

for a term of seven years. He would be requested to name the other six members of the Council, who would serve for various terms, from one to six years, as determined by lot. Each year in April, at the time of the annual meeting of the Academy, the six members of the Council having unexpired terms would elect the seventh member for a period of seven years. Thus the Council would become a self-perpetuating body.

“Rules and regulations. The Council would formulate its own rules and regulations, which could be revoked by a three-fourths vote of the Board of Governors followed by a three-fourths vote of the total active fellowship of the Academy.

“Finances. The work of the Council would be financed by the Advancement Fund of the Academy, and by contributions made directly to the Council for its work.

“Publication of findings. The New York Academy of Dentistry would have full ownership of the publication rights of the investigation results of the Research Council, but the Council would have full charge of the editing and actual publication of these findings. The reports of the Council would be published in the *Journal of Dental Research.*”

The proposal was unanimously adopted by the Academy. Professor Gies accepted appointment as Director of the Council and at the April meeting announced, as the other six members of the Council, the Past president, the President, the President-elect, and the Vice-president-elect, of the Academy, and the deans of the two dental schools in New York City, namely, Henry W. Gillett, Holmes C. Jackson, Arthur H. Merritt, Alfred Owre, Bissell B. Palmer, Jr., and Leuman M. Waugh. The Academy evidenced hearty endorsement of these selections. (The Research Council's first report is published on page 477 of this issue.)

The President of the Academy, Dr. Bissell B. Palmer, Jr., proposed the establishment of a “dental center” in New York City. The suggestion was approved by the Board of Governors of the Academy, and the following Committee was appointed to consider the matter: William J. Gies, Arthur H. Merritt, and Bissell B. Palmer, Jr., Chairman.

III. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON DENTAL EDUCATION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES: 1926⁵

HUGH CABOT, *University of Michigan*; W. A. JESSUP, *University of Iowa*;
LEROY M. S. MINER, *Harvard University*; ALFRED OWRE, *University of Minnesota*;
WILLIAM J. GIES, *Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Chairman*

A

Each of the members of this Committee has had an opportunity to examine a copy of the confidential page proof of the Carnegie Foundation's

⁵ Reprinted from the *Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the Association of American Universities*, Twenty-eighth Annual Conference, Northwestern University, Chicago, November 11-13, 1926; published in 1927, pp. 35-36.

"Bulletin on Dental Education." The *Bulletin*, which is now in press, indicates in detail the present condition of the dental schools, and presents the findings of a prolonged study of dental education in the United States and Canada. It would seem, therefore, that a comprehensive report by this Committee or by its successor might suitably be postponed until the next annual meeting, when all of the Foundation's conclusions could be considered, and it would be more opportune to present the Committee's independent recommendations.

B

Several matters of general import warrant the special interest of this Association in the promotion of dental education. Disorders of the teeth and closely adjacent tissues, and the ensuing maladies, are among the most common disabilities. Dentistry, an important means to prevent these ailments and to cure them or to alleviate their effects, is primarily *health service*. Dentistry has been legally established as a separate profession. There are now about seventy-five thousand licensed practitioners of dentistry, and forty-seven dental schools, in the United States and Canada. Of these dental schools, forty are university schools, three are members of groups of professional schools, and four are independent. Of the latter, two are proprietary. Some of the most useful dental schools are integral parts of universities holding membership in this Association.

C

The present academic year [1926-27] is notable in the history of dental education as the first in which, for dental schools in the United States, an entrance requirement of at least one year of approved work in an accredited academic college became a prerequisite for the Dental Educational Council's Class A or Class B rating. In 1925-26 graduation from a high school continued to be the minimum entrance requirement in sixteen dental schools. Now the Dental School of the University of California and the proprietary Texas Dental College (Houston) are the only dental schools in the United States and Canada that do not require at least one year of approved work in an accredited academic college for admission or include it as the first year in a five-year combination of academic and professional curricula.

The spirit behind this general forward movement in the dental schools is clearly that of an aspiration to make dentistry the equivalent of an oral specialty of medicine in the quality and sufficiency of its service to the patient. It is realized widely among dentists that equivalence in health

service can be achieved, without embarrassing the present organization of the medical profession or disturbing the conduct of the medical schools, if dentistry, maintaining its professional independence and continuing its own schools, adapts its system of education and its practice to the attainment of this purpose. Accordingly, there has been increasing agreement among dentists that establishment of the following general conditions is essential for the most useful development of dental education:

1. The academic requirements for admission to the dental school should not be inferior, in extent or quality, to the minimum for the medical school.
2. The undergraduate dental curriculum, organized for the intensive training of general practitioners only, should include medical science, dental technology, clinical dentistry, and oral medicine, in courses better adapted for their purpose and much more effectively integrated than at present.
3. There should be effectual elimination of the redundancies in the undergraduate dental courses, which have been accumulating not only from the tendency to overload courses with minutiae that neither teachers nor students use or remember, but also from the impossible effort in the training of general practitioners to include the detailed information and the intricate procedures of such specialties of dental practice as maxillo-facial surgery and orthodontia.
4. Advanced courses for practitioners and full-year graduate curricula should be provided for all types of oral specialization.
5. Combined medical and dental curricula, for practitioners of the types of oral health-service that embrace most intimately the joint responsibilities of medicine and dentistry, should be developed in several of the universities having well-supported and closely coordinated medical and dental schools, hospitals, and dispensaries.

D

Dentistry, as a division of health service, should not be inferior to a specialty of the practice of medicine, either in intellectual quality or in usefulness. No other branch of health service is more advanced in the tactual, artistic, and mathematical refinements of its remedial efforts. It should receive, in accord with its contributions to human welfare, the serious attention that its character, capabilities, and enlarging responsibilities suggest. Nearly all of the dental schools are now integral parts of universities, and the independent school is about to become extinct. The dental school should be intimately correlated in the university with the medical school, hospital, and dispensary in a *health union* that would be serviceable to all of the factors concerned. The dental school requires

not only the equipment and facilities traditionally peculiar to it, but also good teaching and a useful library. It should promote research and conduct graduate work. It needs its share of the general income, and deserves recognition as an important unit in the life and work of the university.

Fortunately, the dental schools are being steadily improved. Nowhere are the evidences of growth and betterment more evident than in some of the schools in the universities represented in this Association. It is to be hoped that the leadership of these schools will speed the present evolution, and that their influence will quicken public interest in the adequate financial support of dental education. "There is today," to quote from Dr. Pritchett's Preface in the Carnegie Foundation's *Bulletin on Dental Education*, "no more direct method by which the public health can be served than to enable the universities to place their dental schools in a position to give the kind of education for which the world stands in need."

IV. THE REASONS WHY *FOUR* HAS BECOME THE ACCUSTOMED NUMBER OF YEARS IN THE EXTENSION OF ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL CURRICULA⁶

ERNEST H. WILKINS, A.M., PH.D., LITT. D., *College of Arts, Literature, and Science, University of Chicago*

The reason why we have a four-year college in America today is that the first American institution of higher learning, Harvard, took form in the *seventeenth* century as a four-year college.

The reason why Harvard in the seventeenth century took form as a four-year college is presumably that the University of Cambridge in the *seventeenth* century required a four-year course for the Bachelor's degree.

The reason why the University of Cambridge in the *seventeenth* century required a four-year course for the Bachelor's degree is presumably that the University of Cambridge had *always* required a four-year course for the Bachelor's degree.

The reason why the University of Cambridge originally required a four-year course for the Bachelor's degree is presumably that the *University of Oxford* required a four-year course for the Bachelor's degree.

The reason why the University of Oxford originally required a four-year

⁶ Quoted from a paper on "the relation of the senior college and the graduate school." *Journal of the Proceedings and Addresses of the Association of American Universities*, Twenty-eighth Annual Conference, Northwestern University, Chicago, November 11-13, 1926; published in 1927, pp. 59-60. The italic does not appear in the original.