

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SOUTHEASTERN SECTION S.P.E.E. (1.)
SECOND ANNUAL MEETING- UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA, APRIL 7 & 8, 1936

The second annual meeting of the SOUTHEASTERN SECTION of the Society was held at the University of Alabama on April 7 and 8. The first session started at 7 P.M. as an informal dinner with approximately fifty members in attendance as guests of the University of Alabama.

Dean Floyd Field, chairman of the Southeastern Section, presided over the following program:

Welcome, Dean G. J. Davis, Jr., College
of Engineering, University of Alabama

Informal Remarks, Dr. Geo. H. Denny, President, University of Alabama

Response, Dean Floyd Field, Ga. School of Technology

Address, "How Good is My Engineering School?", Dr. Douglas S. Anderson, Acting President, Tulane University, President S.P.E.E.

Prof. John M. Gallalee, professor of Mechanical Engineering, University of Alabama, took Dean Davis' place on the program as Dean Davis was prevented from attending due to illness.

Dr. Denny reviewed changes which have taken place in the entrance requirements and discussed some very interesting phases of the financial problems of Southern State Universities.

President Anderson's address centered about the problem of accrediting the smaller colleges of engineering. His paper created so much interest and discussion that a motion was passed to have it submitted to the publishing committee of the Society for consideration of publication in the Journal, in an abridged form. His address reviewed certain phases of the work of the Engineers Council for Professional Development, with special attention being given to the problem of accrediting.

The second session convened at 9 A.M., April 8, with Dean L. J. Lassalle, Louisiana State University, Vice Chairman of the Section, presiding. The program was as follows:

"Objectives and Materials of Engineering Education",
by Prof. S. P. Sashoff, Electrical Engineering
Department, University of Florida.

"The General College and Its Effect on Engineering
Education in the Southeast", a discussion led
by Dean L. J. Lassalle, Louisiana State
University and Dean B. R. Van Leer, University
of Florida.

Report of Committee on Five-Year Curricula,
Dean B. R. Van Leer, Chairman.

Discussion of Plans for the National Meeting.

Business, election of officers, etc.

Prof. Sashoff's paper set forth some interesting experiences and dealt largely with the re-adjustments which are necessary on the part of the student after graduation. He stated that, in his opinion, much could be done in engineering education to remove the necessity for so much adjustment, if the proper aims of engineering education were kept in mind. He stated, "The primary aim of education, it seems to me, should be to develop fully the potentialities of the student in order to enable him to help himself and the community in which he lives. To do this it will be necessary to, 1- awaken intellectual interests and curiosity, 2- develop proper attitudes, 3- acquire the habit to study and to work, 4- create a sense of orderliness, discipline and honesty, and 5- learn such skills as may be necessary to fit into a profession."

The discussion led by Dean Lassalle and Dean Van Leer brought out that at Louisiana State University and the University of Florida all freshmen are required to matriculate in a lower

division ~~ok~~ a general college and are not admitted directly to the College of Engineering. One essential difference between the plan at L.S.U. and Florida is that all students who wish to enter the College at L. S. U. may elect the necessary prerequisite subjects right from the start; whereas, at Florida only those in the superior group, which constitutes approximately the top 20%, are allowed to do this.

Dean Lassalle stated the following advantages have come to the College of Engineering as a result of their lower division:

- (a) The Dean does not have to spend a great deal of time with Freshmen on disciplinary and other matters, and so has more time to give to students who are really taking Engineering subjects.
- (b) The number of students taking technical courses is reduced and the average quality is raised.
- (c) As a result of part (b) our sections are smaller and students get more individual attention. Also there is more of an "esprit de corps", more of a feeling of homogeneity, in the College of Engineering than when there were a great many Freshmen in it."

Dean Van Leer brought out that the General College of the University of Florida is the first of its kind to be started in any state university and that ^{the} program and ~~the~~ organization of this General College are found ^{ed,} on the following basic assumptions and principles:

"1. That existing curricula of the various colleges of the University, exclusive of short courses, were designed solely to meet the needs of students who are expected to receive the degrees of these colleges.

4.

2. That the existing program of the first two years of the University did not effectively meet the requirements of approximately one-half of the students, who, for various reasons, drop out before they reach the upper division, and of approximately two-thirds who drop out before graduation.

3. That the new program would provide a fairly uniform two-year arrangement which not only would meet the demands of the students who drop out but, also by broadening the base of education, would meet more adequately the demands of students desiring to prepare for advanced study in the colleges and professional schools of the upper division; that the work, particularly of the first year, should be closely integrated; and that some student may be able to complete the requirements of the General College in less than two years, while others may remain with profit for a longer period.

4. That the General College should be separate and distinct from the colleges and professional schools of the upper division; that while its work should be articulated with these units of the University, its tasks should be broader than the tasks of these units; and that it should not be unduly restricted by them in solving its problems or carrying out its operations.

5. That since intellectual development is largely a matter of self-development, the program should be so formulated as to stimulate intellectual curiosity and to encourage independent work on the part of the individual students.

6. That the progress of students in the General College should be measured in terms of abilities, understandings, appreciations, and skills, instead of courses passed and credit-hours accumulated; and that the passing of comprehen-

sive examinations would excuse some students from certain courses, and vary the usual time for many others.

7. That comprehensive examinations with a special board of examiners to take charge of the administration thereof, thus separating in execution the teaching function from the examining function, would be essential to evolving and putting into effect the new plan of the General College.

8. That the mastery of the contents of certain comprehensive courses should be required of all students; that other comprehensive courses designed to prepare students for advanced study in the colleges and professional schools of the upper division should complete the offerings of the General College.

9. That one of the purposes of the General College should be to provide vocational guidance to students. The "guesses" which Freshmen bring to the University concerning the occupations they have "decided" to enter cannot be accepted as final, for many of such choices are mere whims which will be abandoned as the student matures.

10. That a desirable terminus or honorable exit should be provided at the end of the second year for those students who do not go on into the colleges and professional schools of the upper division.

11. That the unity realized in the establishment of comprehensive courses in the General College would eliminate much duplication and inefficiency.

12. That the work of the General College should be articulated with that of the secondary schools; that the new curriculum would doubtless influence the high-school curriculum

and that the near future may present us with high-schools' products entirely different in type from those we admit to the University at present.

Dean Van Leer further brought out that the average student is now required to take five years in order to secure his bachelor's degree in engineering; but that the superior student will still be able to complete all requirements in four years.

The report of the Committee on Five-Year Curricula brought out the following important points:

" (1). Alabama Polytechnic Institution, although its faculty appeared to be generally opposed to the program, has placed its aeronautical engineering course on a five-year basis.

(2) Georgia School of Technology, although its faculty and administrative officers are also opposed generally to a five-year program, has placed its course leading to the Bachelor of Science in Architectural Engineering on a five-year basis.

(3) The University of Florida, by adopting the General College idea for the first two years in the University, compelled an adoption of a five-year program in all instances except for superior students. The program at the University of Florida for the average engineering student will now be approximately as follows:

For the completion of the work in the General College and the passing of all comprehensive examinations which involves approximately 76 credit hours, a student will be awarded the Associate of Arts degree which is a prerequisite for his admission to the College of Engineering.

For the completion of 76 additional hours plus Summer Camp Surveying or summer shop work and Military Science, a total of 152 credit hours, a student will be awarded a Bachelor of Science in Applied Science.

For the completion of approximately 36 to 40 additional credit hours, practically all of which is in his particular specialty, the student will be awarded the degree of Bachelor of Civil Engineering, Bachelor of Electrical Engineering, Bachelor of Mechanical Engineering, etc.

For exceptionally brilliant and capable student who averages above a "B" in the first two years, it is possible to complete and secure the Bachelor of Civil Engineering, etc. in four years. The average student will require five, but he has already been requiring five in the past."

The Section was fortunate in having Dean P. H. Daggett, Vice President of the Society, and Dr. F. L. Bishop, Secretary of the Society, present at the second session.

Dean Daggett reported that the work of the Accrediting Committee of E.C.P.D. should be complete in the first and second sections this spring and that accrediting in the other five districts of the country should start next fall.

Dr. Bishop reported that Pres. Anderson's topic for the annual meeting, "The Spiritual Adjustment of the Engineering Student" has created a great deal of interest and that we should look forward to a very fine meeting at the University of Wisconsin. He also stated that the Society is in a state of good health financially and otherwise. The meeting was closed after electing the following officers for 1936-37:

Chairman, Dean S. B. Earle, Clemson Agricultural College.

Vice Chairman, Dean W. S. Rodman, University of Virginia.

Secretary, N. C. Ebaugh, University of Florida.

H. C. Ebaugh,
Secretary.

REGISTRATION S.P.E.E.
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA APRIL 7 1936

Taylor, Alton-- Assistant Prof. Civil Engineering, University of Miss.
Anderson, Douglas-- Dean of Engineering, Tulane University
Ricker, C.W. -- Prof. Electrical Engineering, Tulane University
Hill, A.M. -- Asst. Prof. Mechanical Engineering, Tulane University
Johnson, Hamilton-- Prof. Mech. Eng. Louisiana State University
Robert, J.M.-- Prof. Mech. Engineering, Tulane University
Brigman, B.M. Dean of University of Louisville
Waterfall, H.W.--- Asst. Prof. Mech. Eng. ; Louisiana State University
Field, Floyd.-- Dean and Professor of Math. Georgia Tech
Bunger, Harold-- Prof. Chem. Engineering, Georgia Tech
Ellis, J.L.-- Associate Prof. Elec. Eng. Georgia Tech
Dunkin, W.B.-- Prof. Mech. Engineering Georgia Tech
Savant, D.P.-- Dean of Elec. Engineering Georgia Tech
Hixon, C.R. -- Asst. Dean and Prof. Mech. Eng. Auburn
Earle, S.B. -- Dean, Clemson Agricultural College
Fernow, B.E.-- Head Mech. Engineering -- Clemson Agricultural College
Van Leer, B.R.-- Dean University of Florida
Ebaugh, N.C.-- Prof. Mech. Engineering -- University of Florida
O'Brien, E.W. -- Managing Editor Southern Power Journal, Atlanta Ga.
Sashoff, S.P.-- Prof. Elec. Eng. University of Florida
Lassalle, L.J. Dean Louisiana State University
Pegues, B.W.-- Prof. Civil Engineering-- Louisiana State University
Matthes, G.F.-- Asst. Prof. Electrical Eng., Louisiana State University
Voorhies, M.B. -- Prof. Elec. Eng. Louisiana State University
Dixon, D.P.-- Inst. Mech Drawing-- Louisiana State University
Carmichael, Colin-- Asst. Prof. Mech. Eng. University of N.C.
Rodman, Walter S.-- Dean, School Eng. and Prof. E.E. University of Va.

REGISTRATION
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA (Local)

Gallalee, John M.--- Professor of Mechanical Engineering
Hovey, Bertram K.----Instructor Elec. Eng.
Houser Shaler C.--- Professor of Engineering
Schmitz, R.R.-- Asst. Prof. of Industrial Arts
Smith, James O.-- Inst. Mechanics
Kolb, R.P. -- Prof. Aero. Engineering
Du Plantier,--Donald A.--- Asst. Professor of Structural Eng.
Maxwell Fred R.--- Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering
Taylor, Harold W.--- Associate Prof. Drawing and Surveying
Farabee, Ray L.--- Associate Professor of Metallurgy
Cothorn, B.S. -- Asst. Professor of Mining Engineering
Parker, A.C. -- City Engr. Tuscaloosa Alabama
Nicol, Hilliard W. ---- Tuscaloosa, Alabama
Lancaster. D.S. --- Dean of Men
Leister, J.S.--- Asst. Prof. Civil Engineering
Dahlene, Oscar-- Head of Dept. of Mechanics
Denny, George H. --- President of University
Cudworth, James L.-- Director School of Mines and Prof. Mining Engineering
McCuaig, Donald--- Asst. Prof. Mechanical Engineering
Thomas, M.B. Inst. English,
Loyd, Stewart J.-- Dean Chemistry School
Walker, Leslie--- Instructor in Aeronautical Engineering

Five Year Plan - Canvas 1936
 Compiled for S. E. Section S.P.E.E. by Blake R. Van Leer
 Dean, College of Engineering
 University of Florida

Questions Asked

1. Do a majority of the engineering faculty of your institution believe a five year curriculum would be desirable for engineering students?
2. Would you be willing to endeavor to have such a program adopted for your institution if a majority of other Southeastern engineering schools would agree to such a program?
3. Is 1940 an appropriate year in which to make such an agreement effective?
4. Would your faculty favor an arrangement of this kind:
 - (a) For the completion of 64 cr. hrs. of undergraduate collegiate work the awarding of the Junior certificate in Engineering?
 - (b) For the completion of 128 cr. hrs. of undergraduate collegiate work in engineering the awarding of the B. S. in Engineering (BSE)?
 - (c) For the completion of 160 cr. hrs. of work, 52 cr. hrs. of which would be specialized in a particular field, the awarding of the B. C. E., B. E. E., etc.?

Answers

	#1		#2		#3		#4a		#4b		#4c		Person Reporting
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
1. Alabama University													
2. Alabama Poly Inst.													
3. Arkansas University													
4. Clemson Agricultural College													
5. Duke University													
6. Florida University													
7. Georgia School of Tech.													
8. Kentucky Univ.													
9. Louisiana State Univ.													
10. Mississippi Univ.													
11. Maryland Univ.													
12. North Carolina Univ.													
13. North Carolina State Univ.													
14. Ocala Univ.													
15. Ocala Univ.													

Will consider the matter further

Engineering School being discontinued

G. J. Davis
 J. J. Wilmore
 W. H. Wannamaker
 D. P. Savant
 L. J. Lasselle
 A. B. Hargis
 A. H. Johnson
 E. J. Miller

	#1		#2		#3		#4a		#4b		#4c		Person Reporting
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
16. Rice Institute													
17. Sou. Carolina Univ.			X										
18. Sou. Methodist				X									
19. Stetson Univ. Fla.													
20. Tennessee Univ. of					X								
21. Texas A & M													
22. Texas School of Tech.													
23. Texas University	X												
24. Tulane University	X				X								
25. Vanderbilt Univ	X			X									
26. Va. Poly Inst.		X				X							
27. Va. Univ Of													
28. West Virginia		X			X								B. B. Morris
29. Wake Forest Univ		X			X								W. S. Rodman
30. John Hopkins		X			X								B. M. Brigham
31. Clemson		X			X								T. B. Whitehead
													L. S. Teller
<hr/>													
5 8													
<hr/>													
3 7													
<hr/>													
3 8													
<hr/>													
11													
<hr/>													
2 9													
<hr/>													
1 10													

16. Rice Institute
17. Sou. Carolina Univ.
18. Sou. Methodist
19. Stetson Univ. Fla.
20. Tennessee Univ. of
21. Texas A & M
22. Texas School of Tech.
23. Texas University
24. Tulane University
25. Vanderbilt Univ
26. Va. Poly Inst.
27. Va. Univ Of
28. West Virginia
29. Wake Forest Univ
30. John Hopkins
31. Clemson

B. B. Morris
W. S. Rodman
B. M. Brigham
T. B. Whitehead
L. S. Teller

MINUTES OF THE SOUTHEASTERN SECTION S.P.E.E. MEETING

MADISON, WISCONSIN, JUNE 25th, 1936

The meeting was presided over by Dean W. S. Rodman, Vice chairman of the Section.

The following members were present:

B. R. Van Leer	Univ. of Fla.
B. S. Steinberg	Univ. of Md.
A. McLara White	Univ. of Va.
B. E. Fernow	Clemson
A. M. Hill	Tulane
R. S. King	Ga. Tech
J. E. McDaniel	Ga. Tech
Wm. J. Miller	Univ. of N. C. & Univ. of Ala.
L. J. Lassalle	La. State Univ.
James Robert	Tulane
D. P. Savant	Ga. Tech
W. A. Murray,	V.P.I.
W. B. Wendt	Univ. of Louisville
W. E. Freeman	Univ. of Ky.
D. P. Dixon	La. State Univ.
D. V. Terrell	Univ. of Ky.
R. E. Shaver	Univ. of Ky.
W. D. Morris	Pa. State Univ.
F. T. Tingley	Clemson
E. W. Winkler	Univ. of N. C.
W. S. Rodman	Univ. of Va.
Douglas Anderson	Tulane
Daniel Elliott	Tulane
A. Lee Dunlap	Tulane
N. C. Ebaugh	Univ. of Fla.

After luncheon, the following business was attended to:

Dr. A. M. White of the University of Virginia, was elected to represent the Southeastern Section on the Chemical Engineering Committee.

A motion was made and carried to hold the next meeting of the Section at the University of Florida sometime during the winter or spring. The Executive Committee and Dean Van Leer were delegated to determine the time of the meeting.

After a brief discussion of suitable topics for the program, the meeting was adjourned to permit attendance at the afternoon general session.

N. C. Ebaugh, Secretary