

work in college and others two years. Beginning with 1926-27 the Dental Educational Council made one year of college work an entrance prerequisite to Class-A dental schools.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in 1921 undertook an extensive investigation of dental education in the United States and Canada. This survey, which was made by William J. Gies, included all the main features of dental education. The comprehensive report, issued in 1926, criticized the dental curriculum and recommended the adoption of a requirement of at least two years of suitable preprofessional college work, three years of education in dentistry for the training of the general practitioner, and one year of optional graduate training for specialists. This recommendation was based on general considerations. The survey made no detailed analysis of curriculum content.

THESE developments have resulted in a variety of curriculum plans. At present one group of dental schools has three-year curriculums based on two years of preprofessional education in college, the schools in another group have four-year curriculums based on one year of work in college, and those of a third group have four-year curriculums based on two years of work in college.

The confused situation produced among dental educators a general feeling of need for a systematic study and analysis of the dental curriculum. This feeling is reflected in the choice of subjects and speakers at the annual meetings of the American Association

of Dental Schools during the past ten years. In 1924 William J. Gies discussed some of the problems of dental education and referred to the curriculum as a problem of major importance. This statement elicited from Chancellor Capen, of the University of Buffalo, the suggestion that the entire subject, including the preprofessional preparation, should be attacked in detail to determine what should be taught to train a dentist.

During the next few years, the curriculum was a subject of frequent discussion by the Association. An educational psychologist, Austin G. Schmidt, of Loyola University, spoke two years later on the principles of curriculum construction, and his paper was favorably received. This discussion was followed with a paper given by Arthur H. Nobbs, of the University of California, who discussed the need for a "job analysis" of dental teaching, as a basis for a standard curriculum, and Dean John T. O'Rourke, of the University of Louisville, read an illuminating paper on training dental faculties in pedagogy.

The ground having been prepared, the American Association of Dental Schools in 1929 heard a discussion by W. W. Charters, of Ohio State University, on the importance of research in curriculum construction. He presented the idea of an activity analysis as the proper approach, stating that the first thing in developing a sound curriculum is to "discover the activities and problems of the profession and describe these with great definiteness." This address struck a responsive chord and led to the appointment of