

from the EDITOR

Should CEE be Discontinued?

One of our readers questions "the wisdom of publishing **Chemical Engineering Education**." His reason (see Letters section) is that "the magazine is so obviously a quality publication, it will no doubt attract all of the papers pertaining to chemical engineering education, whereas previously many of these papers would have been published in . . . journals such as *Chemical Engineering Progress*." Consequently, he argues, the practitioners in industry will be less aware of educational trends, thereby widening the industry-academic gap.

The editor has replied as follows:

"My immediate answer is that practically all the papers we have published so far would not have been published by CEP. . . . And, I believe that most faculty members would state that CEE fills an important professional need that other journals do not. Furthermore, I do not believe that abolishing CEE would enhance your quite desirable objective of getting educational matters before the practicing engineer.

It seems to me that what is needed, instead of abolishing CEE, is to make it easier for practicing engineers to see it. One way to accomplish this would be to ask the AIChE to co-sponsor CEE and have it sent at modest cost to engineers in industry. Another way, which we have considered, would be to send one or more copies to each local section to be read by their officers and to be used in career guidance work.

I certainly do agree with you that we should do all that we can to alleviate the industry-academic gap and keep graduate engineers abreast of new developments in education. In fact, I have often suggested that the articles we have published dealing with newer developments in education would be much more understandable to the practicing engineer than many of those in the technical journals. What do you think of the idea of promoting **Chemical Engineering Education** among industry as a medium of communication and of continuing education?"

In keeping with the above suggestion, CEE is planning to publish reports of various AIChE committees that deal with educational matters. We begin in this issue with a report from the Educational and Accreditation Committee; future issues will contain reports from the AIChE Educational Projects, Continuing Education and Career Guidance Committees. Through the publication of these reports and of our educational articles, we hope that we can encourage engineers in industry to read CEE. While financial support from the AIChE is very unlikely at this time, we would welcome AIChE assistance in bringing

the possibility of subscription to CEE to the attention of its members.

On the other hand the larger question raised by the reader who wrote us cannot be ignored. With CEE now beginning its fourth year of publication at the University of Florida, we feel that it is time to ask ourselves and our readers whether they feel that CEE should be discontinued. We are encouraged that many of the departments that have responded to Professor Churchill's letter soliciting bulk subscriptions have greatly increased the number of copies ordered—although many others have not replied. We are also pleased that, thanks to the yeomen efforts of Professor Jim Weber and his Publication Board, our advertising income may exceed expectations; we should have the financial resources to publish this year. However we would be pleased to see comments from our readers on whether we should continue publication, and, if so, on how we can better serve both the professor and the engineer in industry. R.W.F.

NOTE TO DEPARTMENT CHAIRMAN AND SUBSCRIBERS

Renewals for 1971 of individual (at \$10/yr.) and bulk subscriptions (at \$4/yr. with \$25 minimum for six) should be sent to R. B. Bennett, Bus. Mgr. CEE, Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32601.

from our READERS

Discontinue CEE

Sir: I have recently been wondering about the wisdom of publishing **CHEMICAL ENGINEERING EDUCATION** and would like to solicit your viewpoints on the subject. You and the others who have been associated with the publication in recent years have done an outstanding job and certainly deserve the highest of compliments.

It is not the quality of the magazine that causes my concern, but rather its impact on the chemical engineering profession. As a matter of fact, it is my impression that the improved quality of the magazine may be its greatest weakness. Now that the magazine is so obviously a quality publication, it will no doubt attract all of the papers pertaining to chemical engineering education, whereas previously many of these papers would have been published in other chemical engineering journals such as **Chemical Engineering Progress**. I feel that the real strength in any profession lies in its interest in education of new members of that profession. Therefore, it is of utmost importance that the practitioners of that profession be constantly aware of educational trends and changes. Recent presentations by Max Peters and committee activities, such as the Wilke Committee, sub-