

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM

History of Youngstown College

Faculty Experiences

O. H. 30

DR. EUGENE SCUDDER

Interviewed

by

Randall Dicks

on

February 28, 1974

EUGENE SCUDDER

Dr. Eugene Dodd Scudder, former chairman and professor in the Youngstown State University chemistry department, was born on August 4, 1894, in Indiana. He received his bachelor, masters, and doctoral degrees in chemistry at Indiana University. He was superintendent of schools in Angus, Indiana, before coming to Youngstown in 1930.

Dr. Scudder attended Poland Presbyterian Church and was a member of the American Chemical Society. He served in the U.S. Army Infantry during World War I.

Dr. Scudder taught at Youngstown State University for thirty-eight years, retiring in 1968. He received the Watson Distinguished Professor Award from Youngstown State University in 1961 and the Distinguished Emeritus Alumnus Award at Indiana University. During his years at Youngstown State University, Dr. Scudder helped to make many improvements in the chemistry department.

Dr. Scudder died on April 9, 1975, ending a long and brilliant career. He is survived by his wife, Marie Grimm Scudder, whom he married in 1962, a daughter, Dr. Phyllis Scudder, and a step-daughter, Mrs. Corinne Donaldson.

SILVIA PALLOTTA
JULY 14, 1977

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

ORAL HISTORY PROGRAM

History of Youngstown College

INTERVIEWEE: DR. EUGENE SCUDDER
INTERVIEWER: Randall J. Dicks
SUBJECT: Faculty Experiences
DATE: February 28, 1974

D: This is an interview with Eugene Scudder for the Youngstown State University Oral History Program on February 28, 1974 by Randall J. Dicks.

D: First, Dr. Scudder, I have a list of some of the dates and events of the University's history and I wonder if you see any serious omissions.

S: The date 1930 is wrong. I came here in the fall of 1930 and the first degree was granted the next spring, which would be in 1931. That's the way I recall it. Dr. Jones didn't become President in 1931; he came in here as Director of the school. The head man was Mr. Homer Nearpass. He was still the head in the spring of 1931 when the first A.B. degree was granted. Mr. Jones was brought in as Director to supercede Nearpass, in July of 1931.

A number of our faculty members did not like the term "Director". Four of us--Mr. Bowden, Dr. Foard, Dr. Richardson and myself--wrote a letter to the Board asking that Mr. Jones be given the title of "President". Once when downtown, I remember meeting Mr. James Wick, Chairman of the Board, who said Mr. Jones would be given the title. The first A.B. degree was granted in June of 1931. Mr. Jones was brought in as Director in July of 1931. I remember distinctly that it was after the letter, written and signed by the four of us and sent to the Board, that I met Mr. Wick downtown and he told me that the title was being changed. The letter probably helped.

The first building, which is now known as Jones Hall, was started during the 1930-1931 year. Cornerstone ceremonies were held the last day of May, 1931. I think it was finished late the next fall. Mr. Skeggs had received pledges, or money for a college building, for expansion of the Central YMCA and for the West Federal Street YMCA. I think work was started on most of the projects during the year of 1930-1931.

I can't remember just when we moved into the new building. It housed practically everything then, except the Secretarial School, which was over in the other building. It was the college building previous to Jones Hall being built. There was also a YMCA preparatory school operating here for several years. That was discontinued at about the same time that the degree was conferred.

When I came here in the fall of 1930-1931, an old Wick residence stood on the present site of Jones Hall. It housed the preparatory school. Mr. Raymond Witchey headed that and I think it was discontinued in the spring of the following year, and the new building was built. There was a good deal of transition started during the year 1930-1931.

The year I came here was a depression year and jobs were very scarce. I remember I met Mr. Nearpass down in Columbus in the summer of 1930 and received the appointment later on. There were four of us brought in: Mr. Bowden, who had a bachelor degree and maybe a master's, Dr. Foard, Dr. Richardson and myself. There were two other full-time teachers, Eleanor North and John Bare. There were a number of part-time teachers--I don't recall who they were. That was the nucleus of the school at that time. It was beginning then that the school started to grow. Mr. Jones came here in July of 1931. I don't know when the Dana School of Music was affiliated with Youngstown College. We were first accredited by the Ohio Association of Colleges and later by North Central. The Engineering dates seem about right and the Business dates seem about right. Library and Tod Hall dates are about right, too. The Department of Education became a school that late; I thought it was earlier. The Ward Beecher Science Hall was completed about 1967. As far as I know nothing else here is wrong. I think you have some interesting stories here that would be well worth going into. The Law School here was one of the strongest in the country. They had a very good record and turned out some very good students. The Business School went along as a night school before it became a day school.

D: What were your first impressions of the College at that time? How big was it?

S: Well, it was very small. As I say, that was the depression year and there were almost no jobs anywhere at all. The school was small but it had people who were interested. Mr. Nearpass was very interested, dedicated, and devoted to the school. I don't know if he was an outstanding administrator, but he was trying to do the job. Phillip P. Buchanan was the registrar and field man. Miss Flint, a very efficient person as Public Relations Director, was on the job for many years.

For the first year I came, we had Nearpass, Buchanan, and Frieda Flint; they about constituted the college administrative staff. On the full-time faculty there were John Bare, Eleanor North and the four of us who came in during September of 1930. The school was not a thing to get enthused about, but with the energy displayed by Mr. Skeggs and the start he had given it, the school seemed to have a future. It was on that basis that the four of us came. With the effects of the depression--although it wasn't a big school to come to--it did look hopeful. In other words, it was rather exceptional that a school had so much money coming into it at a time of deep depression. I remember the remark often made that not many schools could do that in depression time. Jobs were very scarce, but the attitude here was fine. The school was under the YMCA rule at that time. I remember after I was employed, I received letters from various members of the YMCA staff welcoming me. I had a feeling of warm welcome when I came. There was a very fine atmosphere even though the YMCA was having some financial troubles; at times there wasn't much money coming in. In fact, that was the case all the way through. I think, frankly, a tremendous contribution--I'm speaking selfishly now--was made by the faculty in working at low salaries. They saw this as essential in helping to establish the school and they made a great sacrifice in doing this.

We might have moved on; I know I could have moved at various times. One time I had an offer of a job and I went to President Jones and talked over with him what the future of the school might hold. It seemed that the school was moving into good things. A feeling that the school had a future to it was what kept the faculty here.

The change came more slowly than we had all hoped for, but nevertheless, it did come. When I came here, the chemistry faculty consisted of myself and a part-time teacher, Mr. Clair. When I left in 1968, we had nineteen full-time faculty members, all with doctor's degrees.

Of course the Chemistry Department had--you might say--a favored position here because of the need for that type of work. We offered some chemical engineering courses before

the Engineering School was started. We organized the metallurgy work and offered laboratory courses in assaying and testing, before the Engineering Department was started. A number of students had a considerable amount of metallurgy work, even though the degree came in Chemistry. I had had some metallurgy work and some engineering courses in working for my doctor's degree. We were able to give it a start. The Metallurgy Department had a fair enrollment even when it was first organized. Later, it was turned over to and became part of the Engineering School. Several years later some of the students wanted a greater amount of science work than they were getting in the engineering degree, so we re-established the B.S. degree in Chemistry with a metallurgy option. A number of students took this option.

We were authorized to grant the B.S. degree in May of 1937. The granting of the degree was more or less offered to us. I had the largest department and so was most concerned with science work. Therefore, I set up the B. S. degree. I felt that a science student needs a broad background, and not just science, so I set up the B.S. degree with a requirement of 136 semester hours. That let the students get a good strong major in Chemistry or any other science--we in Chemistry were about the only ones who offered the B.S. degree for years--and at the same time get a considerable amount of work in the social sciences, history, English, and those things. It did not shorten the work in other fields. This made our degree in chemistry very strong and our students were very happy to take it. Our good students took the B. S. degree rather than the A.B. degree. They wanted to do this so that they could go out and compete with any other students with master's degrees.

There was an incident which illustrates why I was sorry to see the recent cutback in the B.S. degree to the A.B. level. During World War II, I offered a course in the making of the "Big Four" high explosives being used: TNT, Tetryl, Ammonium Picrate and Picric Acid. With the B.S. degree students were able to include it as part of their major in Chemistry.

I sent William Acks, a B.S. Chemistry major who had taken the course, up to the plant making high explosives in Sandusky, Ohio. He was given a job on a TNT line and soon was supervising one of the lines. The next year I sent up four more Chemistry majors who had taken the course in explosives. They were at first told that there were no jobs. In further talking, the interviewer asked the boys where they had had their training. They told him they had training at Youngstown College and they all got jobs. They also soon became line supervisors. At one time our boys were supervising a major number of lines in high explosives.

Early in World War II the U. S. Government set up the E S M D T program--Engineering, Science, Management, Defense Training. Dr. McQuagg, Dean of the School of Engineering at Ohio State University, was co-ordinator of the work offered in Ohio and most of Michigan and Kentucky. We cleared our management courses through Western Reserve University, our engineering courses through Case and our chemistry courses directly with Washington. When we entered the war E S M D T became E S M W T--War Training replacing Defense Training.

We drew from the metallurgical departments of U. S. Steel, Sheet and Tube and Republic Steel people to teach some of the metallurgy courses. We felt a great service was rendered by the work. Mr. Harry J. Sweeney, Chief Metallurgist of Republic Steel, made the remark, "I don't know what we would have done without some of the courses." Our college enrollment had been cut back greatly by the boys being in the army so the enrollment in the ESMWT courses constituted about a third of all enrollment.

There has been a great deal of change in attitude in the College since I first entered here. Then, in general the student came first and the monied research programs, which often bring much financial help to the school and faculty members involved, played only a minor role. Now much more I think both the student and the school have lost, to a certain degree, by the change.

If a school offers graduate work, it, by all means, should have a well-rounded research program. Too often the programs are offered at the expense of good undergraduate teaching. This is especially true at the freshman level. Poorly qualified assistants are often put in almost full charge of freshman laboratories. The regular faculty member devotes his time to research work.

Always when you have graduate work you tend to swing the laboratory work over to the graduate assistants, sometimes good and sometimes bad. Of course, we sometimes had bad faculty members running the laboratory. This shows the difference in emphasis--it used to be that the instructor or the professor was usually in the laboratory--now the assistant runs the laboratory and he might or might not be interested in the student as much as the grant.

Schools have much more money now and can buy the equipment they want, but again, I'm not sure it's giving the student all he should have. If the student can feel that the school is there to help him, he appreciates it. We had almost no feeling of antagonism between

the faculty and the students back in the early days. There was a feeling that they were all one body. The faculty was there for them and they were there to do a good job and they appreciated what the faculty was doing. We've lost that with emphasis on monied programs. It is not only in schools, it is everywhere. Dollar signs have defeated much of the story of good teaching, good government officials, all the way through. I don't know if I am giving you what you want.

D: Yes, you are.

S: It's a personal story. That's the way I saw things. I can see my method in doing what we were trying to do. Incidentally, I had some very devoted faculty members during the thirty-eight years I was there. I shall not try to enumerate them. In general, we were very fortunate in our Chemistry faculty in that they had that feeling of loyalty to the students. Of course, I had hoped that they would have this attitude. It was the thing I wanted. When I was employing teachers my general statement was, "we are employing first for teaching, second for research." We couldn't offer much research, anyhow, so it had to be that way, whether they wished it or not. I got through to them the way I felt. Consequently, I always had quite a strong teaching faculty and I felt our work progressed well because of it. Now, of course, on some of these things, you might get a slightly different view if you talked with some of the others and I think that you should do that rather than just getting my view.

I think Dr. George Jones, the Librarian, has been here long enough to see a lot of things from the outside and would have a pretty good cross-section view of all the faculty. Most of the older administrative people are gone. Mr. Pickard is gone. Mr. Rook has seen much of the change. Most of the others are new and I don't know how much they have seen of these things. There are very few of the officials here now that were here when I was here. Mr. Rook came in a few years after I left. Preceding him was Mr. Pickard. Mrs. Smith has been on the staff here for years; she can give you a lot of the background.

D: Did the Chemistry Department expand more rapidly than the rest of the college?

S: Yes, it did for a great number of years. Much of it was due to me. I hope part of it was due to me and to the other members of the Chemistry faculty. There was the need here for the things we did. We worked for

the students. We could always be very proud of the students' records and of their placement. I mentioned the particular case in Sandusky. We placed one or two students with Standard Oil of Indiana every year, for several years. Our students with this B.S degree were able to compete with students from elsewhere with a master's degree. I think we put out good students and shaped our work to meet the needs of the valley. We rendered a needed service and our relationship with the industries was a good one.

I had a boy by the name of Jimmy O'Brien, who was a major in Chemistry. I heard that he was from a fairly large family, not too well-to-do, and the money he earned went largely to help out at home. He was working in the steel mills, on night turn, going to school, and assisting in the Chemistry laboratory. I asked him one time how he was able to do all this and keep awake in class. His remark was, "Well, when I feel myself getting sleepy, I ask a question." Well, I remember that he did that; he was an excellent student. That young fellow rose to a foreman, superintendent, and I think to a vice president of U. S. Steel. I tried to select teachers that were interested in teaching and would be interested in their students. That was the thing I looked for when selecting teachers.

Yes, our department was the department that grew the most rapidly. President Jones was always a sympathetic listener. I never went to President Jones with any request unless I thought I had a good reason for it. One time I never did explain to President Jones, or Foard made the remark to President Jones saying, "Scudder says that the way to get things done around here is to ask for a little at a time." Well, I did say essentially that, but Foard did not add my further comment. What I went on to say was, "If you have a definite need for something, you'll usually get the thing you need." In other words, don't make a grandiose approach and try to jump in and get a great big thing before your needs develop. Organize that need and present it, and you'll get it. I found President Jones always very cooperative. Another thing, too, I think the faculty all felt that President Jones was interested in the welfare of "family." Our salaries were not good, but in sickness and things of that sort, President Jones was very quick to see that the family was helped as much as possible. We all would have liked better salaries, naturally, but this very considerate and humane attitude of President Jones helped greatly and gave us a very warm feeling toward him.

D: Did the needs of the community and the interests of the students change as time went on?

S: Not appreciably as long as I was here. I don't ever recall having any students coming in and saying that they were wrongly treated. Oh, there were little minor things, but nothing of importance. I think they all felt that they could come in and discuss things with us. Following World War II, a number of older boys came back under the GI Bill, came back to face the villain in the world but some of them were outstandingly good and altogether we had an interesting group of students. Our Chemistry Department had such a big enrollment with all of these students coming back and taking chemistry. We had some outstanding students. Quite a number of students received an A.B. or B.S. in chemistry,--preferably a B.S. if they could make it--some went on to medical school.

I made a study of my own on pre-medical schools. I wrote the deans of medical schools asking them what they advised students to take should they go into medicine. In about half, the answers came back stating that it didn't matter what the outstanding students majored in. But the poor students would probably have more of the science work, especially chemistry. In other words, they wanted the weak student to concentrate on science. With strong students they weren't so much concerned about science since the student would be picking that up with his medical work. But if they were poor students, then they wouldn't have time for that broader expansion. If they could get the B.S. degree, they did so because it gave them a much better background. All the better students went for the B.S. degree, if possible. They were doing it for themselves. And of course they were also helping the school, since the tuition for 136 hours is more than for 124 hours, so it worked a mutual benefit. It helped our department, it helped the school, and it helped the student.

D: What were most students being prepared for? Were they thinking of work in this area or were many going on to medicine or graduate work?

S: Quite a number, I don't know how many went to medical school. We had many students who went on for graduate work and many went out in industry. We had our students as I said, going to Standard Oil of Indiana, Sandusky, and the energy plant down here in Ohio. One of our graduates, a girl, was placed in a very nice and good paying job near Columbus. You had to be sort of an outstanding student to get into a medical school. With a B.S. in chemistry it was easier. I think our department sent more students for graduate work than any other department. Of course, we turned out more graduates than any other department for many years. Yes, we had some

three or four students at one time in Indiana University. We had many going to Ohio State, Western Reserve, Case, Carnegie, and other schools.

We used to run an open house about every year. Dennis Devine, a Chemistry major, asked if he could set up a demonstration in the Organic Laboratory in what is now known as Jones Hall. The room he wished to use is on the third floor between the two towers. It was equipped with two fifteen-foot double desks. That gave a sixty foot length of working space. Dennis worked at the American Tar Products Company off of Logan Avenue. He wished to set up a demonstration showing the distillation of coal tar and products obtained. He started in very modestly, but soon expanded to take in the whole laboratory. The demonstration was outstanding. His boss came to see the demonstration and was very much impressed with the setup and the grasp Dennis had of the subject.

The Koppers Company of Pittsburgh took over American Tar and when Dennis graduated with his B.S. in chemistry, the company, at their expense, sent him to Carnegie Tech. for graduate study. They cared for his expenses for a doctor's degree.

When Dennis asked if he could make the setup, all I required was that he carry it through. He did that and much more.

D: Did the role or function of the Chemistry Department or sciences, in general, change in the University from when you first came here to recently?

S: No, I don't think it had changed appreciably as long as I was here. There was no graduate work, at that time. I got the graduate work approved the year I left. When the engineering school came in, it pulled away a certain fraction of our students, although we still had plenty. The medical technology work increased, the pre-nursing work increased. We had a larger percentage of medical technology students and pre-nursing students. But, as to the role we tried to play in the Chemistry Department, it never changed. I never had any feeling of this gap between the students and the faculty which seems to be more prevalent in schools now; we had none of that. You know, to me it seems that a teacher striking, displays an attitude a true teacher should not have. There shouldn't have to be strikes, but maybe it is necessary. I don't know; I'm not in it now to know. But it's just too bad to have strikes, whether they have been brought on from the outside or within from the faculty. I don't know who's to blame for it, but I do think it's an unfortunate circumstance. However it has come about.

- D: What was the relationship between local industry and the University?
- S: Insofar as I know, it was quite good. I know industry was pretty generous with its money. And again, speaking for my department, we had excellent working relations with the industries. I think the most outstanding industry was U.S. Steel, and second was either Sheet and Tube or Republic Steel. I think student contracts were more limited in the last two industries than they were in U.S. Steel. I am not sure about Republic, but our students went through Sheet and Tube. They went through U.S. Steel quite a number of times. They were always welcome at Carnegie, Illinois (U.S. Steel) on Steel Street. They were very good in trying to help the students to get work. I'm thinking of Jimmy O'Brien, one of our most outstanding students.

We brought in these teachers from U.S. Steel plants, Sheet and Tube and some from Republic. Donald Babcock, from Republic Steel, was very helpful to me. He was the head of the metallurgy department. In the Sheet and Tube we had Carl Fethers. When I was running the metallurgy work, he came and helped me organize it and he taught it for one year. He did an outstandingly good job. I recall when we were setting up some of these war programs, the president of Sheet and Tube, Frank Purnell, was very helpful. He met with us and gave us all the help he could. He is the only one I remember of industrial head officers meeting with us. Of course, Carl Fethers, chief research man, and later vice president, was a great help. I don't know what his position is now at Sheet and Tube. The head chemist out at the Carnegie, Illinois plant was very nice, too, in taking our groups and personally conducting them through the Ohio Leather Works. I don't know how many times we took groups there. We had our students over at the Shenango Pottery Company and the G.E. Plant on Hughes Street on the South Side and also in Niles. They visited the Goodyear plant and Research Laboratories in Akron. We had graduates employed in the research laboratories at Goodyear.

During World War II, we had to give temporary leaves to faculty members, and John Naples was let go. He went over and got a job at Goodyear and did some very fine work. He was doing so well over there that when we wanted him to come back, we didn't get him back. I don't know where he is now. He was one of our graduates and had his doctorate from Indiana University.

- D: What about the rest of the community? What was their attitude toward the University, especially in the early years?

S: Oh, there was then, there is anytime in small and local schools, considerable criticism. There was, of course, some poor work here, and I suppose we did some poor work in Chemistry, too. But also you could get good work done here. My feeling is that in most any school, if you're looking for poor work, you'll find the teacher that's done poor work, but if you're looking for good work, you'll find the teacher that's doing good work. The ones that criticize most probably are the ones that knew the least about certain work. Here is what I mean. I had, one time, a boy who went up to Hiram College. He reported back that they wouldn't accept his chemistry work up there. I thought that was funny. I knew the chemistry department head, Dr. Falls, and what he thought of our work so I went back into this boy's record. I found his grades in chemistry were D's. Of course they wouldn't accept it; no school would accept D work. Yes, the school did have the problem of getting work accepted at times. It depended largely on the department. There again, as I say, we sort of got a running start and so we had extremely good success. But we had criticism, some was probably just, some was probably not just. There was a department where we had considerable criticism, but in general, it was due to some individual instructor and was probably deserved.

There were differences in the high school graduates, much depended on the principal in the school. At Chaney there was a very good disciplinarian. The students from Chaney, that came in were almost always wonderful. It was the same with East High. Much of it depended on which teachers the students had in high school, and of course who the science teachers were. They had good chemistry teachers at both Chaney and East High. The students got great work. That made a difference. I'd say, as a whole, that we probably fared as well as any small school. In my first college year I went to a small college in Danville, Indiana. Here again, it had both good and bad work. There was a lot of criticism of the work at Danville, but again, I knew there was good work because I was there myself. I did more than a year's work there before I transferred to Indiana University. You could get bad work at Indiana if you wished. So there's criticism of schools, sure, and there's always bad work. Sometimes you get someone that is too darned easy or someone who is too tough.

I knew Dr. Stradley who was Vice-President and Head of Admissions down at Ohio State. He came up here on an accrediting visitation of the school. This thing happened which pleased me very much. I met him on the stairs in Jones Hall and introduced myself. In talking to me, he said he felt the Chemistry Department was the strongest department in the school. So there again we didn't get as much criticism probably as some departments. We just happened to get a running start.

The Biology Department didn't have a full-time teacher for a number of years, so it got a slower start. I was more or less, in on the ground floor and had a distinct advantage. I hope I made proper use of it. That was the story. So when I speak of that, it's just to recognize that circumstances helped me tremendously.

D: Was there a noticeable change when the College's association with the YMCA stopped, and when the College became financially independent?

S: No. See, there was no change in administration. The president and board stayed the same. Before the college separated from the YMCA, there'd been a change there. Mr. Skeggs who started the college was no longer there and another man, Mr. Paul Davies, became General Secretary of the YMCA before the separation. So the transition, insofar as I know, was very smooth and nice. We had hardly noticed the YMCA was in control for several years, so it was more a matter of form than anything else, when it officially came off.

D: It wasn't something sudden or a big issue?

S: No. Many schools had been doing that. Fenn College up in Cleveland, at one time, was a YMCA school. It has been the tendency with many of the church schools to become more independent of the church. No, there was nothing abrupt in the change at all.

D: Was it something that people felt strongly about? Did they think it was important for the schools to separate?

S: I think in general, a separation would be good if a school is too much under the control of the church or YMCA. I think the condition here, as a whole, was quite satisfactory.

Anyhow, I don't think Mr. Davies felt any antagonism toward the school separating from the YMCA. We had on the board, some very fine people; Judge Eugene Bennett, was an example, he was chairman of the YMCA board for a number of years. Many were big people in the town. And I don't mean in the sense that they just threw their weight around. They were strong workers. So that made the transition pretty easy. I don't know just how much President Jones was responsible for this. He succeeded in having quite a good college board behind him most of the time, and that was very helpful.

D: Was the change from college to university, mostly a change in name or was the college really a university?

S: I would say the change was mostly in name. At first I remember, however, hearing criticism on that point. A Youngstown lawyer said to me, "I don't see why that school should be a university. It doesn't have graduate work." Of course, that isn't the determining requisite of a university anyhow. The school was a university in organization to a great extent before it became a university. You see, it had the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Schools of Law and Business Administration, Music, and Education, before it was a university. In more recent years, the Department of Education has become large, as has the School of Business Administration. They both were new schools. Chemistry began its growth early. Education and Business Administration came later. The Education Department had a tremendous growth along with Business Administration. We dropped the Law School, I think, before we became a university. I can't think right now of any dramatic change, as far as I was concerned in going from a college to a university. You, of course, feel a little bit larger, you know.

D: What were the problems or the concerns of the latter part of your experience here? Was there any change in the first half and the second half? What were the changes in the attitudes and feelings of the faculty and the students?

S: Well, I would say there was no marked change until about the time the school became a university. A new president came in about then and the setup changed greatly, some for the good, some for the bad, so the organization became different then. In the early times there was a rather gradual growth and in the last years it has been much more rapid. We had expanded so much in Chemistry and our enrollment had gone up so high that we now had nineteen on our faculty.

We were, incidentally, trying to hold our Chemistry faculty to this level. To do this and at the same time maintain the best teaching possible and not overload the individual faculty member I had set up a new plan of organization in the freshman schedule for the year I left. Three regular members of the faculty would form a unit. The unit would include up to 270 students in one lecture group. The three faculty members would share the lectures equally with each taking as much as possible the phases in which he felt most qualified. For laboratory work and laboratory discussions the group of 270 would be divided into nine sections and each of the three faculty members would have three of the sections. With this plan the instructor would have contact with his students in lecture, laboratory and laboratory discussions. I would have liked to have seen the plan tried, but Dr. Rand did not follow through with it.

With the change of administration, there was a difference. When you get a new administration, changes come; some are for the good and some are for the bad. Then there was a good bit of growth. Then by going state the money came in. There were three things that changed: administration, growth and money. We were very handicapped on money all the way through. If I bought a piece of apparatus which cost as much as \$600, I had to plan for it a great deal. We needed to justify the purchase. Today it is a drop in the bucket.

There again, so much emphasis in schools has gone toward the money spent. Sometimes I wondered. Often it seemed the less equipment the student had, the more he learned from the course. They learned to improvise and make do with what they had. They had to understand the basic principles better. There is a limit both ways.

No, I would say there was no change of attitude of students or faculty through all the years I was here. However, the change was coming, which had to do with the great increase in enrollment. It went up, you know, tremendously just before I left. Of course, it's gone down since. Not because I went out, but because that's the condition in most schools. The changes in administration, in the amount of money, in the regulations of going state, and a larger enrollment, all played a part. I think I worked harder in the various details of administrative work in the last year, than I had in any two years before that. I would turn in reports, one after another, that were almost identical. This was no one's fault, but that's just the way it was. In other words, it just went too fast. It was hard to sort out the good changes from the bad and there are always needed changes. There are always changes that could be delayed too long, but I'm rather of the conservative opinion; I think changes should go a little slower, and as needed, rather than because someone gets an inspiration.

Educational procedures have gone through so many changes in the way of approaching things. Something is started and then thrown over to try something else--probably much too soon. Someone was able to sell a new idea.

- D: Now that we've had the change to state university, I suppose the increase in available money from the expansion, will be both good and bad.
- S: That's right, yes. The money should be very good. But anytime you have money, you tend to ride some of your pet notions along, because of easy money. Again some of these pet notions are good and some of them are very bad. Change for the sake of change is not good. Change for the sake of improvement is fine. We sometimes don't make a distinction between them.

D: At the time you left, what was the state of community relations and cooperation with industry and the reputation of the Chemistry Department of the University as a whole?

S: I would say it was good. No, I don't think there was any deterioration there. In fact, I think as the school grew each year, there was more cooperation. The School of Education went through a period of criticism because the teacher training expanded faster than it could be cared for well. The English Department was criticized for having so many people teach their Freshman English. There was poor teaching and maybe poor organization. I don't blame the department as much as the conditions. When we went state, and had all this money coming in, it was hard to meet all these changes without some confusion. Say the problem Simon is having. It is tremendous. He may be the best man in the world. I don't know how good he is. He has a problem and will make mistakes.

D: I don't want to take much more of your time. What do you think of the future Chemistry Department here now? Is it going to continue to expand? Is there still the local demand?

S: I would imagine. I haven't talked to Dr. Rand about that. As I said, we were authorized to offer the master's degree in Chemistry the year I left; he came the next year. They have, I think, some 12 to 15 students in graduate school, which is plenty for them at the present time. How much is being slanted toward industry, I don't know. I was trying with the master's degree to get in a phase of metallurgy work, I don't think Dr. Rand followed through on that. I don't know how much it slants toward industrial needs and our local needs or whether a doctor's degree is being considered. I just can't answer those questions.

Rand seems to be a very interested and energetic man and I think he's putting himself to the work in very good shape.

D: All right. Thank you very much.

S: Yes, sir.

END OF INTERVIEW