

3. Would it be desirable and feasible to require schools of pharmacy to take an additional 10 percent of the student body, if they get funds from the Federal government?

Those schools receiving funds for construction under existing legislation must, in the case of minimum expansion, increase the first-year enrollment by a 5 percent or 5 students, whichever is greater. In the case of major expansion, the first-year enrollment must be increased by 20 percent or 20 students, whichever is greater.

To obtain the basic improvement grants under existing legislation or in the case of the institutional grants program of H.R. 15757, first-year enrollment must be increased by at least 2½ percent or by five students, whichever is greater.

The enrollment increases required in the construction program seems entirely appropriate since increased capacity can be incorporated in the construction plans.

The incentive to increase enrollments as provided in the institutional grants program (Section 771 (a) (1) (A) (ii)) should prove helpful in increasing the output of health personnel. The requirement of an increase of 2½ percent or five students (Section 771 (b) (1)) is reasonable for most of our schools. But this requirement annually may prove unwise in some schools where capacity enrollments exist or where the quality of the educational program would be weakened. However, in such cases this requirement can be waived by the Secretary.

In September, 1967, about one-half of our schools had an increase in first-year students of 5 percent or more over the previous year. In some instances it is likely that there was a lack of qualified applicants to increase the number of first-year enrollees, and in other instances, the class may have been at capacity. Since the availability of institutional grant funds would enable schools to seek additional qualified students, it would seem imprudent to withhold grant funds solely on the basis of the inability of a school to meet the increased enrollment criterion. As stated above, the incentive provision contained in Section 771 (a) (1) (A) (ii) should serve as a stimulus to increase student enrollment and could possibly preclude the need for the requirement for increasing the first-year enrollment as contained in Section 772 (b) (1).

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Skubitz?

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Bliven, are you a pharmacist?

Mr. BLIVEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. SKUBITZ. When did you graduate?

Mr. BLIVEN. Oh, I wish you had not mentioned that. In the State of Nebraska, in 1934.

Mr. SKUBITZ. How many years did you attend college?

Mr. BLIVEN. I went to school 4 years.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Now 6 years are required; is that correct?

Mr. BLIVEN. 5 years is mandatory. Two schools in California require 6 years.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Why is it necessary to go 6 years to become a pharmacist?

Mr. BLIVEN. Some of our 6-year programs—and this is true, I think, for the programs that are adding 1 year to the 5-year program—for purposes of specialization in such areas as hospital pharmacy, medical, service representatives, and perhaps Dean Weaver—

Mr. SKUBITZ. Specialization.

Mr. BLIVEN. Yes. Specialization. Now, this is not necessarily true of the two California schools. They have increased considerably the amount of basic biological sciences, for example, in their curriculum, and I would add that some of—

Mr. SKUBITZ. Is that necessary?

Mr. BLIVEN. Yes, I think it is.

Mr. SKUBITZ. I am fearful that no matter how much money we give, the result would be raised standards and less pharmacists.