

Learning from History: Quality, Standards, and the Future of Medical Education

Dr. Bilal Bin Younis

Professor of Medicine, Kishwar Fazal Teaching Hospital, Amna Inayat Medical College, Lahore, Pakistan

In the early 20th century, medical education in the United States was largely unregulated, with considerable variation in the standards of medical schools and the quality of their graduates. Many institutions lacked adequate scientific facilities, qualified faculty, clinical resources, and appropriate links with universities and teaching hospitals. Concerns regarding these deficiencies led to major reforms aimed at standardizing medical training and improving the competence of future physicians.^{1,2}

A landmark development in this process was the publication of Abraham Flexner's *Medical Education in the United States and Canada* in 1910. Flexner evaluated 155 medical schools in the United States and Canada and highlighted major deficiencies in the prevailing system of medical education.^{1,3} The report emphasized rigorous scientific education, appropriate admission standards, adequately trained faculty, sufficient institutional resources, laboratory facilities, clinical training, and the promotion of research as essential components of medical education.^{1,2}

The reforms associated with this period were difficult for many poorly resourced and proprietary institutions to implement. Consequently, a substantial number of medical schools subsequently closed or merged with other institutions, while university-based and scientifically oriented medical education became increasingly established.^{2,4} Although this

transformation significantly improved educational standards, its wider consequences, including effects on access to medical education and the healthcare workforce, remain important considerations when examining the Flexner era.⁴ The consequences extended beyond medical schools themselves. The reduction in the number of institutions resulted in fewer medical graduates and affected the distribution of the healthcare workforce. Interestingly, recent analysis of medical school closures during the Flexner era found that reductions in physician numbers were accompanied by improvements in population health outcomes. The study reported approximately an 8% reduction in infant mortality, a 4% reduction in non-infant mortality, and a 3% reduction in total mortality.⁵ These findings provide an important historical perspective on the relationship between the number of healthcare professionals, the quality of their training, and population health.

One of the most important contributions of the Flexner-era reforms was the emphasis on scientific rigor in medical education. Medical curricula increasingly incorporated biomedical sciences and were expected to be delivered by appropriately qualified faculty within academically sound institutions.^{1,6} Research also became an integral component of academic medicine, strengthening the relationship between scientific investigation, medical education, and improvements in healthcare.^{2,6}

Equally important was the emphasis on hands-on clinical training. Direct interaction with patients in appropriately equipped hospitals was considered essential for developing clinical competence. The association between medical schools and teaching hospitals therefore became a central feature of modern medical education, providing students with opportunities for supervised bedside teaching and practical clinical experience.^{2,7} Medical education continued to evolve beyond the original Flexnerian model, but its emphasis on linking scientific knowledge with clinical training has remained influential.^{6,7}

Medical education, however, must extend beyond scientific knowledge and technical competence. The physician has responsibilities towards individual patients as well as the community. Professionalism, ethics, integrity, empathy, communication, and a sense of social responsibility must therefore accompany scientific and clinical training. Modern medical education increasingly recognizes that producing technically competent graduates alone is insufficient; medical institutions must prepare physicians who can respond effectively and responsibly to the health needs of society.^{6,7}

The Way Forward

The historical experience of medical education in the United States offers an important lesson for Pakistan. The objective should not simply be to increase or decrease the number of medical institutions. The priority must be to ensure that every institution provides appropriate standards of education, qualified faculty, adequate clinical exposure, educational resources, research opportunities, and effective governance. Quality assurance and accreditation are particularly important as medical education systems expand.⁸

Pakistan already has frameworks for regulating and accrediting medical education, but the challenge lies in translating standards into consistent educational quality. Studies examining medical education accreditation in Pakistan have emphasized the importance of contextualizing international standards to local educational and healthcare needs.⁸ Regulatory requirements should therefore be accompanied by continuous monitoring, institutional accountability, faculty development, appropriate teaching-hospital facilities, meaningful clinical exposure, and opportunities for research.

The lesson from history is not that closing medical institutions automatically improves healthcare. Rather, the Flexner era demonstrates the consequences of allowing expansion in medical education without ensuring adequate standards and resources. Reform should therefore focus on strengthening institutions and ensuring that graduates possess the scientific knowledge, clinical competence, professionalism, and sense of responsibility required to serve their communities.

Looking retrospectively at the transformation of medical education during the early 20th century, the fundamental principles of quality, scientific rigor, clinical competence, research, ethics, and accountability remain highly relevant. Pakistan can learn from this historical experience while adapting these principles to its own educational and healthcare needs. The important question is no longer whether standards are required, but how effectively they can be implemented. Medical institutions, regulatory authorities, educators, and health policymakers must work together to translate standards and regulations into meaningful and sustainable improvement.

References

1. Flexner A. *Medical Education in the United States and Canada: A Report to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*. Bulletin No. 4. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; 1910.
2. Cooke M, Irby DM, Sullivan W, Ludmerer KM. American medical education 100 years after the Flexner report. *N Engl J Med*. 2006;355(13):1339-1344. doi:10.1056/NEJMra055445.
3. Halperin EC, Perman JA, Wilson EA. Abraham Flexner of Kentucky, his report, Medical Education in the United States and Canada, and the historical questions raised by the report. *Acad Med*. 2010;85(2):203-210. doi:10.1097/ACM.0b013e3181c88506.
4. Sullivan LW, Suez Mittman I. The state of diversity in the health professions a century after Flexner. *Acad Med*. 2010;85(2):246-253. doi:10.1097/ACM.0b013e3181c88145.
5. Clay K, Miller G, Portnykh M, Schmick EJ. *Medical School Closures, Market Adjustment, and Mortality in the Flexner Report Era*. NBER Working Paper No. 33937. Cambridge (MA): National Bureau of Economic Research; 2025. doi:10.3386/w33937.
6. Duffy TP. The Flexner Report—100 years later. *Yale J Biol Med*. 2011;84(3):269-276.
7. Norman G. Medical education: past, present and future. *Perspect Med Educ*. 2012;1(1):6-14. doi:10.1007/s40037-012-0002-7.
8. Khan AW, Sethi A, Wajid G, Yasmeen R. Challenges towards quality assurance of Basic Medical Education in Pakistan. *Pak J Med Sci*. 2020;36(2):4-9.