BRITISHJOURNALOF NURSING

THE NURSING RECORD

EDITED BY MRS BEDFORD FENWICK

No. 1,453

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1916,

Vol. LVI-

EDITORIAL.

THE ECONOMIC BASIS OF TRAINING SCHOOLS FOR NURSES.

Miss M. Adelaide Nutting, R.N., Director of the Department of Nursing and Health at Teachers' College, New York, discusses, in an able paper in the American Journal of Nursing, the question of "A Sounder Economic Basis for Training Schools for Nurses," lucidly demonstrating the kind of basis upon which such schools do actually rest, and how it compares with that of other schools and colleges.

She shows that there are three main ways of securing support: (1) through public funds derived from taxation; (2) through private funds by gifts; and (3) through fees from students.

"I know," says Miss Nutting, "few things more impressive—to me, indeed, more profoundly moving—than to survey the field of education, to note the richness of the gifts which have been there poured forth with such lavish hand, in so many directions, and to perceive the ways through which men and women are striving to put into the hands of their fellows the supreme weapon of knowledge. These enormous private contributions made to education are the wonder and glory of our age."

In regard to the cost of modern education, Miss Nutting quotes Mr. Furst, Secretary of the Carnegie Foundation, who states that "Present educational demands upon even a modest college require resources of approximately a million dollars." Good teaching, he urges, is "not only expensive, but absolutely not to be had below a certain minimum of expenditure, and financial resources constitute the fundamental problem. In other words, any institution which proposes to educate must depend upon appropriate, definite, and permanent sources of income.

"In all this long list of great gifts for education, in all this imposing array of colleges and schools supported by such gifts, I am

astonished," says Miss Nutting, "to realize that no reference whatever is made anywhere to one of the most fundamentally important branches of professional education now in existence, schools for the training of nurses. . . . Is it not strange that, search as you will from one end of the country (I had almost said the world) to the other, you will not find one single gift of any appreciable amount, not one endowment placed at the disposal of a training school for nurses for the proper conduct of its educational work. There have been in history two important gifts made for the education of nurses. Florence Nightingale gave the first in providing, a half-century ago, 200,000 dollars for the founding of the Nightingale School at St. Thomas' Hospital, London. The first training school in history was, therefore, established and has been maintained by an endowment. A half-century later, Mrs. Helen Hartley Jenkins, of New York, gave the second considerable gift, in endowing the Department for Graduate Nurses at the College for Teachers at Columbia University, and these two large gifts complete the list. There is literally nothing to add: so far as my knowledge goes there is no training school for nurses supported anywhere in this country by private endowment; there are none maintained by public funds, and public treasuries and private philanthropy alike seem innocent of any recognition of the fact that there are between thirty and forty thousand student nurses in training in the eleven hundred schools recorded, and that every one of these schools is carrying on its work with difficulty and at a disadvantage because of lack of resources.'

Miss Nutting then proceeds to show that "the primary function of all training schools is that of carrying on the regular nursing work of the hospital; it is not anywhere the education of the nurse. That education is the subsidiary, secondary purpose of the hospital in establishing a training school, and it follows as a matter of course that it can be carried out only in so far as is compatible with the main purpose of nursing the patients through the

previous page next page