

# Irregularities

## M. E. COOLEY, CONSULTING ENGINEER

## Associates

H. C. Anderson      H. E. Riggs  
86 Park Place  
Newark, N. J.

December 7th, 1916

Mr. J. I. Lyle,  
39 Cortlandt St.,  
New York City.

Note.

This letter is in  
bound vol. of  
Minutes of Bd. of Trustees

between Oct. 13 meeting  
and Dec. 12 meeting  
MEC - 4-29, 1969

My dear Irvine:

Agreeable to your request of last evening, I am glad to give you my ideas of the advantage to be gained by the Consolidation of the several separate Engineering Schools at the Kentucky University, into one Engineering Department, with one Dean in control of all branches of Engineering. It seems to me the advantages of such an organization are so numerous, that it is not necessary to mention all of them, so will confine my remarks to only a few of the most important. I would also like to say that such ideas as I will express are governed by actual experience, working in an organization of this kind for the last sixteen years.

1. My idea of the organization would be, one Dean of Engineering and a head Professor for each branch of Engineering, such as Mechanical, Electrical, Civil, Chemical, Mining and Architecture, the head Professor of each of these branches to be responsible directly to the Dean of the Engineering Department.
2. The several head Professors should constitute a standing committee, with the Dean of Engineering as Chairman; this committee to have regular meetings, at these meetings such important subjects as the general policy of the department, the teaching force, salaries, subjects taught, methods of teaching and methods of discipline, could all be thoroughly discussed and some definite course of procedure for each individual case would be adopted or recommended to the faculty for their consideration.
3. I believe the greatest advantage of this consolidation would be the increased efficiency and economy in the teaching staff. With the separate schools as they now have, there must be a large amount of duplication of courses and work; this would be eliminated at once. You will also find a very marked increase in the teaching efficiency of the several departments. For example, you will find that one department is able to teach some particular subject better than another and vice versa. There is no reason that I can see or that I have ever found, why students, say in the Civil Engineering Department should not go to the Mechanical Engineering Department for part of their instruction. In fact, I think such an arrangement is very desirable. For example, at the University of Michigan, our Mechanical Engineers are taught subjects

by the Electrical Engineering Department, by the Civil Engineering Department, ~~and by Chemical Engineering Department~~ and we find that the instruction received by these men is very much better and is obtained at a far less cost to the University than if the Mechanical Engineering Department should attempt to teach such subjects. You will also eliminate the overlapping of work in different subjects, that is, one Professor in giving a course, covers a part of the ground covered by some one else in another course.

4. The students in taking work in these several Departments will come in contact with specialists in different subjects. They would also come in contact with students of other departments, and I always feel that a great amount of general knowledge is absorbed in this way.

5. The Dean of Engineering will have a chance to compare the work that is being done in each branch of Engineering, and if he finds one branch is falling behind he can immediately find the cause, and possibly correct the mistake, before that particular branch of Engineering is wrecked. You will also find that the head Professor in each branch will be thoroughly familiar with the kind and character of work that is being done in other branches, and will constantly be looking for methods to improve his work and bring it up to or even above the work of the other branches. He will also feel that by being a member of the standing Committee, that he has some part in the management and policy, not only of his branch, but the other branches. This I believe will serve to make him a very much broader minded man, and soon bring about a united faculty working together as a unit to build up the Engineering Department as a whole.

6. I believe the discipline administered will be more uniform and just, as the Dean of the Department can review all cases and bring them before the standing Committee for advice.

7. The Dean of the Engineering Department should be a man of excellent executive ability and should have the ability to meet people and students and immediately command their confidence and respect. The students would also receive the benefit of this close personal contact with the Dean.

8. The work in the first year should be the same for all branches of engineering; in fact, this could be extended to include the second year. The student should not be required to choose the branch of Engineering he intends to follow until he has spent one year at the University, thus giving him more time to decide what branch he will follow for his life's work.

I hope the above suggestions will be of some help to you in solving this important problem, and I am delighted to know the Board is giving consideration to so important a matter.

Yours truly,

HCA/T

(Signed)

H. C. Anderson 197

Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Trustees of  
the University of Kentucky, December 12, 1916

The Board of Trustees of the University of Kentucky met in regular session with Governor A. O. Stanley in the chair and the following members present: Governor A. O. Stanley, President Barker, C. B. Terrell, Frank McKee, V. O. Gilbert, Matt Cohen, V. J. Harris, R. J. Bassett, T. L. Hornsby, J. L. Letterle, H. M. Froman, J. M. Elliston, Fred R. Blackburn, Tibbis Carpenter, Gover W. H. Cox, D. P. Smith, R. C. Stoll, J. A. Amons, President J. K. Patterson, J. W. Turner, G. S. Brock, Frank Battaile, J. I. Lyle, J. E. Brown, P. P. Johnston, Jr., Dr. S. B. Marks, Dr. A. Gatliffe, R. W. Wathen, James Breathitt, and C. B. Nichols being absent.

On the question of approval of the minutes of the Executive Board which contained the report of the action of that Board combining the Colleges of Civil and Mechanical & Electrical Engineering, Mr. Cohen moved that the minutes be approved with the exception of that part which referred to this coalition. The motion was adopted unanimously.

At the close of the reading of the minutes, Mr. Stoll moved that as he had been informed that certain students and Dean Rowe were in waiting with petitions to be presented to this Board, affecting the proposed Engineering merger, that they be granted permission to appear. Mr. Stoll included in his motion also that Dean Anderson of the College of Mechanical & Electrical Engineering and Dean Norwood of the College of Mining Engineering be called before the Board. This motion was carried.

D. P. Smith moved that any number not to exceed five of the protesting bodies of students be permitted to speak for reasonable time. President Patterson moved an amendment that students be given the right to appear and be given ample time to present their cause. Seconded by Mr. Cohen, the motion as amended was adopted.

On motion the Board then adjourned for lunch in the College of Home Economics.

The Board re-convened at two o'clock and Mr. Froman moved that the Trustees tender a vote of thanks to Dean Sweeney for the excellent dinner served to the Board and the charming manner in which the young women served the same. The motion was unanimously adopted.

Suspending the order of procedure, Chairman Stanley stated that he would receive members of Board of Control of Patterson Hall, consisting of Mrs. A. M. Harrison, Mrs. Elizabeth King Smith and Mrs. S. T. Harbison and hear their report. Mrs. A. M. Harrison read the report of the Board of Control which she said covered a period of the month only during which they had served. In connection with this report, Mrs. Harrison advised that the recreation hall, which had been converted into

into temporary rooms for girl students, should be made safe from fire by introduction of proper fire escape. Mr. Stoll suggested that fire escapes be put in at once but that the Board of Control make recommendations as to the temporary rooms later because in his judgement it would be unwise to expend money to introduce transoms, etc. for ventilation purpose, then perhaps later abolish these rooms entirely.

Mr. Stoll then moved to refer this matter to the Executive Committee. The report of the Board of Control was received and filed, which is as follows:

December 12, 1916

The present Board of Control of the Women's Dormitory was appointed by the Executive Committee at its meeting on November 1, 1916.

After a conference with the President of the University and later with the Executive Committee in regard to its duties, the Board formally signified its acceptance of the position on November 15, 1916.

It has held six meetings since then, and has devoted all its time to becoming familiar with the resources and expenditures of the institution, and with the condition of Patterson Hall.

#### FINANCES

The income of the Dormitory comes from two sources:-

1. From an annual State appropriation of two thousand dollars (\$2000), which the law says shall be used "to defray the running expenses of the women's dormitory, including fuel, lights, and servant's hire." This sum is not handled by the book-keeper of Patterson Hall, but is disbursed by the business agent of the University

2. From the Board of 133 students, at the rate of \$3.75 per week, from President Barker and his wife who pay each twenty-five (\$25) per month, and from Dean Hamilton who pays five dollars (\$5) per week. A fee is also charged for guests who visit the Hall from time to time.

While the Board of Control has only been in office since the middle of November, yet it submits a brief statement of the receipts and expenditures of Patterson Hall since the opening of the University on September 11, made by Miss Elizabeth Hopper, book-keeper of the Dormitory, who collects and disburses all of its funds:-

#### "Monthly report of School 1916 & 17. Beginning Sept. 11

September 11 to October 1	
Cash Balance	71.85
Room deposit	449.60

Monthly report of School 1916-17 Continued

Deposited		1414.04
Expended	1704.01	
Balance	231.48	
	<u>\$ 1935.48</u>	<u>1935.48</u>

October 1, Balance		231.48
Deposited		1907.80
Expended	1812.15	
Balance	327.13	
	<u>\$2139.28</u>	<u>2139.28</u>

November 1, Balance		327.13
Deposited		1937.59
Expended	2263.01	
Balance	1.71	
	<u>\$2264.72</u>	<u>2264.72</u>

December 1, Balance		\$ 1.71
---------------------	--	---------

Miss Hopper says, "This statement includes all purchases to December 1, but does not include board collected since December 1, which is a little more than \$500."

We find on studying the itemized statements of the expenditures of Patterson Hall, that servants' hire, amounting to more than two hundred dollars per month, is included in the amounts disbursed by Miss Hopper. This item, according to the law, should be paid from the State appropriation, but has not been charged to it in the past. Since servants' hire amounts to more than the entire appropriation, it is clearly impossible to pay all of it from this source; but your Board would ask that any sum in the two thousand dollars, over and above the cost of fuel, lights and water, should be refunded to the Board of Control at the close of the school year. It feels that this will be absolutely necessary this year, on account of running the dormitory at the same rate of board as in former year, when the cost of living is so much higher. Another item that is paid out of the receipts from Patterson Hall is the salaries of Miss Hopper, book-keeper, and Miss Pickett, matron, each of whom receives five hundred dollars per year.

CONDITION OF PATTERSON HALL

There has been a large increase in the attendance of women students at the University this year, who desired board at Patterson Hall. In order to accommodate them the Recreation Hall, the only room in the building large enough for social gatherings, was partitioned off into

ten rooms, where twenty two students were placed. This is a most unsatisfactory arrangement; the thin walls prevent the necessary quiet for study and for rest, the rooms are inadequately ventilated and are therefore unsanitary, and the students are deprived of a place for those social meetings which are so important a part of College life. In addition to those objections, the fire risk of the residents of the Hall is increased. In order to get expert advice on this question, your Board asked the Department of Public Works of Lexington to send out its Building Inspector to go over Patterson Hall, and render a report to them. Mr. T. J. McKenna made this inspection on December 5, and submitted the following recommendations on Friday, December 8.

"On account of increased attendance, one large room was partitioned off into several rooms with a hall-way between. We recommend that these rooms be fitted with transoms above the doors, thereby giving better ventilation for the rooms and light for the hall. Also, a fire escape should be installed at the end of the hall, to accommodate the occupants of these rooms.

We would also recommend that the outside doors to halls be changed to swing outward, and a red light indicating "Exit" be placed above each of these doors. One or two chemical fire extinguishers placed in the halls would add to their safety. Two roof ventilators, placed in each wing of the building would be a great help towards having fresh air in the summer months. An item of safety would be a fire drill and signal inaugurated among the young ladies."

Signed, T. J. McKenna.

The Board of Control regrets that its brief time of service prevents it from making a more complete and satisfactory report, and assures the Trustees of its purpose to do all in its power for the safety and welfare of the Women's Dormitory of State University.

Respectfully submitted,

Mrs. A. M. Harrison, Chairman  
Mrs. Chas. J. Smith, Secretary  
Mrs. Shelby T. Harbison

In connection with this report, Mrs. Harrison submitted the following report made by T. J. McKenna, City Building Inspector on general sanitary condition in Patterson Hall.

Lexington, Kentucky Dec. 7, 1916

Mrs. A. M. Harrison,  
Chairman of the Board  
of Control for Patterson Hall,  
Lexington, Kentucky.

Dear Madam:

The following is an Inspection Report of Patterson

Hall made December 5th, 1916:

Met with two members of the Board of Control, Mrs. A. M. Harrison and Mrs. Charles J. Smith and with Miss Anna J. Hamilton, Dean of Women of the Hall, and Miss Pickett, Matron, at 2:30 P.M. and went through each room of every department.

Perfect order and discipline of occupants noticeable; cleanliness of building, basement to attic, could not be improved. No rubbish to be found, thereby eliminating great fire danger.

Management deserves praise for clean and orderly arrangement of kitchen, provision rooms and dining room. The same may be said of the Engineer whose furnace room is in perfect order, and in this department a point of economy is practiced in the saving of cinders that are used for making walks in the rear of the building.

On account of increased attendance one large room was partitioned off into several rooms with a hall-way between. We would recommend that these rooms be fitted with transoms above the doors, thereby giving better ventilation for the rooms and light for the hall. Also a fire escape should be installed at the end of this hall to accommodate the occupants of these rooms.

We would also recommend that the outside doors to halls be changed to swing outward, and a red light indicating "Exit" be placed above each of these doors. One or two chemical fire extinguishers placed in the halls would add to their safety. Two roof ventilators placed in each wing of the buildings would be a great help towards having fresh air in the Summer months. An item of safety would be a fire drill and signal inaugurated among the young ladies.

Thanking the ladies of the Board of Control of Patterson Hall for their trouble and kindness in showing me through the building, I beg to remain

Respectfully,

T. J. McKenna.

Professor Terrell appeared and submitted a petition to the Board as spokesman to a Committee representing the faculty of the College of Arts and Science which was a general request for increase in salaries, due to the increased cost of living. Chairman Stanley suggested that the matter should come properly before the Executive Board. President Barker thereupon moved that the petition be filed and the matter be referred to the Executive Committee. The motion carried.

At this point, the students presenting petitions protesting against the combining of the Mechanical and Electrical and Civil Engineering Colleges were invited before the Board. Mr. F. M. Crum appeared as spokesman to introduce various proponents.



In one of the students' petitions appeared the following resolution:-

"Chairman, Board of Trustees:

We, the undersigned students desire to appear before the Board of Trustees, and present petitions which we have, and given hearing and request that the meeting be thrown open till this is done."

So much of this memorial as requests the privilege of presenting petitions and being heard upon the same, having been granted, upon the appearance of the petitioners, the Governor said:

You have requested a hearing and the privilege of presenting petitions and memorials to the Board of Trustees of the State University. That privilege has been cheerfully accorded you. You have also requested that this meeting be thrown open until this is done. It is surprising that the manifest impropriety of such a request did not occur to you - I will not say the impertinence of such a demand. It is for this Board to determine whether its meeting shall be executive or public, and any expression from the student body in the nature of criticism, express or implied, of the conduct of the trustees of this University is unbecoming in the extreme. It is not the province of students to pass upon the propriety of the acts and doings of the trustees of this University or of its President or Professors. Your memorials will be heard. I hope, however, that it will not be necessary that I should further admonish you that while it is eminently proper that you express to the Board of Trustees your regret at the possible loss of a trusted and beloved preceptor, or, if you so desire, give any reasons why the Department of Civil Engineering should be preserved as a separate and distinct department of the University, you are not expected, and I am sure you will not, by way of memorial or by way of discussion of any memorial, attempt to sit in judgment upon your superiors or to indulge in any criticism of their conduct or motives. I admonish you in advance, that if such a thing should be attempted, it will not be tolerated.

Mr. C. T. Detson, spokesman for the students then began the reading of a memorial which appears here in full:

To the Honorable Members of the Board of Trustees, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky., November 17, 1916.

We the undersigned students of the University of Kentucky, hereby petition your honorable body to reconsider

and rescind the action of the Executive Committee taken on November 15, 1916, which recommended the consolidation of the College of Civil Engineering and the College of Mechanical and Electrical Engineering and making F. Paul Anderson Dean of all Engineering.

We do not believe that this proposed change is for the good of the University, nor was it designed for any such purpose. We, however, do believe that this change was proposed for the deliberate purpose of humiliating Dean Rowe, and for the aggrandizement of Dean Anderson.

As a student body we have the highest regard for Dean Rowe in every way. His methods are clean, clear cut, and his ability and experience as an engineer is unquestionably of the highest order.

We view with grave apprehension any move on the part of any one, the ultimate end of which is the concentration of more power or authority of any kind in the hands of F. Paul Anderson, and feel absolutely certain that the consummation of the proposed consolidation of the two Engineering Colleges will not only lose to the University the services of Dean Rowe, but will serve to intimidate and reduce to absolute acquiescence of members of the faculty in things not conducive to the best interests of the Institution. We believe that this latter statement to be the real design of the originators in this proposed consolidation of the Engineering Colleges.

Very respectfully submitted,

W. D. Sutton-Agric.	W. H. Rochester-B.S. Agric.
W. W. Owsley- "	C. P. Wyatt-A.B. Educ.
Char. R. Smith-"	O. B. Schaber-A.B.
E. B. Cavallo-Civil	E. D. Moseley-Agric.
A. C. Smith- "	R. Rodgers-A.B.
E. C. Kirtley-Agric.	F. M. Heick-B.S. Agric.
E. W. Scent-Civil	A. D. Crenshaw-Law
Vernon A. Dukle-Law	L. M. Campbell
Stanley H. Smith-Law	John C. Fuss
C. J. Schirmer	H. B. Clarke
E. B. Jones	J. J. Flocken
E. N. McIlvain-Agric.	John C. Miller
G. M. Gumbert- "	M. M. McCreight
Ed. S. Dabney	C. N. Batsel
John McKenzie	R. J. Karnes
C. M. Hubble-Agric.	F. W. Potts
R. H. Hung- "	W. B. Martin
Ray Gilbert- "	J. P. Ricketts
Paul M. Andres-Civil	J. T. Lovett
Charles B. Williams-Civil	H. M. Collier
Mose Smith-Civil	E. K. Kimpton
F. R. Grainger-B.E.M.	Lloyd Fitzgerald
W. O. Snoddy-A.&S.	Clarence Clark-B.S.
Thomas Gordon-Agric.	C. Planck-A.B.
S. A. Day-A. &S.	L. L. Wilson, Agric.

John G. Heber-Civil  
 B. K. Diamond-Civil  
 B. B. McInteer-Agric.  
 D. A. Bricken. B.S.  
 L. W. Adams-Civil  
 F. H. Bell-B.S. Law  
 S. H. Brown-Law  
 J. E. McLelland-B.M.E.  
 L. M. Kerswill-B.S.  
 L. H. Bauer-M. & E.  
 A. Taylor  
 J. F. Irvine-B.E.M.  
 Louis Goldberg-B.S.  
 Etna J. Baker  
 Maxie Johnson  
 R. M. Greene, Agric.  
 L. A. Bradford, Agric.  
 L. F. Rush-A. & S.  
 J. W. Milan-A. B.  
 Louis Reusch, Jr. Ag.  
 C. N. Batset, B. E. M.  
 F. M. Gossum-Agric.  
 W. Berckman-A. & S.  
 Wayne Cottingham-A.&S.  
 W. A. Gilliam-Law  
 W. W. Ware  
 W. M. Adams, B. C. E.  
 J. Spencer Rork, B. M.E.  
 T. G. Rivers-Civil  
 C. G. Cawein-Agric.  
 J. J. Hume, B.E.M.  
 Harold K. Hines, B.E.M.  
 W. C. Eyl-B.E.M.  
 R. Y. Fishback-B.C.E.  
 James G. Roney-B.C.E.  
 John T. Rawlings-Civil  
 T. D. Humphreys, B. C. E.  
 R. T. Ireland, B.C. E.  
 J. J. McBrayer-Law  
 C. T. Dotson-Law  
 F. E. Hickerson-Law  
 L. A. Piper-Civil  
 H. F. Taylor, Jr.-Civil  
 D. S. Engle-A.B.  
 J. K. Wallingford, E.M.  
 L.B. Burge-B.S.  
 R. W. Hanson-B.C.E.  
 E. R. Burnley-B.C.E.  
 H. C. Forman-C.E.  
 R. Frederic Fledge A.B.  
 Herbert C. Maxey-Law  
 W. C. Hoskins-Law  
 B. W. McMurtry  
 C. Cropper  
 R. S. Bowen-Law  
 N. L. Garrott-Ag.  
 W. O. Fogg-Law  
 Thomas M. Rodman - Ag.

R. Pearlman-B.S.  
 Tom Underwood-A.B.  
 Irvine E. Scrivner, Agric.  
 Douglas Crenshaw-Law  
 R. L. Duncan-Agric.  
 E. Y. Van Deren-Agric.  
 Joe G. Moseley-Agric.  
 Ed. D. Moseley-Agric.  
 Everett E. Kelley-A.B.  
 F. M. Heick-B. S. Agri.  
 Fred O. Mayes-A.B.  
 E. R. Likens-A.B.  
 M. L. Varnon-B.S.  
 Donald Dinsmore-A.B.  
 James W. Welch-A.B.  
 Frank Jenkins-B.S.  
 W. R. David-M.E.  
 Louis B. Bessy  
 Ronald Hutchison  
 F. E. Moss-Civil  
 Stanley Moore-Civil  
 Fellmore Sweatt  
 Henry Barker  
 V. L. Mansfield  
 N. W. Knight  
 J. G. Woodruff-B.S.  
 Hyman Fried-Civil  
 C. A. Timmer, B.M.E.  
 C. W. Crowder, Jr.  
 J. E. McMurtrey, Jr.  
 J. Liebschutz-A.&S.  
 A. S. Treadway  
 Beard Doss-Civil  
 W. H. Berry-Law  
 W. S. Rust-Law  
 V. Daniel-A.&S.  
 L. W. Herndon-M. & E.  
 Frank Shinnick-Agr.  
 Thos. M. Rodman-Agric.  
 Frank Crum-A.&S.  
 C. W. Harney-A.&S.  
 A. S. Kelley-A.&S.  
 J. B. Siefel-B.C.E.  
 A. S. Gill-Agr.  
 J.B. Fledge  
 R. W. Bennett-Agr.  
 M. G. Lasley-Agr.  
 Chas. L. Taylor-Agr.  
 E. M. Johnson-Agr.  
 J. L. Hammond-Agr.  
 W. P. Rhoads-Agr.  
 S. H. Jones-Civil  
 W. F. Marshall-Civil  
 J. M. Land-Civil  
 J. M. Utterback-B.C.E.  
 C. F. Johnson-B.C.E.  
 H. E. Robertson-B.C.E.  
 J. M. Pursifill - Civil.

S. H. Jones-B.C.E.  
~~Roscoe Black~~-Law  
 John C. Fuss-Civil  
 H. B. Clarke-Civil  
 W. C. Cobb-Civil  
 R.W. Rowlings-Civil  
 B. Fleming-Mining  
 C. R. Davidson-M.&E.  
 H. M. Neel-B.S.  
 O. K. McAdams-B.S.  
 L. I. Longworth-B.S.  
 Louis Goldberg-A. & S.  
 H. W. Borntraeger-B.S.  
 Sherley Hudson-Civil  
 R. E. Wilson-A.B. ← L.E. Steinhauser-Ag.  
 H. W. Whaley-Civil & O. Barte-BS.  
 J. W. Lindsay-Ag.  
 F. W. Tuttle-A. & S.  
 C. A. Wygal-B.S.  
 W. M. Poole-B.S.  
 E. D. Howerton  
 Ira G. Sloan-Ag.  
 Harris W. Farmer-Ag.  
 Clyde Blank- "  
 J. A. Wesson- "  
 W. L. Rouse- "  
 L. V. Amburgey- "  
 B. G. Marsh- "  
 W. V. Hutchcraft-"  
 G. H. Beasley-B.C.E.  
 W. R. Gary-A. & S.  
 W. P. Taylor-L.L.B.  
 J. S. Parker-B.C.E.  
 E. T. Tapscott-Agr.  
 M. S. Robinson-Agr.  
 R. B. Howell, Agr.  
 C. H. Heavrin-L.L.B.  
 Robert G. Duncan-A.&S.  
 J. A. Neblett-A.B.  
 E. H. Hackney, Jr.-L.L.B.  
 Geo. W. Gardner-Agr.  
 Neville Moore-B.S.  
 Morris Forman-A. & S.  
 M. Glickman-B.S.  
 H. H. Siegel-A.&S.  
 M. Vilcofsky-B.S.  
 C.C. Brown-Ag.  
 W. W. Boggess-M.E.  
 R. C. Monroe-A. & S.  
 R.B. Rankin-B.S.  
 H. Hession-A.B.  
 I. C. Graddy-B.S.  
 R. Watkins-Civil  
 J. A. Hodges-Agr.  
 J. C. Melvin-Agr.  
 W. J. Collins-Law  
 H. O. Newman-Agr.  
 R. T. Faulkner-Ag.

**B. Sparks-Civil**  
 H. E. Hicks-Law-  
 E. W. Lait-B.C.E.  
 E. B. Friedman-A.&S.  
 G. J. McGowan-Mech.  
 E. V. Elder-B.M.E.  
 C. M. Burton-B.M.E.  
 O. C. Schwant-B.E.M.  
 H. C. Haggan-Ag.  
 H. E. Robertson-B.C.E.  
 L. T. Rector-A. & S.  
 Edward A. Baute-A. & S.  
 Calvin Whitcomb-A. & S.  
**C. W. Bennett-Agric.**  
 M. L. Muncie-A. B.  
 Louis Goldberg-B.S.  
 Morris Vilcofsky-Agri.  
 C. B. Hill-B.C.E.  
 E. L. Kuykendall-B.C.E.  
 D. W. Christian-Civil  
 Ben Lowenthal-B.M.E.  
 Louis Gould-B.S.  
 Frank Trik-B.S.  
 Otis B. Taylor-Ag.  
 L. S. Fish  
 R. E. Henry  
 W. J. Cambren  
 J. E. Duke  
 W. H. Parker-Ag.  
 R. B. Venlt-B.S.  
 J. V. Chamberlain  
 M. U. Conditt  
 C. R. Gaugh-B.C.E.  
 J. G. Stewart-B.S. Ag.

Before he concluded reading this memorial, he was interrupted by the Governor who said:

File that memorial,- you will not read another line of it. It is amazing to me that these young gentlemen do not appear to understand the first duty of a student in this University. It is highly desirable that you should master the principles of engineering, civil and mechanical,- it is infinitely more important that you should practice deference to your preceptors and obedience to constituted authority. In so far as the President of this Institution, the trustees of this University and its professors are public servants, it is eminently proper that the citizens of this state should sit in judgement upon their conduct. It is not the province, however, of young men who are sent here as students to assume any such authority. The Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, members of the Legislature, the President of the United States, or the Federal Congress, are fit subjects for criticism by the citizens of the state and of the country. It is not, however, the province of the soldiers on the border to pass upon the conduct or proper management of the army and navy; it is not proper that soldiers in a company should reprimand a captain or criticize a colonel, and you wear the uniform of soldiers,-you are cadets, and the first lesson for you to learn is respect and obedience.

It would be better for this University that every insubordinate student be discharged, though it strip the institution of its matriculates, than that subordination and sedition should seethe here like a caldron, and open insolence to superiors go unrebuked.

I have spent many happy years in this institution. I have had some experience as a pupil and as a professor in college halls. I believe I understand something of the privileges and the duties of a student. I feel for my Alma Mater, the University of Kentucky, the affection of a student and the keen interest of a public servant, its dignity and its usefulness are very near my heart. I hope to see it grow in power and in usefulness. I am especially desirous that the Department of Engineering shall furnish to the State able and efficient young men who shall assist us in the construction of our public highways, but I am more anxious that they shall go forth not only qualified as engineers but grounded in the useful lesson of deference and obedience. 'They who have not learned to obey, are not fit to command.'

Mr. Burnley of the College of Civil Engineering presented the petition from the students which he read as follows:-

To The Honorable Governor, President, Executive Committee  
and the Board of Trustees of the University of Kentucky,  
Lexington, Ky., November 17, 1916

Gentlemen:-

Believing that the action taken by the Executive Committee of the University of Kentucky is detrimental to the welfare of the College of Civil Engineering and of the University of Kentucky, we, the undersigned students, of the College of Civil Engineering respectfully submit for your earnest consideration the following statement and petition.

Ten years ago the Trustees gave over to Prof. W. E. Rowe the entire direction and responsibility of preparing our students for professional careers in Civil Engineering.

**same**  
At the time there were no permanent quarters assigned to this College and the equipment was poor and inadequate. Classes were shifted about from place to place with great inconvenience. Not only were quarters and equipment lacking but personal help was furnished only from the spare time of the Commandant.

The College now enjoys and shares in the use of a large and well equipped building. The organization is second to none in the University. The methods of design and drafting are far superior to those of any other College of this University. These exceptional results are due to the energy and determination of Professor Rowe who at personal sacrifice has devoted his summers to actual work with the most progressive Engineering and Bridge companies in the United States. As Resident Engineer for the Illinois Central and detailer and checker for the American Bridge Co. has been able to bring back the most modern and approved methods of these up-to-date companies.

We respectfully represent further that the Intellectual and personal attainments of Professor Rowe have amply confirmed the wisdom of his original selection and appointment by your honorable body.

We honestly believe that we voice the unanimous sentiment when we say that Dean Rowe has endeared himself to all his students and associates. His personal qualities are fully equal to his intellectual attainments and both are unusually high. His positive, straight-forward, open manner is exceeded by his willingness to render timely assistance to those who call upon him.

Therefore we humbly petition our Governor, our President, our Executive Committee and our Board of Trustees not to confirm the reported removal of Dean Rowe from his position. We sincerely believe that the former action of the board was wise; that it has been confirmed by re-

sults, and that any other course is fraught with danger to the department. Hence we beg of you to preserve our College distinct for we are assured that any merger of our College with the College of Mechanical and Electrical Engineering will prove destructive to the best interests of the College of Civil Engineering.

Sincerely yours,

M.V. Burgin,	John G. Heber
R. Y. Fishback	N. W. Knight
Hyman Fried	Stanley C. Moore
J. T. Rawlings	D. S. Purdon
James G. Roney	L. W. Adams
C.R. Gaugh	C. B. Hill
E. W. Hopkins	P. M. Perkinson
K. C. Frye	R. C. Stephens
E. R. Burnley	T. E. Moss
W. M. Adams	C. B. Williams
Beard Doss	T. G. Rivers
H. G. Beasley	J. M. Utterback
George H. Hill, Jr.	R. W. Rawlings
W. W. Haffler	W. C. Cobb
H. E. Robertson	R. Ireland
Mose Smith	J. T. Vowel
Bradley Sparks	E. W. Scent
R. R. Diamond	Sherley Hudson
J. M. Land	R. W. Hanson
L. T. Wheeler	Howard I. Kinne
W. F. Marshall	H. C. Forman
W. E. Rowe, Jr.	J. C. Fuss
E. S. Forester	H. B. Clarke
C. F. Johnson	Paul M. Andres
A. E. Smith	H. G. Littrell
T. D. Humphreys	Harry W. Whaley
J. B. Siegel	J. M. Pursiful
H. F. Taylor, Jr.	E. B. Cavallo
E. L. Kuykendall	Louis F. Bessey
H. H. Barker	H. M. Collier
L. F. Bischof	L. A. Piper
Orville Collins	H. C. Frye
J. F. Sweatt	J. H. Hogrefe
D. W. Christian	
V. S. Mansfield	

George R. Smith, Attorney, representing certain business men of the city then asked leave and presented the petition from the citizens of Lexington protesting against coalition of the colleges in question. He said he was acting in behalf of the students and at their request. Governor Stanley said he had a right as an attorney representing citizens to read to that Board any petition he had to offer and would not be interrupted, whatever its contents. Mr. Smith then proceeded to read the following petition:

To the Honorable Members of the Board of Trustees, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky., November 19, 1916.

We hereby petition your honorable body not to affirm the regulation consolidating the College of Civil Engineering with that of Mechanical and Electrical Engineering.

Just at this period of development in the State, the College of Civil Engineering stands next to that of the College of Agriculture in regard to development of great importance to the commonwealth.

The College of Civil Engineering is doing a great work for the Commonwealth along the lines of Highway development and Municipal improvements and therefore should remain separate and distinct and be presided over by a man specially trained for the work and should not be in any way hindered or crippled by placing in charge of other hands.

The faculty of the University, the student body of the University, and the people of the City of Lexington have every confidence in the Administration of the College of Civil Engineering under the direction of Dean Walter E. Rowe, and have never heard anything but good reports from this College.

The students of the University, the faculty of the University, and the people of the City of Lexington will all greatly regret the passage of any act that would relieve Professor Rowe of the Deanship of the College of Civil Engineering, or any act that would enlarge in any way the influence of F. Paul Anderson.

Very respectfully submitted,

Frank L. Smith-Architect  
 Mrs. Frank Bricken  
 L. P. Gooding-Smith-Watkins  
 C. P. Rowland-Furniture  
 W. R. Pullen-Furniture  
 James M. Byrnes-Printer by J.M.  
 Chas. Anderson  
 Anderson & Benton  
 A. B. Barber  
 E. D. Veach  
 J. R. Henderson-Civil Engineer  
 Nelson H. Smith-Merchant

Frank L. Carter  
 C. W. Baugh, Harness



T. B. Talbot-Missionary  
 McGurk Bros.  
 E. P. Perry  
 Nich Ryan  
 J. J. Graddy  
 W. R. Pinnell  
 A. M. Caden  
 F. P. Keller-Florist  
 Wrenn & King  
 Kaufman Clothing Co.-Phil Straus  
 J. D. Purcell  
 C. A. Johns by A. E. Johns  
 P. A. Rowe, Ass't City Engr.  
 H. H. Barnes  
 Bishop Clay  
 W. C. Lawill  
 H. M. Silverman-F. & S. Shoes  
 W. F. Oldham-Grocery  
 A. Hamon-Clerk  
 T. J. Ginochio-Confectionery  
 A. M. Papania-Fruit  
 H. H. Leet-Furniture  
 Jeff T. Jones-Attorney  
 W. C. Stagg-Typewriter  
 David Kann-Grocer  
 J. T. Slaton, DDS  
 J. E. Robertson  
 Leonard Roberson  
 M. Levy-tailoring  
 George R. Smith, Atty.

Dean Rowe was then invited to appear before the Board. Before opening his remarks, the Governor said that the spirit of any insubordination shown by certain students as expressed in petitions demanded to be read before the Board was the first indication he had had that these young men had not been properly trained in the matter of obedience and subordination and regretted that they had not been taught the prime lesson of obedience.

Dean Rowe then read the statement which follows:

To the Honorable Board of Trustees,  
 University of Kentucky  
 Lexington, Ky.

It is with deep regret that after ten years of loyal and efficient service at this institution, I find it necessary to come before your honorable body in order to receive common courtesy and common justice.

As the head of the College of Civil Engineering I feel that it is not only my duty to organize the College and direct the instructional work, but that it is also my duty to protect this College from methods of organization which have been designed and which point to its destruction as a factor in the University. My influence in this institution has always been for the good. We have never given the administration any anxiety. This will be the universal testimony of students and faculty. The College

of Civil Engineering has done more building and made more progress with a small instructional staff and a small budget than any other College of the University, and I now request that the proposed amalgamation of the College of Civil Engineering and Mechanical and Electrical Engineering be not ratified for the following reasons:

1. Over twenty years ago these Colleges were separated by President Patterson and the Board of Trustees at the request of F. Paul Anderson, because Professor Anderson said at that time each engineering branch should be separate and distinct in order to do the best work. At that time Professor Anderson was Professor of Mechanical and Prof. J. P. Nelson was Dean of Engineering.
2. The College of Civil Engineering next to the College of Agriculture is the greatest factor in the State now assisting to develop the resources of the State. The development in Highways and municipal improvements require many more Civil Engineers than we are able to train at our University. At the beginning of this great construction period I would dislike very much to see the College of Civil Engineering hamstrung, which is practically what merger would mean.
3. In the proposed merger I was given no notice and the interests of the College of Civil Engineering were entirely overlooked.
4. No economy is proposed by the combine.
5. No work is duplicated under the present organization.
6. The budgets for 1916-17 have all been allotted and half spent or nearly so.
7. No necessity exists requiring the College to be combined.
8. At the present time it costs about \$1300 for every Mechanical Engineer graduated, while it costs about \$650 for each Civil Engineer graduated from the University.
9. The students in the College of Civil Engineering are better located than the students from any other College, and are more loyal and have greater respect for their course of study and their faculty than any other students in the University. The letters written testify to this fact.
10. The right to shape the policy of the College of Civil Engineering in the University is to be taken from the hands of a Civil Engineer and put into the hands of a Mechanical Engineer.
11. The move to consolidate was not for the purpose of bettering the conditions of the University but for the purpose of satisfying personal ambition, to intimidate the faculty, to increase the power of the Deans in usurping the rights of the faculty, and finally to eliminate me from the University.

12. If the time should ever come when a necessity shall arise demanding the consolidation of the engineering Colleges I will be the last man to object, but even then I should deem it proper and fitting that all parties to be included in a necessary merger should be notified and a scheme of merger worked out satisfactory to all. If a merger is to be consummated there are many things to be considered. Whether separate budgets are to be maintained, whether the right to arrange the various courses would be left with the specialist in his line or to some one not a specialist. These are vital questions to every course.

13. I have no personal quarrel with President Barker or any other member of the faculty and it is no part of my appeal to say anything unkind or unseemly about any one, I am simply asking that justice be done and I feel that the members of the Board of Trustees are too far removed from the situation to pass upon the matter without going into the question thoroughly. If this board will appoint a committee from their number, call in the service of a stenographer, examine students and members of the faculty and promise them protection they will soon have the situation in hand. If they do not do this, the same unpleasant things that are constantly occurring will continue to occur.

14. I deplore as greatly as any one, the things that have been circulated and wish to say that these were no part of my defense, and I am ignorant of the parties perpetrating the acts and they could not have been circulated by any one interested in my cause.

Very truly yours,

Walter Rowe  
Dean College of Civil Engineering.

Dean Rowe was asked various questions by members of the Board bearing on the work of his College and course of study pursued therein. Dean Rowe said that he regarded combining at this time a source of embarrassment in the progress of his work, in that at this present time the state was in the midst of a great era of road building which would have much to do with developing her natural resources; that in this work his students had been eminently successful; that he had taken great pride in their success and had ambition to continue it.

The students and Dean Rowe then started to leave the room but the Governor urged that they remain and see how this Board would handle the question at issue.

Mr. Lyle suggested that both Deans Norwood and Anderson be called.

Dean Anderson was sent for and entered the room. He was asked to give his views on the propriety of the consolidation. Dean Anderson said in substance "Gentlemen, I have no statement to make, I am a servant of this Institution, I am ready to obey

the orders of my superiors. The merger is not yet an accomplished fact and I am not therefore in a position to make any statement affecting details at this time."

Dean Norwood came into the room at this point. Asked if he had any statement to make, Dean Norwood said; "I was called and am here in obedience of that call. I have no statement or request to offer but will be pleased to answer any questions you gentlemen desire to put to me." In answer to certain questions, Dean Norwood stated that he had thought for sometime it would be better for the College of Mining Engineering to enter such a combination. He said, "I have considerable ambition to build up my College and enhance the training of my young men. It seems to me that we could handle matters better by having these separate departments, all of engineering training, combined under one head. In addition to mining, our students need training in other phases of engineering. We are not equipped to give these courses as they should be given, hence I conclude it will be well to combine the engineering efficiencies of the three departments to this end because I believe my department would do better work under such arrangement. I have stated this to Dean Anderson."

At this point Mr. Stoll suggested that the students and Deans retire and that the body continue its discussion of the question in executive session.

Doctor Gatliff then submitted the following resolution:

Whereas, the Board of Trustees desires to be more fully acquainted with the reasons for and against the proposed consolidation of the Colleges of Mechanical and Civil Engineering,

And, Whereas, there is not sufficient time for obtaining knowledge of true facts relating to the expediency of the proposed consolidation during the present meeting of the Board,

Therefore, Resolved that the chairman of the Board appoint a committee composed of non-resident Trustees and of members who are not members of the Executive Board to investigate the expedience and propriety of the proposed consolidation and to report to an adjourned meeting of the regular Board, or at the regular meeting in June.

This Committee is further instructed to investigate and report upon other conditions causing or tending to produce discontent among the Alumni and Student body, and of the general public towards the existing Administration.

The Committee shall have power to administer an oath and to guarantee immunity to such students and employees of the institution as they may call to testify.

The scope of this investigation shall include the Experiment Station as well as the University proper.

Mr. Lyle moved to amend Doctor Gatliff's resolution to the effect that the Board approve the action of the Executive Com-

mittee affecting the merger and that this Board appoint an Investigating Committee as called for in the motion. After considerable discussion, Mr. Lyle withdrew his amendment to Doctor Gatliff's resolution and the resolution was passed unanimously as presented.

Mr. Lyle in discussing the resolution gave his reasons for approving the action of the Executive Committee. He submitted a paper written by H. C. Anderson of the class of '97, at this time, one of the most eminent engineers in the United States, which he said Mr. Anderson prepared at his, (Lyle's) request, setting out the reasons of an expert why greater efficiency could be accomplished by the merger. This paper was filed with the Secretary.

Mr. Stoll moved that all discussions be eliminated from these minutes. The motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Froman, alluding to Governor Stanley's admonition to protesting students on the score of discipline and obedience moved that the Trustees go on record as approving the forceful and striking way in which the chairman had presented the matter in presiding over this meeting. The motion was carried unanimously.

Governor Stanley announced that he would appoint the committee contemplated in Doctor Gatliff's motion after he had time to think the matter over carefully.

The Trustees approved by unanimous vote the following report from the Registrar:

December 12, 1916

The faculty of the University of Kentucky begs to report to the Board of Trustees that the following persons had completed the course of study leading to the degrees as indicated below, and request that these degrees be granted:

BACHELOR OF ARTS IN EDUCATION

Rachael Bohrer  
Orville Willett

BACHELOR OF ARTS IN HISTORY

Walter Lindsay McKee

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY

Owen Scott Lee

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN AGRICULTURE

Eugene Thomas McClure

Ezra L Gillis  
Registrar.

Mr. Stoll submitted the following report:

December 8, 1916

To the Board of Trustees,  
University of Kentucky,

Gentlemen:-

At a meeting of the Board of Trustees in June, the undersigned was appointed on a special committee to recommend to this Board sub-committees of the Board, and to define the duties of each of the sub-committees.

Your committee would recommend that the following committees with the following duties be appointed at each regular meeting of the Board, and that such committees report at the next subsequent meeting of the Board.

The committees recommended and their duties are as follows:-

1- Committee on President's Report.

The committee on the President's report shall consider the report of the President of the University, and shall make such recommendations and suggestions relating thereto as it may deem proper to the Board of Trustees for its action. The committee on the President's report, however, may report at the same meeting of the Board at which the report of the President is made.

2- Committee on Military Instruction and Discipline.

The Committee on Military Instruction and Discipline shall investigate the discipline at the University and instructions given in military science. It shall make such recommendations as it sees fit to make for the betterment of the discipline of the University and for the improvement of the instructions in military science, which recommendations shall be contained in a report made to the Board of Trustees of the University for its action.

3- Committee on Internal Problems.

The Committee on Internal Problems shall examine into the courses and methods of instruction at the University and as to the competency and ability of the officers and teaching force to the end that the students at the University may receive the best instructions, and that the business affairs of the University be properly handled. This committee may consider and recommend new courses of study or the elimination of courses of study, and in general anything that will in its opinion improve the instruction or the conduct of the business affairs of the University, and it shall report to the Board of Trustees for its action.

4- Committee on nomination of Executive Committee of the University.

This committee shall nominate to the Board of Trustees at its June meeting suitable persons to act as members of the Executive Committee for the ensuing year.

5- Committee on Nominating members of the Board of Control.

This Committee shall nominate to the Board of Trustees

suitable persons to act as members of the Board of Control of the Experiment Station at each June meeting of the Board of Control, such members of the Board of Control to serve for ensuing year.

6- Committee on Buildings and Grounds.

It shall be the duty of the Committee on Buildings and Grounds to examine into the physical condition of the buildings of the University and the care of the grounds of the University, and to make such recommendations to the Board of Trustees for its action as the Committee may deem proper.

7- A Committee on the general welfare of the University shall be composed of five persons, at least three of whom shall be alumni or former students of the University. It shall be the duty of this committee to consider generally everything connected with the University in any way, and to make such recommendations as it may deem proper for the betterment and welfare of the University to the Board of Trustees for its action. The members of this Committee shall be appointed for one year.

Your Committee further recommends that with the exception of the Committee on General Welfare of the University that each Committee be composed of three persons; that each of these Committees shall visit the University as often as the Committee shall deem proper in order to properly perform its duties and formulate its report, and all expenses of such committees incurred in attending to its duties shall be paid by the University.

Your Committee would further recommend that no member of the Executive Committee of the University be appointed on any of the above Committees.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard C. Stoll-Chairman  
H. S. Barker,  
J. M. Elliston

President Barker submitted his report which is attached herewith.

Mr. Brock offered the following resolution which was adopted unanimously:

Be it resolved by the Board of Trustees of the University of Kentucky that hereafter no appointment shall be made to any position in the University or Experiment Station, of any member of the Board of Trustees for at least two years after his term of office expires, or of any person who is a near relative by blood or marriage of any person holding a position in the University or the Experiment Station, or of any member of the Board of Trustees.

Meeting adjourned subject to call of the Chairman.

Respectfully,  
Enoch Grehan  
Secretary-Board of Trustees

APPLICANTS FOR DIRECTOR OF EXPERIMENT STATION

C. C. Hedges,  
Department Chemistry & Chemical Eng.,  
College Station, Texas

*Note -  
Between  
Minutes of Dec. 12, 1916  
and Pass. Board's report  
dated Dec. 12*

Doctor J. N. Harper,  
Clemson Agricultural College,  
Clemson College, S. C.

Doctor C. K. Francis,  
Oklahoma Agr. & Mechanical College,  
Stillwater, Oklahoma.

R. M. Allen,  
Ward Baking Co.,  
New York City.

J. H. Shepperd,  
N. D. Agricultural College,  
Agricultural College, N. D.

C. I. Christie,  
Department Agricultural Extension,  
Purdue University,  
LaFayette, Ind.

Professor J. J. Hooper

Doctor Fred Mutchler

Professor E. S. Good

J. A. Yates,  
State Manual Training Normal School,  
Pittsburg, Kansas.

L. Junious Desha,  
Memphis, Tennessee.

Dr. Alfred Peter

W. H. Scherffius

H. A. Morgan  
Knoxville, Tennessee



Names of those protesting against coalition of Civil and Mechanical Engineering Colleges.

- J. S. Parrigan, Associate Member American Society Civil Engineering, Dayton, Ohio.
- R. L. Gregory, Interstate Commerce Commissioner, Chattanooga, Tenn.
- R. T. Albert, '16, Dayton, Ohio
- L. L. Adams, Nashville, Tenn. ( L.&N. R. R. Stationery.)
- R. Lavercombe, Milwaukee (Sewerage Commissioner Stationery)
- Robert L. Ehrlich, B. C. E., Owensboro, Kentucky
- H. A. Nelson, 1910. (Interstate Commerce Commissioner, Chattanooga, Tennessee)
- Sherman H. Stevens, 1910 )Interstate Commerce Commissioner Envelope)
- Benjamin D. Home, Louisville.
- Emery Wells, Assisting Engineer, St. Louis, St. Louis and Frisco R. R
- R. S. Haff, Assisting Engineer, Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad, St. Louis, Missouri
- John H. Hogrefe, Madison, Mississippi
- Louis Roth, Chicago. Chief Engineer Calumet Steel Co.
- G. A. Scott, Paducah, Kentucky. Commissioner Public Works Stationery.
- S. E. Caudill, Tifton, Ga. (Atlantic Coast Line R. R. Stationery.)
- S. B. Coleman, Legislator, Elkton, Kentucky
- O. S. Aulich,
- T. M. Hamerton, Bryson City, N. C. Eng. Swain Highway Commission.
- R. T. Robinson, B. C. E. 1910 Assisting Eng. Maintenance of Way, East Coast Railroad.
- Clarence H. Schwartz, B. C. E. 1914, Dayton, Ohio, Miami Conservatory District.
- Naler A. Horn, Akron, Ohio, B. C. E. 1911
- Tounsel Combs, Hazard, Kentucky
- James S. Chambers, Austin, Texas, 1909. Superintendent of Construction.
- W. W. Clarke, 1916, Loganport, Indiana
- James E. Byars, B. C. E., Ft. Madison, Iowa

Albert S. Karsner, Lexington, B. C. E. 1907

F. R. Naylor, Marshall, Texas, Assistant Division Engineer,  
Texas & Pacific.

F. F. Caywood, Harlan, Kentucky Contractor and Builder.

J. S. Coleman, B. C. E. 1914, Chattanooga, Tennessee

J. V. Karrich, American Bridge Company, Ambridge, Pennsylvania

H. W. Smith, 1910, Kansas City, Missouri

Charles Treasurer, C. E., 1901, Aberdeen, Mississippi

John B. Hutchings, Jr., B. C. E. 1903, Associate Member Society  
Civil Engineering.

H. T. Madison, B. C. E., 1907, San Francisco.

A. Duncan, Assistant Engineer, Delaware & Lachamania Road,  
? Brighthampton, New York

Fred Myers, Assistant Engineer, C. C. C. & St. Louis, R. R. Co.

H. D. Palmore, Principal High School, Glasgow, Kentucky

G. M. Ferris, Knoxville, Tennessee

A. G. Rankin, Gary, Indiana

Ernest L. Baches, C. E. Class 1911, Grand Chain, Illinois Engi-  
neer in charge U. S. Dredge Boat, Zeta.

John H. Wadsworth, 1912, Norwood, Ohio-Allis Chalmers, Manu-  
facturing Company.

E. M. Denham, '07, Hazard, Kentucky

Letter postmarked stamped, Kentucky and signed B. E. Rout, Contractor

W. R. Grimes, Jr., Assistant Postmaster.

M. C. Newland, Circuit Clerk.

G. Hays Lexter, C. E.

W. C. Wilson, Superintendent City Schools

J. L. McKeem, County Road Engineer

W. R. Wallis, Civil Engineer, Marbs, Mississippi

Favoring Coalition

J. H. Graham, New York City, Class 1900, under John P. Brooks

December 12, 1916

TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES,  
University of Kentucky.

Gentlemen:-

As by law required, I have, now, the honor to make you my official report as President of the University.

Up to the present time, we have on our register the names of eleven hundred and ninety-five (1195) students, which is about twenty less than we had at this time last year. This deficit is more than accounted for by the students in the State Guard who are now patrolling the Mexican border and some engineers who have been tolled away to the large munition plants of the North by the high prices which they obtain for their labor during the great European War.

The student body, so far as mental equipment and ability, is the equal, if not the superior, to any body of students that have been here during my administration. I think the progress of the University, in every way, is gratifying, and it gives me great pleasure to so report to you.

That you may have before your mind the total progress of the institution, I repeat what I have said on former occasions, that the number of students has about doubled within the last six years; the total income of the institution has increased \$50,000 per year, and I believe the teaching done in the University proper, taken as a whole, is the equal to that of any institution of similar kind in the country. The only way that I know to compare the preparation of our students with that of students of other institutions is by observing the results when ours come into intellectual competition with the students of other universities and colleges.

I shall first take up the debating and oratorical record of the University of Kentucky from 1910-11 to 1916-17, inclusive. From 1910-11 to 1916, inclusive, the University of Kentucky has participated in the following intercollegiate contests:-

In April 1911, Intercollegiate Debate between Central University and University of Kentucky was won by State, unanimously.

Debate between Transylvania and State was held in the spring of 1912, and resulted in a victory for State.

In the spring of 1913, a triangular debate was held among the law teams of the University of Indiana, Transylvania and State. State won unanimously at Indianapolis, and tied at Lexington, there being only two judges.

In 1913 the Intercollegiate Debate between Georgetown and State was won by State, unanimously, at Georgetown.

In 1914, the University of Kentucky won the Intercollegiate Oratorical contest.

In 1914, the Intercollegiate Debate was between Vanderbilt and University of Kentucky, and was won by State at Lexington.

In 1915, the Intercollegiate Debate between Georgetown and the University of Kentucky was won by State at Georgetown.

In 1915, the Triangular Debate was among Vanderbilt, University of Alabama and University of Kentucky. State lost both debates.

In 1916, the Intercollegiate Debate between University of Kentucky and Central University was won by Central at Lexington.

In 1916 State won the Intercollegiate Oratorical Peace Contest, at Lexington, in a contest with Kentucky Colleges.

In 1916 State also won the Southeastern group contest at Chapel Hill, N. C., and at Mohawk, N. Y., the University of Kentucky won a prize of sixty dollars (\$60.00).

Within the last five years there has been great interest in literary and debating societies. State has won two-thirds of her intercollegiate contests and most of the societies have held intersociety debates and oratorical and declamatory contests. There is perhaps more interest in literary work in the University of Kentucky, today, than ever before in its history.

As you perhaps know, our Agricultural College has been sending stock judging teams to the great interstate stock shows where they competed with teams from other agricultural colleges for prizes offered for the best judging of stock. I herein set forth a list of some of the stock judging contests with the following results:-

At the National Dairy Show in Chicago in 1912, the boys from the University of Kentucky won four out of six trophies offered at that show, as follows:-

- (1) The National Holstein-Friesian Cattle Breeders Association cup for the best judging of Holstein cattle.
- (2) The silver pitcher offered by the American Guernsey Cattle Club for the best judging of that breed.
- (3) The silver vase offered by the National Dairy Show for the best judging of Jerseys, Guernseys, Ayrshires, and Holsteins.

[4) The large loving cup offered by the Hoard's Dairyman for the best judging of the four breeds of dairy cattle. Fourteen universities were represented in this contest.

At the International Live Stock Exposition in 1913, the students from this institution won the contest for the best judging of American Saddle horses and was awarded the large silver loving cup offered by the American Saddle Horse Breeders Association. The contestants in this contest came from the Universities of Missouri, Iowa, Texas and Kentucky.

In 1913, the team of students from this institution won the large silver loving cup offered by the American Ayrshire Breeders Association for the best judging of Ayrshire cattle at the National Dairy Show in Chicago.

That year the Dairy team from this institution won second place with fourteen universities competing, Iowa occupying first place.

At the International Live Stock Exposition this month the team of students from the University ranked seventh in competition with fifteen Universities and in the judging of one type of animal, namely, sheep, our boys won third place.

The milk and cream from this institution has been exhibited at various dairy shows. At the National Dairy Show in Chicago in 1912, we were awarded second premium in open competition with some thirty dairies, on a sample of milk, consisting of four quarts. At the International Dairy Show in 1912, at Milwaukee, we were awarded second premium in open competition with all dairies on the sample of cream that we sent.

In June 1915, an exhibit of four quarts of milk was sent to the Panama Pacific Exposition and in competition with six state universities, was awarded second premium, a silver medal and a diploma of excellence.

At the National Egg Show held at Purdue University in May 1916, this university was awarded first premium in competition with ten state universities. We won on this exhibit of eggs the first premium in the class for "White Eggs" and also the premium offered for sweep-stakes, consisting of a silver pitcher offered for the best exhibit of "eggs of any color", including white and brown.

Regarding the apple judging contests, in which our horticultural students have participated, the first occurred in Washington on December 19, 1913, under the auspices of the American Pomological Society. The contestants for that year were Arthur Bruckner, Paul D. Brown and Leon Leonian. They took third or fourth position out of eight or ten contestants.

In the contest at Morgantown, W. Va., held in January 1915, our boys stood second in the contest.

One year ago, at Baltimore, a contest was held under the auspices of the Maryland Horticultural Society, and our representatives stood fifth.

The Athletic Department of the University has shown great activity within the last five years, and is ranking higher, at present, than ever before with Southern teams.

In 1912, nine football games were played, State winning seven, with a total of 240 points to their opponents 41. That year they were defeated by V.M.I. and Miami.

In 1913, six of the eight games played that year were won by State. They were defeated by Illinois and Tennessee.

In 1914, State won five of the eight games played that year. They were defeated by Tennessee, Purdue and Cincinnati; however, winning the game played with Mississippi A. & M.

In 1915, eight games were played, State winning six, losing only one with Mississippi A. & M. and tying Sewanee.

This past year only seven games were played, our boys winning four, losing the one with Vanderbilt, and tying Sewanee and Tennessee.

Last year Schrader was selected for All Southern team in the Guide and Rhodes was selected universally for All Southern. This was the first time this institution was ever represented on an All Southern team. Within the last few years, the northern papers, those of New York and Chicago, have been collecting statistics and results of our games. Only recently Parke H. Davies, the greatest football statistician of the United States, has included the reports of the University of Kentucky. Within these five years the University of Kentucky has not been defeated in football or baseball by a Kentucky team.

From the foregoing, you will observe that our students have more than held their own in all contests which they have had with the students of other universities and colleges of the United States during the last five years, and this result certainly shows that the work done here has been the equal of that of any of the institutions with whom we have come in competition and superior to many of them.

You have before you a copy of our Business Agent's financial report to the first of December, which shows that we have lived within our income as by law required. I commend to you a patient and careful perusal of this report.

On the November 15, 1916, the Executive Committee, in regular session, passed a resolution consolidating the Mechanical and Electrical Engineering College with that of the Civil Engineering, placing Dean F. Paul Anderson at the head of the consolidated school. Since then Professor Norwood, of his own motion, has endorsed the philosophy and expediency of this move and requested that the College of Mines also be included in the consolidation. This I heartily recommend to

you for the following reasons:

Professor F. Paul Anderson, in my mind, is one of the greatest engineers in the country. He has indomitable energy and great executive ability; his college has long been a model of excellence and reflects great credit upon the institution of which he is a part. Under Professor Anderson's administration, these schools will go forward with great energy and the students will all be benefited by the change. The consolidation will not only increase the efficiency of the institution, but will increase the economy of administration, and will give a great deal more room in the engineering department than it has had heretofore. To illustrate, the College of Mechanical and Electrical Engineering has nearly double as many students as the other two combined. Each of the others has better buildings and more room than the College of Mechanical and Electrical Engineering. By the consolidation all of this space can be utilized in an economical way and will, in my opinion, save the cost of erection of a new building for Professor Anderson's college.

In this progressive age of industrial achievements, it is very necessary that every engineer, regardless of the particular field that he undertakes, should have comprehensive training in shop practice. At the present time, only the mining and mechanical engineers take shop work at the University of Kentucky. Civil engineers do not take it. The civil engineer's work at the present time is largely a mechanical process; bridges are manufactured and the civil engineer who takes up bridge design should be a good shop man. Dredging machinery, pile driving machinery, all structural work, can only be handled intelligently by men who know shop methods. There is scarcely a field of endeavor, outside of the mere routine of surveying, that the civil engineer does not need shop experience as a basis of leadership.

The students of the University in engineering, should have a two-year fundamental course in drawing, mathematics, physics and chemistry. This will give an opportunity for young men to determine as to just what field of specialized engineering they prefer to enter and time will be given for young men to decide what special course of study will be taken during the junior and senior years.

By having all the engineering courses together, a harmonious engineering atmosphere can be created, where the interest of every student who is taking engineering will be identical. All the students can have the advantages of non-resident engineering lectures which are, up to the present time, very largely denied civil engineers for very little attempt has been made to bring to the University, eminent engineers to address engineering students.

What applies to shop practice, applies to machine design and the knowledge of electrical and steam machinery. No civil engineer is adequately trained who does not have a fundamental training in these subjects.

The College of Mechanical and Electrical Engineering has taught for a number of years, Descriptive Geometry, Strength of Materials, Analytical Mechanics, Elementary Drawing, laboratory work in testing materials, and this year, after some pertinent comments had been made about the civil engineer not getting any steam engineering, the seniors are getting some work in Thermodynamics.

All the engineering students should be given a more special training in English. A course in English training, three hours a week during the senior year, has been arranged for mechanical and electrical engineers. The civil and mining engineers should be given advantage of this training.

One of the great handicaps that has existed at the University of Kentucky is the spirit of hostile rivalry that exists among the three colleges of engineering. This sort of spirit does harm to all students and should be eliminated. A young man cannot become a leader in a profession who is not drilled day after day for a considerable period, in the ethics of his profession and this cannot be done where hostile rivalry exists among the students of the same University. The principal thing that a young man learns in his university life is to be ready to respond without question to the orders of constituted authority.

The standard of work in all of the engineering colleges can be improved by having all of the men in one great organization. Proper rivalry and spirit can be created by seeing that splendid training is given in every branch of engineering and then let the young man choose that that best meets his tastes and talents.

By having all of the engineering under one organization, there can be a very efficient system developed, using the physical properties of the various engineering colleges. The laboratories can be combined; the recitation rooms can be more effectually used; the drawing rooms can be in common. Special subjects can be introduced, even with the present force of instructors, such as architectural training, sanitary engineering, general efficiency engineering, and concrete construction.

There need be no concern about a broad engineer seeking to train men in the particular branch in which he is interested. This is the idle fancy of the narrow man. The broad engineer, through his association with many fields of engineering endeavor will be proud to provide opportunity for the exercise of every phase of engineering intelligence.

In conclusion on this particular subject, permit me to say that I have no feeling in this matter of consolidation and no desire to humiliate Professor Rowe, the Dean of the College of Civil Engineering, or to aggrandize Professor Anderson. I have no desire to put up any man or to pull any man down. My position in this matter is covered solely by what I think would redound to the substantial benefit and interest of the University, and the wisdom of the proposed change is now submitted to you.



Under the provisions of the Smith-Lever bill, with which you are familiar, the University, in connection with the government of the United States, is carrying on a very large and varied Extension Work throughout Kentucky. We are really conducting an out-of-doors University where the lecture halls and laboratories and the class rooms are the farms, the corn fields and tobacco patches. Here the farming part of the community is given very valuable lessons in scientific agriculture. There are now in the field in Extension Work forty-three (43) men county agents and twenty-six (26) women county agents, making a total of sixty-nine (69) extension workers, not including specialists of the college and demonstration specialists. The University is spending, this session, the sum of \$171,623.30, and next year this will be increased very considerably by the additions authorized by the government under the Smith-Lever bill, which goes on increasing each year, until 1923, when Kentucky's part will be \$142,300 and the total budget for this work will be in the neighborhood of a quarter of a million dollars. All of this money is spent through the University and can only be used for actual demonstration work in the field. It is our intention and hope, within a very few years, to have a man county agent and a woman county agent in each county of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, and I see no reason to doubt that by pushing this great work, the Commonwealth of Kentucky will soon be agriculturally one of the greatest states in the Union.

It would be impossible for me to set forth, in my report, the details of the work of the Extension Department. During the past summer, there were held throughout the State by this department, a large number of farmers' chautauquas, farmers' institutes and educational institutes with an agricultural bearing. These were attended in large numbers by the farmers of the neighborhood. Learned lectures were delivered by specialists from the college and elsewhere on all the vital subjects in which farmers are interested. These included, of course, soil fertility; rotation of crops; animal husbandry; poultry raising; hog cholera, its prevention and cure; home economics; rural credits and co-operative marketing. I attended a large number of these in person and delivered such addresses as I thought appropriate to the occasion and best for arousing enthusiasm in everything which makes for the uplift of the rural community. Upon the whole, I think these meetings resulted in much good and will grow in popularity in the future.

During the year there were 954 boys in Pig Clubs, and these clubs were held in forty counties of the state. 747 of these boys bought and raised a pure bred pig at a net profit of twelve dollars (\$12.00) per pig. Had each pupil of school age raised a pig, their profits would have more than maintained the public schools of Kentucky. Through the work of the agents in the Extension Department, bankers, and farmers and business men contributed, as prizes, six thousand dollars (\$6,000). 656 boys and girls in Poultry Clubs raised, last year, ten thousand standard bred chickens, worth from one dollar to one dollar and fifty cents each, and this was done in the poorer sections of the State and not

in the Blue Grass country.

There were 1200 girls in Canning Clubs, being divided into one hundred and forty-four (144) clubs. These were taught by the women agents, and they canned two hundred and twenty-six thousand (226,000) cans of tomatoes and other vegetables and fruits. These cans were worth, and were sold readily, when sold at all, at fifteen cents each, but they were mostly kept in the homes as additions to the usual menu. All of these cans could have been sold readily on the market, the demand being much greater than the supply.

The girls' clubs were also taught plain sewing, home economy and sanitation, and the local support of these clubs in the communities where they existed has been double that of any previous year.

No one not in close touch with this work can appreciate its magnitude or its importance. One of the principal objects of the Extension Work is home building; to make comfortable and beautify the homes of the men whose lives are isolated on the farm. This means sanitation, wholesome food, wholesomely cooked and delicately served. It means music and flowers, books and telephones and all the gifts of science that are within the reach of the city man, shall also come into the home and life of the country man. But this can only be done by educating the farmer in the way of making money and educating his wife and daughter in the way to spend it so as to bring the maximum amount of elegance, culture and health to the country home.

I have spoken more particularly of the Agricultural side of the University than of any other. This is because scientific education in Agriculture has been so woefully neglected in the past by the farmers of the State.

The great mission then of the Agricultural College is to consider the condition of the farmer, to educate his children and to imbue them with the love for the farm and a just appreciation of the nobility of agriculture as a vocation; to solve all the problems which need solution, to restore the fertility of the depleted soil; to find for him a market for his produce; to teach him the value and philosophy of cooperating with his neighbors for the mutual benefit of the whole community; to banish preventable disease from his family and his stock; to unloose from his throat the grasp of monopoly and unlawful combinations by whatever name called; to banish sloth and poverty and all unnecessary toil and to fix the bow of hope on the horizon of prosperity. This view in no wise loses sight of the value of cultural education or in any way minimizes it: it rather rounds out and illumines the rural life by clasping the hand of academic culture in that of agricultural success.

In this connection, I desire to say that our Extension Work brings us in very close touch with the Farmers' Union, whose President is a graduate of our Agricultural College, also a post graduate in Agriculture in the University of Wisconsin and who has taught Agriculture and Agricultural

Education in the State University of Missouri. I have assisted him and his enterprises as far as I could, giving him office room in the Administration building and furnishing him, so far as I was able, with all the aid and assistance that he needed. Mr. Harrison's work, in a very large part, is pure Extension Work, and I suggest, to aid the farmer as far as possible, the Extension Department should take over a pro rata of his salary, equal to what he does in Extension Work. This would draw the farmers closer to us, aid them in a most laudable enterprise, and at the same time greatly facilitate the work the great Extension Department is doing. This would bring us in close touch with the great principles of cooperation among farmers and enable us to teach in a practical way, the farmers the absolute necessity of their cooperating with each other and with the State of Kentucky in building up an Agricultural interest and Agricultural Education.

This is made as a suggestion to be taken up and considered by the Extension Department at some time in the near future, and if the wisdom of the suggestion commends itself to them, I hope they will adopt it.

I wish to reiterate that every interest in the Commonwealth is involved in the fate of Agriculture; it is the basis of the large part of our real wealth. Unless the farmer prospers, every other business must correspondingly suffer; if he is prosperous, every other interest is prosperous. It matters little how much money you spend on pensions or criminals or idiots, on the insane, the deaf and dumb, the halt and the lame, if you do not dry up the fountains of the farmers' wealth; if you make his farm fertile, his crops smile in the waving fields and his bins and granaries burst in the exuberance of their overflow, he cares not what taxes you take or spend.

This University is valuable to the Commonwealth of Kentucky just in proportion as it stimulates every intellectual interest and aspiration of its people. In other words, it must bring to every man the last word in science which is interesting to his business or necessary to his life. It must educate and ennoble all the children of all the people of the Commonwealth.

Respectfully submitted

(Signed)

Henry S. Barker