoting his or her entire time to the duties of that office. It should be a part of the duty of the dean in vacation to visit other schools at home and abroad, and to observe the operations of various administrative methods, of improvements in all kinds of college-work, embodying these observations in an annual report. There can be no doubt that if the dean were made an officer of this type the state of affairs, which we may call a hypostatic congestion of authority in which the vital executive fluid almost ceases to move because there is nothing strong enough to push it, would no longer occur.

The president of a medical college should also be a more active officer and the collaborator of the dean. There should be no meetings in the college which these two officers should not be privileged to attend.

The president of the college should be its public representative in all social and formal functions. The dean should be freely accessible to students who desire personal advice and counsel.

I now come to the subject of a Board of Censors, whose duty it should be to dispose of all cases where students are found mentally or morally unfit to continue the study of medicine. This body should be composed of members of the faculty and should be presided over by the dean. We have not yet reached the point which enables us to reject on sight all students unfit to study medicine. A few of the worst fail each year at our entrance examinations, but a number still squeeze through whom it were better to have dismissed. I could at this moment name a number of students in our own College who have no right to be numbered with our matriculates, and yet the present conditions for entrance compel their acceptance, however manifest their incapacity for study or practice. I am not so blind nor so infatuated with cleverness as to suppose that only very smart men and women will do for doctors, but we do want the best brains we can get, and if, after three years of hard study, a student does not know what mercurous chlorid is, nor how to spell it, we have a right to our inferences. Moreover, I think that never more than now have we needed vigilance over the college standard. It is true that we now number more college-bred women than we ever before numbered among our students; it is true that we have each year more women bringing certificates from schools of a high grade, and yet the standard of scholarship does not rise. It seems rather to have fallen. The fact is that it is no guaranty of fitness merely to have passed through a certain preparatory course. I remember a bachelor of arts, with extended experience in a chemical laboratory, who worked like a sloven and ended by trying to cheat her way through the final examination. In a certain class which I have in mind, the poorest student was a college graduate. The fact is that the college woman is no longer what she once was, when only exceptional women coveted an A.B., and the mere possession of that degree was ground for high estimation. To go to college has become a fad. Everybody goes. This altered aspect struck me forcibly when after ten years' absence from college I returned as a graduate student. In that decade there had been a powerful influx of younger and more frivolous women and the average of attainments had fallen. It is true that the woman's colleges have continuously raised their grade in the past ten years; there is more required of the students in the way of examination and study; but the method by which these requirements are met are not wholly satisfactory. I presume this cannot be helped. We are gradually approaching the level of men's colleges, whereas we have heretofore stood above them. The same influences are at work in medical schools. It is best to recognize them and study

how we may combat them. Years ago, there were matriculated only inspired women with lofty purpose and eager minds, willing to face any difficulty and master it for the sake of being allowed to minister to that suffering humanity to whose interests they were truly devoted. There are still many such who enter college every year, but there are others also who come with an inferior motive. Therefore, I say that there is needed in the college a careful espionage. Students not properly qualified for the work should be urged to discontinue it. A board of censors could establish a standard and allow a student two years in which to meet it. At the end of that time, if she fell below the mark, she should be advised to discontinue her work. They could not, of course, refuse to allow her to study, if she choose to do so, as a means to a liberal education. But they could warn her that her hope of success was very slight, and that she was wasting her time and money. This would be a kindness to the student and an act of justice to the college, in that it would tend to restrict the number of incompetent graduates. It may be thought that repeated failure in examination would convey to students this discouragement without the interference of a board of censors. My observation is that students generally attribute failure to any cause but the right one—their own stupidity. How many times have I been wearied by explanations of why such and such an one did not hand in a better paper. Everybody knows how it was—she was nervous; there was not time; she had a headache; the questions were unfair; the paper was not justly marked, and so forth. It certainly does not seem right for the college tacitly to encourage students who can only hope to graduate by indefinitely prolonging their courses, and can never practise medicine with the faintest appreciation of the true art. It was once said to me by a poor discouraged woman, whom I pitied from the bottom of my heart, that she felt she had been deceived by the college, inasmuch as it was so easy to get in that she had no idea it would be so hard to get out.

As to moral fitness, I think it should be more clearly defined in its bearings upon qualification for the degree of Doctor of Medicine. There is a great deal of dishonest work among students in all medical schools. I do not see how we can prevent students, if they feel disposed, from cheating at examinations, especially in the more exact scientific branches. But a student caught cheating at an examination should be promptly expelled from the college. The prevailing custom is to reject the paper in question and compel the student to be re-examined. Surely no better evidence of "moral unfitness" could be found than that a student should seek to obtain a medical diploma by fraud. The best student learns little enough in four years of hard study, as she knows to her sorrow when she comes into practice. The creature who voluntarily chooses to know less than the average, who will seize

the privilege of practising medicine before she is actually qualified, who is willing to hold in her unskilled hand the balance of life when her ignorance may be the weight to turn it downward to death, this creature, I say, can there be any doubt of her moral unfitness? She steps across the threshold of our college, an arrogant, low-minded pretender, cheating the trust of her wretched fellow-creatures who come to her, pitiful and suppliant, begging a boon she can only feign to bestow. Is there any spectacle more horrible than the bold assumption of such a feminine Sangrado, luring ignorant humanity into an office where death and Nature struggle alone? It shocks us when we see a man in such an attitude, and since women have so long contended for a higher moral standard in public life, to find them sinking into this mire is especially painful and demoralizing.

Another type of "moral unfitness" obtrudes itself in the form of what is called looseness of character. That this evil prevails more among men than among women will hardly be disputed by anyone, and yet it has prevailed among women physicians to a greater extent than many may suppose. It has no right to prevail at all. Women have been graduated from our own College who are a disgrace to the sex and to the profession. They have obtained their diplomas without opposition simply because our present methods of determining the moral status of matriculates are not adequate. We state in our announcement that the degree shall be withheld from a student on the ground that she is morally unfit; but who investigates? The responsibility rests nowhere and no one assumes it. It is not a pleasant task. There may be much repugnance to the duty of police officer or private detective to the college, but such an agent is needed. It is not true that the college is concerned only with the mental training of women who are to become physicians. It has much to do also with their moral characters. It owes it to you and to me that our diplomas shall not be smirched by contact with the diplomas of women who ply medicine as a trade in iniquity. If it be, as we all feel it is, an honor for a mother to guard well her daughter's fame, to know her associates and regulate her behavior, it is an honor to a college that it watches with a stern omniscient eye over the conduct of its students. A board of censors could deal summarily with all such matters, not to speak of minor incidents such as unfortunately occur in the outside clinics and in the college proper.

Finally, it seems clear to me that the method of distributing financial aid to students in our own college is a very poor one. We have not much to give. That little should be carefully dispensed. The Board of Corporators should have nothing to do with the awarding of scholarships. These endowments should be made on the basis of competitive examinations of a high grade, and should be forfeited any

year the student falls below an excellent grade. Students who cannot comply with such requirements should not be encouraged to practise medicine. Under the present system mental ability does not by any means entirely determine the choice of a beneficiary. It is possible to make the possession of a scholarship a high honor. Now it seems that it is regarded as a meaningless charity, not to be spoken of for fear of hurting the feelings of the incumbent. Several times financial aid has been given to students who entered the college determined upon the practice of homœopathy. This seems to me very much like warming a viper. In one case a scholarship student confided in me during her first year that she meant to practise homœopathy. From the nature of the confidence I could not expose her; but when I told her in plain terms that she was obtaining money under false pretences, she replied that she intended to pay the money back. I have never heard of such a restitution. It seems little enough to ask that scholarship students should at least give us their perfect allegiance from the outset, and that as an earnest of loyalty they should be asked in the beginning to subscribe to the code of ethics. A student may have subsequent aberrations which will lead her in devious foolish paths, but while she is the ward of the college she should walk only in the path prescribed.

At this point I have strong premonitions that it is time to close these remarks, though there are other things worthy to be added. Yet if my thoughts have to any extent echoed those of any who are truly interested in the advancement of systems of teaching and government in medical schools, I am well content. The first step toward reform is a recognition and admission of evil. In the case of our own alma mater, what can we, the Alumnæ of the Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania, do toward instituting an order in any way different from that which now obtains? I reply that we can work primarily for representation on the Board of Corporators. This is an entering wedge, and I shall feel amply repaid for the humble effort I have made in this paper, if it be followed by a free discussion leading to a formal resolution which shall embody the request for alumnæ representation on the Board of Corporators in the event of vacancy.